TO: Those listed below*

FROM: Alan H. Geiger, Secretary, Board of Trustees

SUBJECT: Minutes of the October 8, 1988, Meeting of the Board

Enclosed for your file is a copy of the October 8 minutes. This draft will be presented for approval at the next stated meeting of the Board.

Also enclosed for members of the Board are copies of the minutes of the September 29, 1988, meeting of the Innovation Center and Research Park Authority and the October 3, 1988, meeting of the Edison Animal Biotechnology Center Authority. A new Trustees Directory is also enclosed.

I will be calling around soon to see if you will be able to attend the Regent's budget and strategy session planned for Wednesday, November 16, 1988, at Darby Dan Farm. The time is 3:30 p.m. and we would appreciate your attending if your schedule permits. Thanks!
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Enclosures

*Chairman and Members of the Board
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Voelker
Dr. Ping
Dr. Bruning
Dr. Harter
Dr. Turnage
Mr. Rudy
Dr. Geiger
Mr. Kennard
Mr. Ellis
Mr. Burns
Mr. Mahn
Archivist (2)
Chairman, Regional Coordinating Council
Chairs of the Senate
EXECUTIVE SESSION

Prior to the Formal Board of Trustees Meeting, the members met Saturday morning in Executive Session at 8:30 A.M., in the Conference Room of Cutler Hall. Six members present included Chairman Campbell, Mrs. D'Angelo, Mr. Heffernan, Mr. Russ, Mr. Schey and Dr. Strafford. Also present were President Ping and Secretary Geiger.

On a motion by Mr. Russ, and a second by Dr. Strafford, "The Ohio University Board of Trustees hereby resolved to hold an executive session to consider collective bargaining matters under Section 121.22(G)(4) O.R.C. and property matters in accordance with Section 121.22(G) O.R.C. this 8th day of October 1988." On a roll call vote all members voted aye.

Chairman Campbell asked President Ping to report on the two matters before the Board. The President reviewed the current attempt to organize the clerical staff and in turn was given direction on how to proceed in the matter. President Ping outlined three proposals for long-term leases of university property in the Home and E. State Streets area. Consideration, pending further negotiations, is expected at a later date.

I. ROLL CALL

Seven members were present, namely Chairman Richard R. Campbell, Priscilla S. D'Angelo, Dennis B. Heffernan, Fritz J. Russ, Ralph E. Schey, Lewis R. Smoot, Sr. and Craig Strafford, M.D. This constituted a quorum. Trustee Jeannette G. Grasselli attended Friday sessions, but was unable to attend the Saturday meeting.

President Charles J. Ping and Secretary Alan H. Geiger were present. Also present was Donald H. Voelker who sits with the Board by invitation as President of the Ohio University Alumni Board of Directors.
II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JUNE 25, 1988
(Previously distributed)

Mr. Schey moved that the minutes be approved as distributed. Mr. Heffernan seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.

III. COMMUNICATION, PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Secretary Geiger reported none had been received.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Secretary Geiger stated there were no announcements.

V. REPORTS

Chairman Campbell invited President Ping to present persons for reports. The President introduced, in turn, Provost James L. Bruning, Vice President Carol C. Harter, William Y. Smith, J.D., and Gary O. Moden, Ph.D. Much of the supportive material utilized by presentors is included with the official minutes. An overview of each report therefore is only included here.

A. ENROLLMENT REPORT

Dr. James L. Bruning, Provost

Provost Bruning reported the University's preliminary figures are favorable. He acknowledged the efforts of many within the university who helped make the enrollment factors positive. Total enrollment for Fall 1988, all Campuses, is 24,381, up 1,373 students from Fall 1987. Athens Main and Continuing Education is 17,453 students. The Branch system shows a moderate increase of 413 students to a total of 6,928.

Dr. Bruning indicated that members of the 1988 Freshman Class showed a continuing increase in high school rank and ACT scores. The retention rate for all 1987 freshmen is at a high of 82.5%, while that for Black students is 75%. Both figures rank the university high nationally among all four year institutions. He concluded by describing the substantial improvement in freshmen reading and math test results since 1977.
B. HOUSING OCCUPANCY REPORT

Dr. Carol Harter, Vice President for Administration

Vice President Harter presented Housing Information for the Years 1975 to 1988. She outlined the design capacity of the Residence Hall System against actual Fall occupancy levels for each year. She reported the Fall 1988 figures for occupancy level at 6988 beds against a designed capacity of 7039 beds. Dr. Harter noted the System had spent $1.2 million over the past year for improvements to its facilities including a substantial renovation of Gamertsfelder Hall on the East Green.

C. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION REVIEW

William Y. Smith, Executive Assistant to the President for Affirmative Action

Mr. Smith provided Trustee's with a copy of a report detailing changes in the university's Female and minorities hires over the past three years, and emphasized the 1988 time period. He stated the purpose of the report was to reaffirm our institutional commitment to educational justice and the supporting objectives that are critical to the meeting of those desires.

Mr. Smith indicated his pleasure with the gains made this year in meeting our affirmative action desires. Utilizing transparencies he described improvements to the number and proportion of Group I Female Faculty and Administrative hires on the Athens Campus. He noted this was increased representation, not replacement. Mr. Smith commented that an aggressive program announced by Provost Bruning was helping to rectify a chronic underrepresentation of Black faculty and staff on the campus. Acceptance and participation of faculty and staff has led to recruitment of seven Group I Black tenure-track faculty over five colleges, seventeen Blacks and 7 other minorities in key administrative roles. He reported this year we have the largest number of minority civil service employees in our history. He stated he was pleased with what we have been able to accomplish, but that we must find ways to sustain and improve on our gains.

Mr. Smith concluded by describing programs for disabled students. He noted the number of identifiable handicapped students has increased by 35 to a total of 147.

D. LONGITUDINAL STUDIES
(Institutional Impact)

Dr. Gary O. Moden, Director, Institutional Research

Dr. Moden indicated the studies helped us determine whether or not we accomplished what we say we do, and then to make adaptations as necessary. Dr. Moden's presentation focused on generally describing the
six major components of the effort. These included the major study areas of Tracking/Retention Study, Freshman Treatment Study, College Outcome Measures Project, Involvement Study, Placement Study and Survey of Alumni. Within each of the major areas he outlined specific studies undertaken and the measures and outcomes associated with each. He concluded each section of his report by describing, in detail, how the studies were implemented and the nature of the data received.

Highlights from Dr. Moden's presentation included the increasing positive overall effect on student learning, i.e., value added to one's education; the positive effect of a student's involvement in extracurricular activities and retention and good feelings about the institution; ability to identify those students likely to leave, and to development programs and processes to minimize the numbers leaving; and the comments of alumni who graduated five to ten years ago citing general education as important and the benefit of good speaking and writing skills.

Chairman Campbell thanked all those for their reports. He commented he enjoyed viewing the film, "Ohio University: Personal Perspectives," and complimented Marsha Turnage for her leadership in overseeing the development and production of the film.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The Secretary reported no unfinished business.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Campbell reported that Board Committees had, at their respective meetings, discussed matters being presented to the Board, Chairman or committee members designated by them presented matters for action.

A. BUDGET, FINANCE AND PHYSICAL PLANT COMMITTEE

Committee Chairman Ralph Schey reported the committee had received, from Treasurer William L. Kennard, a Preliminary Financial Report for the Year Ending June 30, 1988 on the University. He noted Treasurer Kennard would present for Trustee action, at a later meeting, a final and audited report. Mr. Schey thanked Mr. Kennard for his explanation of the report. A copy of the Treasurer's report is included with the official minutes. Mr. Schey presented matters on behalf of the Committee.
Mrs. D'Angelo presented and moved approval of the resolution. Mr. Heffernan seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.

1. ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY AIRCRAFT HANGAR

RESOLUTION 1988--1000

WHEREAS, the Ohio University was given permission by the Department of Administrative Services, Division of Public Works to solicit proposals, interview, select and hire a project architect to develop plans and specifications for the Engineering and Technology Aircraft Hangar Facility Project, and

WHEREAS, the Ohio University has solicited proposals from interested and experienced consultants, and has conducted interviews on the Athens Campus, and

WHEREAS, the Ohio University Board of Trustees did at their regular meeting on January 30, 1988 recommend the firm of Varasso, Wachtel and McAnally Architects as Associate and authorizes the preparation of plans and specifications for the Engineering and Technology Aircraft Hangar Facility Project, and

WHEREAS, final plans and specifications have been prepared for advertisement of bids,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby approve construction plans and specification for the Engineering and Technology Hangar Facility Project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby authorize the advertisement for and receipt of construction bids for the Engineering and Technology Aircraft Hangar Facility Project, and does hereby authorize the President or his designee, in consultation with the Budget, Finance, and Physical Plant Committee to accept and recommend award of contracts for the Project provided total bids do not exceed available funds.
OHIO UNIVERSITY
Interoffice Communication

September 15, 1988

To: Dr. Alan H. Geiger, Assistant to President

From: John K. Kotowski, Director, Facilities Planning

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATION OF CONTRACT AWARD FOR THE ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY AIRCRAFT HANGAR AT THE OHIO UNIVERSITY AIRPORT

The development of plans and specifications for the Engineering Hangar Facility are complete, and I am prepared to advertise the project for bids. This project involves the construction of a metal-skinned structure at the Ohio University Airport which will provide much needed space for the Avionics and Aviation Programs. The new facility will contain approximately 14,500 gross square feet of space. Included will be about 12,000 square feet for the Avionics Engineering program, most of which is a hangar for aircraft. The remaining area is being constructed to meet the needs of the Aviation Department and will support the newly created four year bachelors degree program in airway science.

The new aircraft hangar will be located between the Zero Hangar and the Tee Hangar complex, with access to the existing parking apron. The facility will be attached to the existing Avionics laboratory and when complete, both the new and existing buildings will appear as one. The estimated cost of construction and related expenses necessary to accept the base bid and all add alternates is $1,083,210.00. The acceptance of the base bid only will require approximately $800,000.00.

I have enclosed a resolution for consideration by the Board of Trustees at their October 9, 1988 meeting which seeks approval of plans and specifications and permits the recommendation of contract award so long as total bids received do not exceed total funds available.

JKK/sw/ENTH8702.AHG

xc: Dr. T.R. Robe, Dean, Engineering and Technology

enc:
Mr. Schey presented and moved approval of the resolution. Mr. Smoot seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.

2. UTILITY AND RENOVATION PROJECTS

RESOLUTION 1988--1001

WHEREAS, the 117th General Assembly, Regular Session, 1987-1988 has introduced and approved Amended House Bill 810, and

WHEREAS, the Amended House Bill 810 includes $1,697,000.00 for Basic Renovation Projects (CAP-020) on the Athens Campus, $876,000.00 for Basic Renovations at Shannon Hall (CAP-095) on the Belmont Campus, $200,000.00 for Basic Renovations (CAP-098) on the Lancaster Campus, $186,000.00 for Basic Renovations (CAP-099) on the Zanesville Campus and $206,000.00 for Renovations to Bennett Hall (CAP-100) on the Chillicothe Campus, and

WHEREAS, discussions with the Ohio Board of Regents and the State Architect's Office have identified the following Utility and Renovation Projects:

1. Athens Campus - Utility and Renovation Projects
   a. Innovation Center Roof Replacement ($120,000)
   b. Chubb Hall Roof Replacement ($155,000)
   c. Roof Renovations and Replacements ($345,000)
   d. Clippinger Laboratory Code Improvements ($75,000)
   e. Air Conditioning and Emergency Lighting System Improvements ($752,000)
   f. Engineering Aircraft Hangar Facility ($250,000)

2. Branch Campuses - Utility and Renovation Projects
   a. Exterior Column and Building Improvements at Shannon Hall ($110,000) - Belmont County Campus
   b. Shannon Hall Partial Rehabilitation ($766,000) - Belmont Co.
   c. Lancaster Exterior Building and Site Improvements ($200,000)
   d. Littick and Elson Hall Building Improvements on the Zanesville Campus ($186,000)
   e. Bennett Hall Building Improvements on the Chillicothe Campus ($206,000), and

WHEREAS, the State Architect's Office has given the University permission to handle the development of bid documents, the solicitation of bids, the award of contracts, and the supervision of construction locally for the Innovation Center Roof Replacement Project, the Engineering Aircraft Hangar Facility Project, the Exterior Column and Building Improvements Project at Shannon Hall, the Lancaster Exterior Building and Site Improvements Project, the Littick and Elson Hall Building Improvements Project on the Zanesville Campus, and the Bennett Hall Building Improvements Project on the Chillicothe Campus,
f. The development of an aircraft hangar for the College of Engineering and Technology at the Ohio University Airport. This facility will cost just over $1,000,000.00. Utility and Renovation capital improvement dollars will provide for a portion of the project - $250,000.00.

2. Branch Campuses - Utility and Renovation Projects
a. The columns and other woodwork will be replaced on Shannon Hall. The building's wood trim will be painted when repairs are complete - $110,000.00. Belmont County Campus.

b. The theater/lecture hall, student activity areas, and many of the classrooms will be improved in Shannon Hall - $766,000.00. Belmont County Campus.

c. The exterior control and expansion joints will be cleaned and re-caulked on buildings on the Lancaster Campus. Also, concrete walks will be repaired, the entrance drive re-surfaced, and site lighting upgraded - $200,000.00.

d. The Littick Hall roof will be replaced and the physical science laboratories upgraded in Elson Hall - $186,000.00. Zanesville Campus.

e. On the Chillicothe Campus, improvements will be made to Bennett Hall and to the site around the facility. Work will include concrete walk and stair replacement, repair of wood trim on the building itself, and repair to the adjacent parking facility - $206,000.00.

It is my desire to proceed with each of the utility and renovation projects described above. Toward that end, I have enclosed a resolution for consideration by the Board of Trustees at their October 9, 1988 meeting which seeks approval to proceed with the selection process that will lead to the hiring of a consultant for each project. This resolution will so permit the University to proceed with the preparation of bid documents.

If I can be of further assistance regarding this matter, please advise.
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xc: Dr. James C. Bryant, Vice Provost
enc:
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby authorize the President, or his designee, in consultation with the Budget, Finance, and Physical Plant Committee to interview, select, and contract with a consulting architect and authorize the preparation of construction plans and specifications for the Innovation Center Roof Replacement Project, the Shannon Hall Exterior Column and Building Improvements Project, the Lancaster Exterior Building and Site Improvements Project, the Littick and Elson Hall Building Improvements Project, and the Bennett Hall Building Improvements Project, all of which will be handled locally.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby authorize the President, or his designee, in consultation with the Budget, Finance, and Physical Plant Committee to interview and select consulting architects and authorize the preparation of construction plans and specifications for the Roof Renovation and Replacements Project, Clippinger Laboratory Code Improvements Project, Air Conditioning and Emergency Light System Improvements Project, and the Shannon Hall Partial Rehabilitation Project, all of which will be administered jointly with the State Architect's Office.
OHIO UNIVERSITY
Interoffice Communication

September 15, 1988

To: Dr. Alan H. Geiger, Assistant to President
From: John K. Kotowski, Director, Facilities Planning

SUBJECT: UTILITY AND RENOVATION PROJECTS

The 117th General Assembly, Regular Session, 1987-1988 introduced and approved Amended House Bill Number 810. This Bill, the Capital Improvements Bill for the period beginning July 1, 1988 and ending June 30, 1990 included $1,697,000.00 for utility and renovation projects on the Athens Campus and $1,468,000.00 for utility and renovation projects on the Branch Campuses.

Following discussions with key University persons and after similar discussions with the Ohio Board of Regents and the State Architect's Office, I would like to recommend the expenditure of the utility and renovation funds in the following manner:

1. Athens Campus - Utility and Renovation Projects
   a. The replacement of the Innovation Center roof and masonry parapet wall repair - $120,000.00.
   b. The replacement of the Chubb Hall roof which will include a small portion of the building's flat roof and two of the three gabled roofs - $155,000.00.
   c. The replacement of a portion of the roof on the Grover Center, Alden Library, and Clippinger Laboratory - $345,000.00.
   d. The planning and development of bid documents to make improvements in Clippinger Laboratory so that the building meets the current requirements of the Ohio Building Code. This project will involve only the areas not effected by the current renovation work - $75,000.00.
   e. The improvement of air conditioning and emergency lighting systems in various buildings on campus - $752,000.00.
Mrs. D'Angelo presented and moved approval of the resolution. She did so on behalf of Trustee Grasselli who was unable to be present and J. Craig Strafford, M.D. both former students of Dr. Eblin. Dr. Strafford second the motion. Approval was unanimous.

3. Naming of Lecture Hall, Clippinger Laboratories Addition

RESOLUTION 1988–1002

WHEREAS, The Ohio University Board of Trustees did award emeritus status to Lawrence P. Eblin for his forty-four years of dedicated service to the university during the period 1935 to 1979, and

WHEREAS, during his tenure in the Chemistry Department he served as Chairman from 1952 to 1958 and was instrumental in the development of the Department's doctoral program, and

WHEREAS, his many university roles included that of author, graduate and friend of alumni, he is best remembered for his teaching at the freshman level and the lasting influence he had on thousands of students.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees name, and appropriately designate, the Lecture Hall of the Clippinger Laboratories Addition as the LAWRENCE P. EBLIN LECTURE HALL in recognition of his good service to Ohio University.
Mr. Schey presented and moved approval of the resolution. Mr. Russ seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.

4. BELMONT COUNTY WATER SYSTEM EASEMENT
RESOLUTION 1988-1003

WHEREAS, the Belmont County Commissioners are developing an Industrial Park adjacent to the Ohio University Belmont Regional Campus, and

WHEREAS, they have requested a lease of 12.3862 acres on the Belmont County Regional Campus, which is not needed for campus development, for purposes of constructing a water tower; and an area for a fifteen foot (15') water line right-of-way to service the Industrial Park,

WHEREAS, the granting of this lease will be beneficial to the Ohio University-Belmont Regional Campus and the Belmont County community,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ohio University Board of Trustees hereby grants the requested lease subject to final approval as to the terms and conditions by the President; and hereby authorizes the President to arrange for execution in accordance with the Ohio law.
Ohio University

Date: September 15, 1988

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: John F. Burns, Director of Legal Affairs

Subject: Lease to the Belmont County, Ohio Sanitary Sewer District No. 3

The Belmont County Commissioners are developing an Industrial Park north of the Ohio University-Belmont Regional campus. They have requested on behalf of their Sewer District a lease of 12.3862 acres and a fifteen foot (15') right-of-way to construct a water tower and a water line to facilitate the Industrial Park development.

This project has been reviewed by Dean James Newton and has the support of the Ohio University-Belmont Regional Campus Coordinating Council. It has also been reviewed by the Athens staff.

One important aspect to this project is that the Sewer District has agreed to place a pump station in the basement of Shannon Hall to help insure adequate water pressure to the upper floors of the building as part of the consideration for granting this lease. The term will be for twenty-five (25) years, with a renewal provision, as there is a federal interest period required to fund such projects of forty (40) years.

The attached resolution has been prepared for your review and consideration to grant this lease.

Thank you very much.

JFB:rt
xc: Dr. Alan H. Geiger, Asst. to the President
Dr. James C. Bryant, Vice Provost for Regional Higher Education
Mr. James Newton, Dean, Ohio University-Belmont
The Ohio University Belmont Regional Coordinating Council met on September 15, to consider the request made by the Belmont County Commissioners for land that is now presently part of the Ohio University Belmont campus.

Mr. James Dixon, a member of our Coordinating Council, presented the proposal from the County Commissioners to the Council. After its consideration, the Board unanimously voted in favor of the request made by the County Commissioners.

Enclosed, you will find final drawings that indicate the land requested by the County Commissioners and the location of the water line and water tower that will be sited on the Ohio University Belmont campus. Other information that needs to be pointed out includes the following.

1. The lessee will be the Belmont County Commissioners.
2. The industrial park, that will be accessed by the land the Commissioners are requesting, will be called the Belmont County Industrial Park.
3. The lease will be for 25 years with an additional 25 years if all the conditions are met.
4. OUB and its Regional Coordinating Council would like, as a condition of the lease, a statement that indicates that adequate water pressure will be provided in the entire building, which now is not sufficient.

If you need any additional information or understanding of this memo, please do not hesitate to contact my office.

JWN: bja

cc: A. Geiger
    J. Burns
    Regional Coordinating Council

Enclosure

P.S. Jim will you see that A. Geiger receives the drawings.

PRESIDENTS OFFICE

SEP 19 1988
Mrs. D'Angelo presented and moved approval of the resolution. Mr. Heffernan seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.

5. EAST STATE STREET SANITARY SEWER EXTENSION EASEMENT

RESOLUTION 1988 -- 1004

WHEREAS, the City of Athens is engaged in a water and sewer service expansion project on the east side of Athens, and

WHEREAS, the City has requested an easement for a twenty inch (20") sewer line over University property, currently part of the Athens Mall, to facilitate this project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ohio University Board of Trustees hereby grants the City of Athens its requested easement for fifteen (15) years, upon final approval of the terms and conditions by the President, and authorizes the President to arrange for execution in accordance with Ohio law.
Ohio University

Interoffice Communication

Date: September 19, 1988

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: John F. Burns, Director, Office of Legal Affairs

Subject: East State Street Sanitary Sewer Extension Project

The City of Athens has been engaged in a water and sewer project to upgrade service to the eastern portion of the City.

The Board of Trustees has previously adopted Resolution 1988-953, which granted the City of Athens a fifteen (15) year easement for a twenty inch (20") sewer line; and this request is for an extension of that line for a twenty inch (20") sewer line over the remaining eastern portion of the Athens Mall fronting on the East State Street property line (see attached drawing).

The University staff has reviewed this request with the City officials and requests that the Board approve granting this easement, upon approval of the final terms and conditions by the President. The attached resolution has been prepared for your review and consideration to accomplish this.

Thank you very much.

JFB:ndw

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Alan H. Geiger, Assistant to the President
    Mr. John K. Kotowski, Director, Facilities Planning
Mr. Schey presented and moved approval of the resolution. Mr. Smoot seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.

6. STIMSON AVENUE ELECTRIC EASEMENT RENEWAL

RESOLUTION 1988 -- 1005

WHEREAS, the Columbus Southern Power Company has requested renewal of its current easement for electric service for street lights on Stimson Avenue.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Ohio University Board of Trustees hereby grants the requested renewal for fifteen (15) years, upon final terms and conditions as approved by the President, and authorizes the President to arrange for execution in accordance with Ohio law.
Ohio University

Interoffice Communication

Date: September 21, 1988

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: John F. Burns, Director, Office of Legal Affairs

Subject: Easement to the Columbus Southern Power Company for service for Stimson Avenue Street Lights

This requested easement is for a renewal for another fifteen (15) years of an existing electrical service line for street lights on Stimson Avenue (see attached drawing). The staff has reviewed this request and recommends the renewal; and the attached resolution has been prepared for your review and consideration.

Thank you very much.

JFB:ndw

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Alan Geiger, Assistant to the President
    Mr. John K. Kotowski, Director, Facilities Planning
Mrs. D'Angelo presented and moved approval of the resolution. Dr. Strafford seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.

7. NATURAL GAS LINE EXTENSION TO FORMER KROGER FACILITY

RESOLUTION 1988 -- 1006

WHEREAS, the Athens Mall currently contains space formerly occupied by Kroger's, and

WHEREAS, Chesapeake Realty has requested a utility easement be granted to the Columbia Gas Company to provide natural gas service to the space to allow it to be heated with gas.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Ohio University Board of Trustees hereby grants the requested easement to the Columbia Gas Company, upon approval of the final terms and conditions by the President, and authorizes the President to arrange for execution in accordance with Ohio law.
From: John F. Burns, Director, Office of Legal Affairs

Subject: Easement to the Columbia Gas Company at the Athens Mall

Due to the development of the new Kroger Store, the space formerly occupied by Kroger's in the Athens Mall needs natural gas service to facilitate its being leased to a new tenant.

Chesapeake Realty, the leasee of the Athens Mall, has requested the University grant the Columbia Gas Company an easement for a gas line running from the current Ponderosa to the former Kroger space (see drawing).

The University staff has reviewed this request and recommends the Board of Trustees grant the requested easement for fifteen (15) years, with approval of the final terms and conditions by the President, and for the President to arrange for execution in accordance with Ohio law.

Thank you very much.

JFB:ndw

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Alan H. Geiger, Assistant to the President
    Mr. John K. Kotowski, Director, Facilities Planning
Mr. Schey presented and moved approval of the resolution. Mr. Russ seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.

8. RICHLAND AVENUE LAND LEASE
RESOLUTION 1988--1007

WHEREAS, Inn-Ohio of Athens, Inc. is in need of greater Ohio University Inn parking, and

WHEREAS, the University has unused and surplus adjacent property on Richland Avenue.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees hereby authorizes the President or his designee to negotiate a lease to the Ohio University Foundation for up to 25 years, with final lease terms to be approved by the President, and for the President to arrange for execution in accordance with Ohio law.
Date: September 19, 1988

To: The President and the Board of Trustees

From: John F. Burns, Director, Office of Legal Affairs

Subject: Lease of University Property to the Ohio University Foundation

The Ohio University Foundation's acquisition of the former Ashland Oil gas station on Richland Avenue has enabled the Ohio University Inn to use the area for employee parking. The current parking area needs to be expanded and this would be possible with the University leasing the Foundation a portion of its adjacent property south of the Foundation property (see attached drawing).

The lease will be for 25 years for a fee of one dollar, and the Foundation will pay any taxes that may be applicable.

The attached resolution has been prepared for your review and consideration.

Thank you very much.

JFB: dmb

cc: Dr. Alan H. Geiger, Assistant to the President
    John H. Kotowski, Director, Facilities Planning
B. EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE

Committee Chairman Strafford thanked Joseph Welling, Joel Rudy and David Stewart for the reports given during the Committee's Friday session. He noted the insight provided by these types of reports helps Trustees to better understand campus issues and concerns.
To: Charles J. Ping, President
From: James L. Bruning, Provost

Attached are summaries of the five-year and two-year review of academic programs completed last academic year by the University Curriculum Council.

These summaries reflect the vigor of our ongoing program of internal program review and provide a useful self-examination of our curricular programs.

je
Mr. Heffernan presented and moved approval of the resolution. Mr. Schey seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.

1. Program Review Reports

RESOLUTION 1988--1008

WHEREAS, the continuous review of academic programs is essential to the maintenance of quality within an educational institution, and

WHEREAS, Ohio University has had for many years a rigorous program of internal review, and

WHEREAS, Section 67 of Am. Sub. H.B. 694 requires that college and university Board of Trustees "shall during the 1981-83 biennium initiate on-going processes for the review and evaluation of all programs of instruction presently conducted by the institutions for which they are responsible."

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University accepts the 1987-88 review and approves the recommendations for academic programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Qual of Grad</th>
<th>Demand for Grad Prog</th>
<th>Demand for Graduates (grades)</th>
<th>Quality of UG Majors</th>
<th>Qual of UG Experience</th>
<th>Demand for UG major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>high quality</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>above avg</td>
<td>valuable</td>
<td>declining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engr</td>
<td>active to moderate</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>declining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engr</td>
<td>active to moderate</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Secretarial Tech</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>declining</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>declining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerontology UG Certificate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>below avg</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Program</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Tech Lancaster</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Commun</td>
<td>high to low</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>favorable</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>below avg</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engr</td>
<td>active to moderate</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>increasing</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>active to moderate</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>increasing</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>increasing</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>active to moderate</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>declining</td>
<td>above avg</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>favorable</td>
<td>declining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Demand for Grads (Undergrad)</td>
<td>Demand for Program (Nonmajors)</td>
<td>Advantage Over Other Institutions</td>
<td>Quality of Library Holdings</td>
<td>Quality of Facilities Equipment</td>
<td>Quality of Honors Program</td>
<td>Quality of CE Programs</td>
<td>Quality of RHE Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTANY</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>increasing</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEMICAL ENGR</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>quality facilities</td>
<td>marginal</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIL ENGR</td>
<td>steady</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>quality facilities</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL SECRETARIAL TECH</td>
<td>steady</td>
<td>steady</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chillicothe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>declining</td>
<td>steady</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERONTOLOGY</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>LTC Adm Prog a plus</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIV. INTERDISP. PROGRAM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>unique in Ohio</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL TECH</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>quality equipment</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL COMMUN</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>only prog in Ohio in Coll of Communication</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECHANICAL ENGR</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>quality of fac &amp; facilities</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>only program in Ohio</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEATER</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>unique aspects of program</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two-Year Reviews

Summaries

Master in Public Administration

This two-year graduate program in the department of political science is designed to develop skills that are needed for careers in local government administration. Students rank the faculty in this program in the top one-third of the department’s faculty. Two have received the Outstanding Graduate Faculty Award. Course work is integrated with teaching assistantships in the Institute for local Government Administration and Rural Development. The program functions using existing faculty in political science and economics without additional aid. Lack of such aid limits recruiting; students in the program are not easily identified or tracked among departmental majors. The program is encouraged to seek additional sources of support and to develop a regular system of polling graduates to evaluate the relationship of the program to their needs.

Computer Science Technology (Lancaster)

The program is a two-year course offered at Ohio University’s Lancaster campus. Students may choose either an associate in applied business or associate in applied science degree. To date all of the students completing the program have chosen the associate in applied business option. Enrollments are steady but lower than projected when the program was approved. The program is meeting a regional demand for entry level technicians in data processing for business and industry. Administrators need to define a comprehensive marketing strategy to recruit students. Program administrators should also consider a more comprehensive interaction with business and industry. They should also be concerned with addressing the high attrition rate in the program.
University Curriculum Council
Five Year Review Of
BOTANY
Spring 1988

Description of Program

The Department of Botany is primarily concerned with the complexity of plant life and in understanding some of the basic phenomena which relate to the function of plants at different levels of organization. The discipline of Botany at Ohio University includes teaching and research, ranging from the field of molecular botany to that of environmental botany. There is considerable interdisciplinary integration of botany with other life and physical sciences. At the molecular and cellular level there is considerable interaction with zoologists and chemists; at the environmental level botanists interact with zoologists, chemists and geologists; at the organismal level interaction occurs with zoologists and geologists. The Bachelor of Science, the Master of Science, and the Doctor of Philosophy degrees are offered.

The undergraduate programs prepare students for careers as professional botanists, biologists and teachers. These programs include preparation for environmental biology, forestry, field biology, applied plant sciences, agri-business, biotechnology, and advanced training in botany. The students interested in forestry usually take pre-professional training in plant sciences, but they are encouraged to transfer to a school specializing in forestry either before or after completing the B.S. or A.B. degree. The Department has cooperative programs with the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor), North Carolina State University (Raleigh) and Duke University (Durham, North Carolina). The program in cell biology and biotechnology prepares students in the broad area of biology at the cellular or molecular level. The program provides a sound foundation for a technical career, or for further study at the graduate level. In 1987 there are 33 majors compared to 54 in 1983. (Added sentence below.)

The Department provides advanced instruction and research training for students who wish to major in botany at the M.S. and Ph.D. levels. Research and training in the Department of Botany include a broad range of topics in plant biology, from molecular through environmental levels. The M.S. program takes 2-3 years to complete. The Ph.D. program takes 3-4 years after the M.S. degree. In 1987 there are 9 M.S. and 14 doctoral students.

For non-majors the Department of Botany offers several courses at the 100-400 level. The high degree of service level teaching in the Department is indicated by 69% of the total weighted student credit hours at the general studies level in 1986-87. The Department also participates in two interdisciplinary programs: (i) the M.S. degree in Environmental Sciences and (ii) the Ph.D. degree in Molecular and Cellular Biology. The Department also serves students in other colleges.

The department has an Honors Tutorial Program leading to a Bachelor of Science Degree in Botany.
B. STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM

The quality of the faculty, as judged by publications and outside grants, is high. Eleven of the thirteen faculty are active professionally—publishing regularly, attending and presenting papers at scientific meetings and applying for external support for their research activities.

Courses at all levels are taught by faculty, while the laboratories are taught by graduate students.

C. WEAKNESS OF THE PROGRAM

The main disadvantage of the program is the small number of undergraduate majors. Generally, these programs tend to be small nationally.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Department should continue both its research efforts and its applications for outside funding.
2. Efforts should be made to increase the number of majors.
3. The Department should undertake a survey of its graduates to assess the program.
4. There is no need for further review until the next review cycle.

E. REVIEW TOPICS

1. Quality of the scholarship and creative activity of the faculty.
   Faculty vita provide an evidence of professionally active members. Eleven out of thirteen faculty members regularly attend and present papers at scientific meetings and apply for external support. Six of the eleven faculty members have external support for their research activity. The size of the outside funding has increased from $117,462 in 1983-84 to $304,423 in 1986-87. The teaching load of the faculty varies between six and nine hours.

2. The quality of the teaching.
   The letters from the alumni of the Department indicate that there is a strong commitment to teaching.
   The Botany Department uses a student evaluation of faculty teaching questionnaire developed by the College of Arts and Sciences. During 1986-87 the overall rating of the faculty in terms of teaching varied from 3.7 to 4.8 (based on a scale of 1-5, 5 being the top of the scale).
   The results of student evaluations are considered in faculty tenure and promotion decisions, as well as in annual merit raise determinations.

3. The quality of its graduate students.
   The GPA of currently enrolled students ranges from 2.97 to
3.94, with an average of 3.53. The Department requires prospective students to take the GRE; the average percentiles for the verbal, quantitative, and advanced sections are 61, 63 and 50.3, respectively.

4. The quality of the graduate educational experience.
Recent letters from alumni indicate the students receive a high quality educational experience. They feel that the Department offers a wide variety of courses which provide excellent training for research and teaching careers.

About 95% of the students enrolled in the master's program complete their degree in two years, while about 90% of the students enrolled in the doctoral program complete their degree in four years. These times are quite standard nationally.

During the past five years, only four students left without obtaining their degrees. Two were dismissed for not making satisfactory progress, one withdrew for personal family reasons, and one transferred to the University of Georgia where he could do research in an area (viral plant pathology) not offered here.

Most doctoral graduates take post-doctoral research positions. Presently program graduates are working at Harvard University, Washington University and the University of Tennessee.

5. Demand for its graduate program by students.
Graduate enrollment during the past five years has varied from 20 to 27. This suggests that demand for the graduate program is stable.

6. Projected demand for its graduates outside of the university.
According to the Department the demand for its graduates is high. The employment and placement records of graduates is excellent; almost all of them have obtained positions relevant to their training and education.

7. The quality of its undergraduate majors.
Students entering degree programs in Botany have SAT/ACT scores above the O.U. "entering freshman" average. Students already in degree programs have above average GPAs.

In 1986, ACT scores for entering students average 21 for the Botany students vs 19 for University students in general, suggesting that the quality of students in the program is above average for Ohio University.

The group of students taking Botany Honors Tutorial curricula are outstanding. Their caliber is comparable to that of the best students in the United States, a claim supported by the large number of tutorial graduates that have been accepted with financial aid for graduate work at top institutions.

8. The quality of the undergraduate educational experience.
All courses are taught by full time faculty, while laboratories are taught by graduate students. Letters from
9. Demand for the undergraduate major by students.
The number of undergraduate majors has declined from 54 in 1983 to 33 in 1987.

10. Projected demand for its undergraduates. According to the 1982 edition of Occupational Outlook Handbook the job outlook in the 80's is most promising for those with advanced degrees. Some individuals with B.S. and A.B. degrees may find employment in high schools, in government agencies, and in industry. But the low level of demand is expected to continue.

11. Demand for the undergraduate program by non-majors.
Demand for botany courses by non-majors is on the increase. Fall quarter credit hours have increased from 1895 in 1983 to 3395 in 1987. The average class size has also increased, from 10.5 in 1983 to 19.1 in 1987.

12. Advantage in relation to other institutions.
The plant species diversity of forested southeastern Ohio provides the Department with a major locational advantage for research and teaching.

13. Quality of its library holdings.
Library holdings in most areas of botany are currently adequate. The Department feels the book budget is not adequate to keep up with the current literature. New journals are being initiated and funds are needed to acquire some of these significant new publications. The heavy use of interlibrary loan has permitted Botany faculty and graduate students to obtain the references needed for their research.

14. Quality of its facilities and equipment.
Facilities in Porter Hall and the Research Building near the greenhouse are good, but Porter Hall is in need of a major renovation; plumbing and other utilities are in constant need of repair. There is a lack of office space for graduate students, although they have adequate laboratory space.
Laboratory buildings are the converted World War II cadet barracks. They have outlived their usefulness. The programs are not presently being hampered by the relatively poor space.
Generally, because of past and present grant support the Department has excellent equipment. However, maintaining this equipment has become expensive.

15. Quality of its honors program.
It is a small but high quality program, requiring entering students to have at least a 1200 SAT score. The tutorial program in the Botany Department offers the possibility of degree
programs in Botany, Environmental Biology or Cell Biology. Fifteen students have graduated from the Honors Tutorial Program in Botany; fourteen have gone on to graduate school. Students have been accepted with offers of financial support to graduate programs in Botany (including Plant Pathology and Forestry/Natural Resources) at the Universities of Chicago, Cornell, Duke, Georgia, Michigan State, Minnesota, North Carolina, Ohio State, Purdue, Washington State, Wisconsin, Yale, Alberta and McGill; and in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology at University of California (San Francisco), Harvard, Michigan, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Vanderbilt.

Within the Botany Department each student is evaluated by an annual comprehensive examination covering the areas completed that year by the student in the Tutorial College. This is part of the requirement for the degree of Bachelor of Science. Outside the Botany Department the student is expected to show proficiency in fundamental areas of Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics and Zoology by taking courses in those departments.

16. Quality of its offerings through workshops, independent study and experiential learning.

There is no problem with the quality of its offerings through workshops, independent study and experiential learning. Under life long learning two courses, Botany 101 and Botany 102 are offered. One faculty member is the instructor for both correspondence courses.

Botany 303 (Medicinal Plants of Ohio) is offered under workshops. Up to three credit hours may be earned for Botany 303 under this arrangement. Table 1 gives annual enrollment since 1983 for workshops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Non-Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the last 10 years only 2 students earned Botany 404 credit through experiential program.

17. The quality of its programs on regional campuses.

There are no degree programs in any of the regional campuses. Only Botany 101, 102, 110, 111 and 225 are taught at the regional campuses. These courses are taught by either part-time faculty or by full-time branch faculty. Main campus Botany faculty do not teach overload courses at the branches. There is good communication between the regional and Athens campuses.
### I. FALL HEAD COUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate/Grad Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. ANNUAL DEGREES AWARDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalareate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. FALL STUDENT CREDIT HOURS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>2171</td>
<td>3029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>2309</td>
<td>2595</td>
<td>3395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. TEACHING FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Retirees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. BUDGETED FTE STAFFING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>11.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Assistants</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23.72</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>22.93</td>
<td>21.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Program Description

The degrees offered are the Bachelor of Science, the Master of Science, and the Doctor of Philosophy. The number of required courses for the baccalaureate is large allowing little room for electives, although 12 hours of technical electives allow some variation. The number of students registered in the Ph.D. program is small (4), although 10 are currently working in some phase of the program. This number relative to the number of faculty, was stated to be near normal in comparison to other Chemical Engineering departments.

Though not unique, programs in chemical engineering are not common place in American colleges and universities. Fewer than 150 departments exist nation-wide. Ohio is unusual in that there are seven state supported departments of chemical engineering and two private programs. However, of these, only Ohio University is located in a non-metropolitan area, thus providing benefits of classical, residential education.

There are 8 faculty (7.70 FTE). During the past 5 years, 2 have retired and a third will retire Spring 1988. Two faculty have been hired. Faculty stability is anticipated for the next 3-5 years.

B. Strengths of the Program

The faculty is of high quality and has historically been very active in research as well as serving as consultants for industry and other institutions. Each graduate student interviewed indicated that they chose to do their graduate work at Ohio University because of a faculty member's research program and reputation. The quality of both undergraduate and graduate educational programs was documented by the Accreditation Board of Engineering and Technology (ABET) report of October, 1986. The department has been accredited continuously since 1966, shortly after its founding, and the recent visit of ABET was highly satisfactory in that, in recent years, accreditation visits nation-wide have been even more demanding.

The Stocker Engineering Center provides high quality space for undergraduate and graduate programs. Equipment is excellent and research money from the Stocker Endowment continues to make significant contributions to the chemical engineering research program as well as to the recruitment of high quality graduate students.

C. Weaknesses of the Program

Library holdings related to chemical engineering are marginal. Attempts are being made to increase holdings for the graduate program, however, funding remains low when compared to the rapid rise in technical publication costs.

The department does not have clearly stated graduate admission criteria.
The department has no formal mechanism for assessing program quality through student follow up.

Both undergraduate and graduate students believe that the lack of a co-op program is a definite disadvantage when seeking employment. They strongly recommend the department consider establishment of such a program.

D. Recommendations

a. The department should be encouraged to develop a process to monitor student outcome through follow-up of their graduates.

b. Clearly stated criteria for graduate student admission should be developed and implemented.

c. The department should review the undergraduate curriculum in mathematics, chemistry, and design components.

d. The department should consider the feasibility of establishing a co-operative education program.

e. The library budget be enhanced for the Department of Chemical Engineering.

f. There is no need for further review until the next review cycle.

E. Review Topics

1. Quality of the scholarship and creative activity of its faculty (where evaluation is based on the analysis of publications, research, performances, presentations, research projects, awards, and recognition).

   Of the eight faculty members who currently teach in the department, four are considered to be active in research and publication. The other faculty members are at least moderately active as evidenced by paper presentations at professional meetings, non-refereed publications, or consultancies. Chemical Engineering has been successful in securing outside funding. Over the past five years 1.8 million dollars have been brought into the department in support of research projects.

2. The quality of the teaching of its faculty (where evaluation is based on student evaluations, teaching awards, written peer evaluations, and outside evaluations).

   Courses are evaluated by students each quarter. These student evaluations are used in departmental evaluation procedures and in decisions regarding raises, promotions and tenure. Summary evaluations for the last several quarters indicate that the students rate course offerings in the Chemical Engineering Department slightly above the 3.00 level based on the 1 to 4 rating scale.

3. The quality of its graduate students (where evaluation is based on the analysis of test scores, merit awards, research projects, and grades in all classes).

   The Graduate Record Examination is not required for entrance. Normally, a 3.0 GPA is required and applicants are evaluated using undergraduate transcripts, references, and a knowledge of the schools from which they come as well as personal recommendations.
4. The quality of its graduate educational experience (where evaluation is based on reports of current students, alumni and/or employers).

Information regarding the students' impression of their graduate experience is not systematically gathered. However, a number of students have provided statements that they were as well prepared as anyone and better than most, even those from prestigious schools. Thirty-eight students who have completed masters level work here have gone to other schools and have done well in their respective Ph.D. programs.

5. Demand for its graduate program by students (where evaluation is based on past placement records and projected employment demand).

An average of 27 students enroll in the graduate program each year. Approximately 50 graduate applications are accepted each year. There are approximately 3 graduate students per faculty member and this appears to be a workable number for the faculty. The department is attempting to increase the number of US applicants and is considering new recruitment programs to give better visibility and attractiveness.

6. Projected demand for its graduates outside the university (where evaluation is based on projected placement of its students).

The Chemical Engineering program provides a broad base for employment. From faculty reports, the majority of its graduates enter an industrial corporate position in process engineering. Some enter research or design engineering, while others enter manufacturing. Approximately 1/4 of the graduating class continue their education in graduate work at this or another university.

7. The quality of its undergraduate majors (where evaluation is based on GPA test scores, merit awards, etc.).

The quality of the undergraduate majors appears high. The fall 1987 average entering ACT score for its undergraduates was 24, and the average SAT score was 1035. The average undergraduate GPA over the past five years is 2.89. The present senior class is extraordinary and 40% (9) of the class is expected to graduate Summa Cum Laude.

8. The quality of its undergraduate educational experience (where evaluation is based on reports of alumni and/or employers).

Although no data were presented from alumni or employers as to the quality of undergraduate educational experience, from faculty reports it appears that graduates of the chemical engineering program do well in both outstanding graduate schools and professional careers. Comments from other universities and industrial people indicate that OU's graduates are competitive in both the job and graduate school "market place."

Students view their undergraduate preparation as weak in mathematics and chemistry because of what is offered, not what the department requires. They further view the capstone sequence (design) course as narrowly presented providing little integration or creativity.
9. Demand for its undergraduate major by students (where evaluation is based on enrollment trends).

There are currently 89 undergraduate students enrolled in chemical engineering at Ohio University. This figure is down from a five year high of 108 in 1983 and is illustrative of the national trend in engineering. Admissions have been stable for the last two years.

10. Projected demand for its undergraduates (where evaluation is based on past placement records and projected employment demands).

The need for quality chemical engineers has not diminished. It appears that graduates will remain in demand and that this program will continue to provide excellent employment opportunities for its majors.

11. The present demand for its undergraduate program by non-majors (where evaluation is based on trends in non-major enrollments in changing program requirements or other majors, departments, and schools).

Very few non-majors take courses in this department. Only one course is offered for non-majors.

12. Advantages in relation to other institutions (where evaluation is based on distinctiveness in its approach, curricular or other factors).

The Stocker Center provides high quality space for both undergraduate and graduate programs. Equipment in laboratories and classrooms are of the latest design and technology, thereby making a significant contribution to both the research program and the recruitment of high quality students.

13. The quality of its library holdings (where evaluation is based on holdings and gaps in those holdings).

The department rates current library holdings and acquisitions in chemical engineering as marginal at best. Currently the department is making a concerted effort to increase holdings for the graduate program.

14. The quality of its facilities and equipment (where evaluation is based on age, adequacy, and condition of equipment and facilities).

The Stocker Engineering Center is rated as an excellent resource by faculty, undergraduate and graduate students. It provides state of the art space and equipment for classrooms, laboratories, and research programs. The Stocker Endowment continues to make a significant contribution.

15. The quality of its honors program.

There is no honors program in Chemical Engineering.

16. The quality of its offerings through workshops, independent study, or experiential learning (where evaluation is based on the reports from the office of continuing education and students in the programs).
The department has not offered any independent study or correspondence courses during the last five years. Workshop courses are not applicable for degree credit.

The department has no formal manner to award credit for experiential learning and states they would be uncomfortable to do so except in rare cases - the nature of the curriculum is formal and not easily reduced to experience.

17. The quality of its program on regional campuses (where evaluation is based on reports from the Vice Provost for Regional Higher Education, the regional campus deans, faculty, and students in the off campus programs).

No courses have been taught on the regional campuses.
Data from the Historical Compendium

The Compendium provides the following data on the department:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT COMP</td>
<td>24.51</td>
<td>24.31</td>
<td>24.68</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>24.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT VERBAL</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT MATH</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS RANK</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU GPA</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL HEADCOUNT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERGRAD TOTAL</th>
<th>108</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL          | 134      | 124    | 105    | 98     | 114    |

| ANNUAL DEGREES AWARDED |          |        |        |        |        |
| Baccalaureate          | 24       | 23     | 23     | 10     | ---    |
| Masters                | 7        | 8      | 10     | 8      | ---    |
| Doctorate              | 0        | 0      | 0      | 1      | ---    |

| TOTAL                  | 31       | 31     | 33     | 19     | ---    |

| FALL STUDENT CREDIT HOURS |          |        |        |        |        |
| ChE                       |          |        |        |        |        |
| Undergraduate             | 995      | 761    | 505    | 437    | 530    |
| Graduate                  | 302      | 357    | 301    | 262    | 280    |
| Sub-Total                 | 1297     | 1118   | 806    | 699    | 810    |

| ET42                     |          |        |        |        |        |
| Undergraduate             | 228      | 174    | 255    | 156    | 144    |
| Sub-Total                 | 228      | 174    | 255    | 156    | 144    |

| TEACHING FACULTY          |          |        |        |        |        |
| Tenured                   | 7        | 7      | 6      | 6      | 6      |
| Non-Tenured               | 1        | 1      | 1      | 1      | 2      |
| Term (non-Tenured)        | --       | --     | 1      | 2      | ---    |
| Early Retirees            | --       | 1      | 1      | 1      | ---    |
| Total                     | 8        | 9      | 9      | 10     | 8      |

| Percent Tenured           | 87.0     | 77.0   | 66.0   | 60.0   | 75.0   |

| BUDGETED FTE STAFFING    |          |        |        |        |        |
| Faculty                  | 7.27     | 7.00   | 7.00   | 7.03   | 7.70   |
| Grad. Assistants         | 2.90     | 2.70   | 2.30   | 2.33   | 2.30   |
| Civil Service            | 1.00     | 1.00   | 1.00   | 1.00   | 1.00   |
| Total                    | 11.17    | 10.70  | 10.30  | 10.36  | 11.00  |
A. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The design of the Civil Engineering Department undergraduate curriculum is to provide education, training and research opportunities in four general areas: (1) broad understanding of mathematics and basic physical sciences, (2) basic engineering sciences, (3) knowledge of civil engineering principles and practices and (4) an enhanced understanding of the world and its culture and their role of engineering in humanities and social sciences. The degrees offered are the Bachelor of Science and the Master of Science. While there are no sub-programs offered at the undergraduate level, students have the opportunity to specialize somewhat by selecting electives in the disciplines of fluid mechanics and hydraulics, water resources, solid mechanics, structural engineering, geotechnical engineering, environmental engineering, transportation or surveying. The graduate students in Civil Engineering can take a major emphasis in any of these areas except surveying. Graduate students have the option of either a thesis or non-thesis program, with most graduate students taking the thesis program.

The Civil Engineering Department offers several courses that are required in other engineering programs. These include Statics (CE 220), Strength of Materials (CE 222, CE 223 lab) and Fluid Mechanics (CE 340) for Mechanical Engineering students; and Applied Mechanics (CE 301) for Chemical Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering and Industrial and Systems Engineering. The faculty also participate annually in teaching a refresher course (ET 400) for all engineering students preparing to take the state Engineer-In-Training registration examination.

B. STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRAM

The department has a very high quality faculty that has been active in research and that provide excellent research opportunities for their students. The undergraduate and graduate educational programs appear to be excellent, and this has been documented by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) report of October, 1986, in which the Civil Engineering Department was praised for the strengths and improvements in the curriculum. The undergraduate Civil Engineering curriculum has been fully accredited by ABET since 1951. The Stocker Engineering Center is a major strength for Civil Engineering and all other Engineering Departments.

C. WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRAM

The advantage of a rural setting for Ohio University poses a disadvantage for the Civil Engineering students in several areas. It is difficult for students to obtain cooperative educational opportunities with local employers. Faculty contact with practitioners and industry is difficult to maintain, and most contact is with civil engineers in Columbus. Finally, there is limited
recruitment of graduate students from local firms in Southeast Ohio. The ABET report of October, 1986 recommended some additional design and capstone coursework for students and the accreditation report also encouraged greater exposure to the utilization of personal computers and related civil engineering software as part of the overall education of the students. The faculty has made significant strides to address the concerns.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The faculty should continue its efforts to augment the design and personal computer applications in civil engineering.

2. The department should continue its research and applications for outside funding. This will hopefully attract more graduate students.

3. The Civil Engineering Department should be commended for its strength and quality, and continued as a major and integral part of Ohio University.

4. The Civil Engineering faculty should develop a survey to assess the recommendations from graduates of the program.

5. The Civil Engineering Faculty are encouraged to develop criteria for acceptance into the graduate program.

6. There is no need for further review until the next review cycle.

E. REVIEW TOPICS

1. Quality of the scholarship and creative activity of its faculty. (Where evaluation is based on the analysis of publications, research, performances, presentations, research projects, awards and recognition).

   There have been between seven and nine faculty members each year for the past five years. A recent graduate will join the faculty in January, 1988 to bring the current number of faculty to eight. Four of the faculty are highly active professionally. They have been successful in obtaining externally funded research monies, and have published and presented their research in numerous referred journals and professional associations. The remaining faculty are moderately active professionally. Faculty resumes list a total of 60 refereed publications over the past five years. All of the faculty are involved in service on college and/or university committees, and the chairman was the Past President 1986-1987 of the Central Ohio Section of the American Society of Civil Engineers.

   Civil Engineering has generated $556,786 in outside funding over the past five years. This compares very favorably with the other engineering departments at Ohio University, and also with reported outside funding from the other universities in Ohio that have civil engineering as a major. In the March, 1987 Engineering Education (American Society of Engineering Education), Ohio University's CE research expenditures for 1985-86 were ranked fourth out of seven universities, only behind those schools which are located in major urban areas (Cincinnati, OSU, and Cleveland State).
2. The quality of the teaching of its faculty. (Where evaluation is based on student evaluations, teaching awards, written peer evaluations, outside evaluations).

Students evaluate all of the undergraduate courses every quarter. These student evaluations are included in consideration for tenure, promotion and merit raises. Based on the information provided, the ratings appear to be at the 3.00 level based on the College of Engineering rating scale from 1.00 to 4.00. No evidence was presented on any faculty teaching awards. The ABET accreditation report commended the faculty on their teaching excellence.

3. The quality of its graduate students. (Where evaluations is based on the analysis of test scores, merit awards, research projects and grades in all classes).

The Graduate Record Examination is not required for its graduate students. Applicants are evaluated on the basis of their undergraduate transcripts and references. Of the 27 students who have graduated from the MS program in the past 5 years, the average GPA was 3.58 with a range from 3.20 to 4.00. The average yearly graduate acceptance is approximately 40 students per year. The Chairman of Graduate Studies in Civil Engineering reports that approximately 60% of the annual applicants are unacceptable and thus rejected.

4. The quality of its graduate educational experience. (Where evaluation is based on reports of current students, alumni and/or employers).

The average length of time required to complete the MS program is about 19 months with a range of 9 to 30 months. Of the 32 graduate students over the past 5 years, only 2 have left for academic reasons, and only 3 have withdrawn for personal reasons. Based on this, the quality appears to be good. The department is able to retain graduate students. The department does not currently send questionnaires to their graduates. However, the Chairman thought the Review Committee's suggestion of a graduate questionnaire to inquire about their evaluation and recommendations for improvement of the curriculum was valuable, and they plan to initiate a graduate evaluation process.

5. Demand for its graduate program by students. (Where evaluation is based on past placement records and projected employment demand).

Of the 40 graduate students that are accepted per year, there are an average of 23 students enrolled in the graduate program. Approximately 15% of the Ohio University undergraduate students enroll in the graduate program at OU as compared to only 1 - 2 undergraduates who go to graduate school at another university. Over the past five years, there have been 7 MS graduates leave Ohio University to pursue doctoral degrees. Ohio University Civil Engineering faculty have approximately 3.3 graduate students per faculty member, and this is an acceptable and workable number of graduate students for the faculty.
6. Projected demand for its graduates outside the university. (Where evaluation is based on projected placement of its students):

Graduates usually find the same type of employment as the undergraduates, i.e.: consulting engineering firms, government agencies or private corporations. All of the graduate students in the past five years have gained employment.

7. The quality of its undergraduate majors. (Where evaluation is based on GPA, test scores, merit awards, etc.):

The average quality of the undergraduate students is probably the same as that of the entire College of Engineering and Technology, since the entrance requirements are the same for all students. Appendix I provides ACT, SAT and GPA scores for the past five years. The average entering ACT score for its undergraduates is 22.5 and the average SAT score is 989. The average undergraduate GPA is 2.65.

8. The quality of its undergraduate educational experience. (Where evaluation is based on reports of alumni and/or employers).

There were no data presented from alumni or employers as to the quality of the undergraduate educational experience. However, faculty reported that undergraduates gain employment in private corporations, consulting engineering firms and/or government agencies. Personal contact between faculty and former undergraduates indicates that the students were pleased with the quality of their educational experiences. It is noteworthy that all of the undergraduate courses are taught by faculty members, although some laboratories may be taught by graduate assistants.

9. Demand for its undergraduate major by students. (Where evaluation is based on enrollment trends).

There are currently 94 undergraduate students enrolled in Civil Engineering at Ohio University. This is approximately the annual undergraduate enrollment over the past five years. Recruitment of undergraduates into Civil Engineering has not been a problem.

10. Projected demand for its undergraduates. (Where evaluation is based on past placement records and projected employment demand).

The future demands for civil engineers are not likely to differ greatly from the present demands. Civil engineers are usually associated with public works design and construction activity which tend to be rather steady nationwide; as reported by the department chairman.
11. The present demand for its undergraduate program by non-majors. (Where evaluation is based on trends in non-major enrollments and changing program requirements or other majors, departments and schools).

With the exception of the five courses that are required courses in other schools within the College of Engineering, there is not much demand for CE courses by other university non-majors. However, if a non-major meets the pre-requisites or equivalent for a CE course, they are permitted to enroll in the course.

12. Advantages in relation to other institutions. (Where evaluation is based on distinctiveness in its approach, curricula, or other factors).

Among the unique facilities of the Civil Engineering Department, there are facilities for teaching and research which provide distinct advantages to students and faculty. The multi-axial soil testing apparatus and the modal analysis apparatus are not commonly found at other universities.

13. The quality of its library holdings. (Where evaluation is based on holdings and gaps in those holdings).

The department rates the current library holdings and acquisitions of Alden Library in Civil Engineering as adequate for undergraduate students, and marginal for graduate students. The ABET accreditation report also found the library holdings adequate for the needs of the engineering students. The department feels that additional journals to assist students become aware of current research are needed, particularly for the graduate students.

14. The quality of its facilities and equipment. (Where evaluation is based on age, adequacy and condition of equipment and facilities).

The Stocker Engineering Center is an excellent resource and provides excellent space and equipment for classrooms, laboratories and research. The seven laboratory facilities in CE are shared by faculty and students. At this time, laboratory space is adequate for undergraduate teaching, but becoming marginal for research activities.

15. The quality of its honors program.

There is no honors program available in Civil Engineering.
16. The quality of its offerings through workshops, independent study or experiential learning. (Where evaluation is based on reports from the Office of Continuing Education and students in the programs).

There have not been any correspondence courses offered in the past five years. Course credit by examination is not offered on a regular basis. No credit has been granted in the CE department for workshops during the past five years. Workshop courses alone are not applicable to major or degree credit, although they might be a positive factor for experiential credit. The CE department receives one or two requests for experiential credit each year. The evaluator is the instructor who teaches the on-campus course and who must be satisfied that the experiential learning is substantially equivalent to the academic course.

17. The quality of its program on regional campuses. (Where evaluation is based on reports from the Vice Provost for Regional Higher Education, the regional campus deans, faculty and students in the off-campus programs).

There are three CE courses taught on regional campuses at Belmont and Lancaster. These are CE 210 Plane Surveying, CE 220 Statics and CE 222 Strength of Materials. The courses are taught by full-time regional campus faculty, although not necessarily civil engineering faculty. These courses appear to be equivalent to the corresponding courses on the Athens campus.

DATA FROM THE HISTORICAL COMPLEMENTUM

This is a reproduction of the data in the Historical Compendium showing enrollment trends, staffing, majors and degrees granted. The information is from items 1, 2, 3, 9, and 11 of the Historical Compendium.
### UCC PROGRAM REVIEW INFORMATION

#### CIVIL ENGINEERING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT COMP</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>23.43</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>23.02</td>
<td>22.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT VERBAL</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT MATH</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS RANK</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU GPA</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FALL HEADCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRESHMEN</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPHOMORE</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRAD TOTAL</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANNUAL DEGREES AWARDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BACCALAUREATE</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORATE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Degrees Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>1684</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>1333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>1557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET42</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET43</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TEACHING FACULTY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TENURED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-TENURED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERM (NON-TENURED)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT TENURED</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUDGETED FTE STAFFING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD. ASSISTANTS</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIL SERVICE</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>10.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program: GENERAL SECRETARIAL TECHNOLOGY, a two-year program on the Chillicothe Campus

1. Program Description:

The General Secretarial Technology program prepares students to enter secretarial and administrative support careers. Initiated on the Chillicothe Campus in 1974-75, the program changed in 1983 to meet area needs. The change was a one-year Clerical Technology program which was developed as suggested by both the Ohio Board of Regents and the program's advisory committee. The Clerical Technology program became the first year of the two-year GST curriculum.

The GST curriculum consists of approximately 1650 clock hours or 100 credit hours with 51 in GST courses, 30 business-related courses, and 19 non-technical courses. Curriculum content conforms to the standards set by the Ohio Board of Regents and the Ohio Department of Vocational Education.

GST majors and non-majors learn word processing in the program. They learn word processing with a variety of programs on various brands of equipment. Upon completion of the program they can quickly adapt to whatever word processing equipment or programs they find at their place of employment.

PROGRAM STRENGTHS

1. In spite of a relatively poor job market in the Chillicothe area, graduates of the program find jobs. The GST program supplies general office workers to employers; such workers are apparently in demand, especially if they have word processing skills.

2. Through grants and donations both public and private the GST program has obtained Wang, IBM, and Apple equipment and word processing programs. The facilities and the equipment are a program strength.

3. The program has well qualified part-time teachers, all of whom are vocationally certified by the State Department of Vocational Education.

PROGRAM PRACTICES INVITING IMPROVEMENT

1. The GST program should work on better retention of students between the first and second year. Actually the retention rate has improved since 1982-83, but even in 1986-87 25% of the students dropped out.
2. The program should regularly survey its graduates to assess its quality and to acquire data about employment.

RECOMMENDATION

The Five Year Review Subcommittee has reviewed the General Secretarial Technology Program on the Chillicothe Campus and finds that the review is complete. The GST program does not require another evaluation until its next regular review in 1992.

REVIEW TOPICS

1. The quality of the scholarship and creative activity of its faculty.

Because GST is a two-year program, the teachers carry heavy teaching loads and they are not expected to produce traditional scholarship. Instead, the program coordinator and the one full-time faculty member are involved in consulting and referral activity, especially about word processing. The Coordinator is currently pursuing a Ph.D. at the University of Cincinnati.

Both full-time people are active in the Ohio Office Education Association, and both have served as proctors and evaluators at the State of Ohio OEA Post-Secondary Contests. OU-C hosted the 1986 OEA convention which attracted 438 high school seniors.

The GST department developed a test battery covering a wide range of office positions. The Wearever-Proctor Silex Corporation commissioned the test battery which is administered and evaluated by the department.

2. The quality of the teaching of its faculty.

The faculty of the GST department consists of two full-time faculty, one of whom is the Coordinator for 25% of his time. These two full-time faculty are joined by an average of four part-time faculty each quarter. These full- and part-time faculty teach from 8-12 credits per quarter, often at night or on weekends. Full-time faculty usually teach 6-8 sections; part-time faculty usually teach 3-4 courses.

Students evaluate all faculty with a standard form. Student evaluations are considered when faculty members are evaluated for promotion, tenure, or merit salary.

The two full-time faculty members do most of the advising for GST majors though student services advises students about the general requirements. The Coordinator does the recruiting, placement and testing for the department.
Questions 3, 4, 5, and 6 refer to graduate level instruction and are, therefore, not applicable to this program.

7. The quality of its undergraduate majors.

No quantitative data provided nor was any requested in the UCC review questionnaire for 1986-87.

8. The quality of its undergraduate educational experience.

No survey results from employers or alumni. The department reports that personal letters from graduates and early leavers indicate a positive feeling about their education at OU-C. Ohio Board of Regents forms also indicate a positive feeling about the department by both those who graduate and those who do not.

Telephone reports and follow-up calls indicate that most of the students in the program are excellent, productive workers.

9. Demand for its undergraduate major by students.

As indicated in the table below, the number of students in the program has remained relatively steady. Increasing number are staying through the second year, but the number of graduates remains relatively small because many students finish the degree on a part-time basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demand for graduates of the program has been high in spite of soft market conditions in the area. Hiring "has occurred on a very frequent basis," especially since word processing skills were built into the program. Employers indicate the future is very bright for the vast majority of the students in the program.


Demand for the program could drop in the future because the business departments in area high schools have increased the requirements in math and English. One result of the new requirement is that fewer students are choosing business education. The kind of students attracted to the program has moved to the non-traditional: the adult student is an increasing presence; the eighteen-year-old group is shrinking.
12. Its advantages in relation to other institutions.

None in particular though the mission of the campus and the program is to meet the needs of the local area.

According to GST, the program compares favorably with other college level secretarial technology departments. The department claims that the GST curriculum may differ from others in its adaptation to local business and industry, the recommendations of its advisory committee, and the superiority of its facilities and equipment.

13. The quality of its library holdings.

"Library acquisitions have been modest but well supported by the librarian," according to the department. Library allowances are spent and the demand for library materials tends to escalate each year.

14. The quality of the facilities and equipment.

The physical facilities, the equipment, and the software available to students to learn word processing are excellent.

15. The GST program does not have an honors program.
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Description of Program

The Department of Geological Sciences offers programs of study leading to the Bachelor of Science (with concentrations in Geological Sciences, Environmental Geology, Water Resources) and the Master of Science (with concentrations in Geology, Hydrology, Geophysics, and Remote Sensing). A Bachelor of Arts in Geology (a liberal arts degree) is also offered, but attracts few students. Twenty-one students were listed as undergraduate majors, and thirty-two as graduate majors in Fall, 1987.

The Department also works closely with the Master of Environmental Studies, with one of its faculty members serving as Director of that program, and with the newly created Institute of Ground Water Research.

There are eight faculty members in the Department, a slight decline (.33 FTE) since 1983.

Program Strengths

The Department ranks high among Departments of Geology in Ohio state-assisted universities in terms of professional activities and grants, according to a bi-annual survey of departments of geology at state supported universities conducted by Richard Heimlich at Kent State University. It is gaining a solid reputation in the areas of environmental geology and hydrogeology.

Graduates (both B.S. and M.S.) of the program rate their educational experience highly. It is a solid geological program in a rapidly changing field.

Program Weaknesses

A major weakness noted in the 1983 review, that of facilities and equipment, continued through this review period. The planned move to Clippinger will remedy the facilities weakness, but there appears to be little or no improvement in the problem of equipment. In some cases faculty will move into new labs with little or outdated equipment.

There has been a rapid decline in the number of undergraduate majors, from 72 in 1983 to a projected 13-15 in 1988. This is partly due to the bottom falling out of the petroleum industry,
where early in the 1980s one quarter of the professional geologists were laid off. There is some growth in other areas (environmental study, hydrology, remote sensing), but not sufficient to off-set that of petroleum. There are indications that there will be an up-turn in employment of geologists in the petroleum industry within the next few years which will help increase the number of undergraduate majors.

Recommendations

1. The Department should develop and submit a prioritized plan for long term equipment and maintenance needs for submission to the College.

2. The Department should address the decline in the number of its majors, including its apparent close association with petroleum geology and identification of alternative courses of action.

3. Clearly stated criteria for graduate student admission should be developed and implemented.

4. The University Curriculum Council sees no need for further review until the next review cycle in 1993.

Review Topics

1. The quality of the scholarship and creative activity of its faculty. On the whole this is a highly active department professionally. Two of the faculty are very active and three are quite active in presenting papers and making professional appearances. In comparison with ten other geology departments in Ohio, O.U. does very well (Bi-Annual Survey of Departments of Geology at State Supported Universities in Ohio). In 1985-86, O.U. faculty ranked second in papers published per faculty member and first in abstracts published. The department also had the highest percentage of its faculty with new and/or continuing grants. Recently a new grant of $66,000 was awarded for radon contamination research.

2. The quality of the teaching of its faculty. In the absence of truly comparative data, the quality of the department's teaching, as evaluated by students in courses, approximates average for the college. Graduates of the program rate the program highly. A survey of geology graduates (1981-1986) reported that 75% of the bachelor's graduates who responded (N=20) and 91% of the master's degree graduates (N=23) rated the quality of instruction as "Extremely" or "Very" satisfactory.

3. The quality of its graduate students. The department does not require standard tests (GRE) for admission. The fact that 95% of its graduates either went on for their Ph.D.s (24%) or have
obtained professional employment in the geological sciences suggests high quality or employability.

4. The quality of its graduate educational experience. Graduates from its master's program indicate that they are generally pleased with the quality of their educational experience. Ninety-one percent of the respondents indicated that they were "extremely" or "very" satisfied with the education received from the department. The only area which indicated some concern was that of "career planning and placement information." Twenty-five percent of the respondents indicated that they were only "somewhat" or "not at all" satisfied with this area of their graduate educational experience.

5. Demand for its graduate program by students. Graduate enrollment has declined somewhat (from a high of 41 to 31 in the Fall of 1987) during this review period, largely due to a falling job market in the petroleum industry. The department expects enrollment to hold steady for the immediate future.

6. Projected demand for its graduates outside the university. There is a continuing demand for graduates of the geological sciences program. The demand has shifted, however, moving from petroleum based jobs to those dealing with the environment, geophysics, and hydrology. Of the 38 students completing the program between 1982 and 1986, 24% entered doctoral programs elsewhere, 42% were international students who have obtained positions with their home governments.

7. The quality of its undergraduate majors. Geological sciences majors generally have higher ACT and SAT scores than the campus as a whole. In 1987, for example, the average ACT score of majors was 24.06 compared with a campus-wide average of 20.38. Their overall grade point average was lower than that of the university as a whole (2.69 vs. 2.85) partly because of generally lower grades given by the department. Forty-three percent of B.S. graduates continued on to graduate school, a percentage higher than most other departments at Ohio University.

8. The quality of its undergraduate educational experience. In a survey sent to 64 individuals who graduated with an undergraduate major in geological sciences (20 returned), 79% of the respondents evaluated their undergraduate departmental educational experience as "Extremely" or "Very" Satisfactory. When asked to compare their geological education with that of individuals with whom they had come into contact since graduating, 89% indicated that they were "Extremely" or "Very" Satisfied.

9. Demand for its undergraduate major by students. The number of students majoring in geological sciences has declined significantly during the past five years, from 72 in 1983 to 21 this fall. This should decline further in 1988 since the last "big" group of majors (12) are seniors. Thus, without a change in
the present pattern, it may be that there will be only 13 - 15 majors. Part of this decline is due to changes in the labor market, especially the petroleum industry, but there may be other factors at work. The department is quite concerned about this and is considering strengthening alternatives such as hydro-geology and environmental geology.

10. Projected demand for its undergraduates. Employment demand has declined over the past five years, especially in the area of petroleum. On the other hand, demand has increased in the areas of the environment and hydro-geology. The area identified by graduates of the program as weakest was in the area of career planning and placement. Indeed, 83% of the respondents indicated that they were only "somewhat" or "not" satisfied with the department's effort. Part of this perception may be due to the bottom dropping out of the petroleum industry, leaving some students who had planned to enter it unsure of their future.

11. The present demand for its undergraduate program by non-majors. Non-major undergraduate demand for courses in geology has remained fairly constant over the past five years. Most of this demand is at the 100-200 level where the major of the department's courses may be used to fill natural and applied/Tier II requirements. In order to make up for a decline in credit hours generated at the upper levels by the smaller number of majors, the department is adding additional service courses at the lower levels.

12. Advantages in relation to other institutions, if any. None.

13. The quality of its library holdings. Library holdings are considered adequate, but may fall behind what is needed to remain current. The funds allocated to the department are among the lowest of the state supported universities in Ohio.

14. The quality of its facilities and equipment. In the 1983 Review it was noted that lack of funds was a serious problem for both the purchase and maintenance of equipment. This situation has not changed. In the 1983-84 and 1985-86 surveys the equipment budget for the department was the lowest among the 11 state universities: indeed, it was less than half of the next lowest university. The department has been able to obtain equipment through UPAC, special college allocations, and special funding through the state, but these have been ad hoc with little opportunity to plan long range planning for equipment purchases or maintenance. The 1983 review noted the hardship situation the department labored in with respect to facilities, noting that the planned move should alleviate this problem. The move did not take place during this review period but is expected during the next year as work on Clippinger Hall is completed. This move, however, will not solve the problem of inadequate and insufficient equipment.

15. The quality of its honors program. The department does not
participate in the Honors Tutorial program.

16. The quality of its offerings through workshops, independent study, or experiential learning. The department does not offer work through the Office of Continuing Education.

17. The quality of its programs on regional campuses. There is one regional campus faculty member who teaches geological sciences courses on the Lancaster and Chillicothe campuses. He is not involved in departmental curriculum planning and there is relatively little interaction between the department and the regional campuses.

Historical Information

On the next page is a reproduction of the data in items 1, 2, 3, 9, and 11 of the Historical Compendium showing enrollment trends, staffing, majors and degrees granted.
### 1. FALL HEADCOUNTS BY MAJOR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06 GEOL SCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. ANNUAL DEGREES AWARDED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>1983</th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>1987</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. FALL STUDENT CREDIT HOURS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>2371</td>
<td>2287</td>
<td>2278</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. TEACHING FACULTY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term (Non-Tenured)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Retirees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Tenured</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11. BUDGETED FTE STAFFING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Assistants</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.29</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>13.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Description of Program

The Gerontology Certificate Program (referred to in this report as the Program) is cosponsored by the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Health and Human Services. From 1982 to 1987 the Program was housed in the College of Arts and Sciences. During February, 1987, the Program was transferred to the College of Health and Human Services for administration and operation within the Division on Aging. The director of the Program, who also is currently the director of the Division on Aging, is appointed by the Dean of the College of Health and Human Services. The University Committee on Aging serves in an advisory role to the director.

The Program can be combined with any undergraduate major at Ohio University and is available to all students who want to gain knowledge and skills for careers in working with or for the elderly. To fulfill requirements for a certificate, a student must complete at least 28 credit hours from a specified list of courses offered by the following departments/schools: Health and Sport Sciences, Hearing and Speech Science, Home Economics, Nursing, Psychology, Social Work, and Sociology. Five credit hours of the required 28 must come from a gerontology-oriented practicum, field experience, or internship. A student who completes the Program is awarded a Gerontology Certificate; completion of the Program also is recorded on the student's official transcript. Currently there are 51 students in the Program.

Many of the records concerning students in the Program prior to 1987 have been lost. Most of the information provided for this report is from 1986 to the present.

B. Strengths of the Program

The Program was developed with a plan which involved development of new courses on aging by faculty with primary interest in the area. Most of the faculty who started with the Program remain active participants. Many of the participating faculty have field experience with gerontology.

While the Program is closely associated with the Long Term Care (LTC) Administration program in the College of Health and Human Services, it is available to any undergraduate student in the University.
C. Weaknesses of the Program

Courses dealing with gerontology in the following areas are needed to strengthen the curriculum: Ethics, demography, clinical gerontology, and public policy.

Students are not provided written information that they are required to maintain a minimum grade point average of 2.00 for courses taken within the Program.

Since most records for students who have participated in the Program prior to 1987 have been lost, it is difficult to evaluate certificate recipients and the successes or failures of the Program for the past five years.

D. Recommendations

1. The Program should make information available to students concerning the required minimum grade point average of 2.00 for gerontology courses taken by students in the Program.

2. The Program should continue to seek support from participating and possibly new departments/schools with regard to providing time for qualified faculty to develop courses appropriate for the Program.

3. The Program should make special efforts to maintain records of participants in the Program, seek records of former participants in the Program, and obtain feedback about the Program from certificate recipients.

4. Because of lack of information about the Program's development prior to 1987, a full five-year review should be made in the 1990-1991 academic year.

E. Review Topics

1. Quality of the scholarship and creative activity of its faculty

The Program has no faculty of its own. Faculty are evaluated by their respective departments/schools. Of the seven faculty who currently teach courses in the Program in Athens, one participant is the rank of professor, five are associate professors, and one is an assistant professor.

2. The quality of the teaching of its faculty

The Program has no faculty of its own. Faculty are evaluated by their respective departments/schools. Teaching within the program is enhanced by faculty members who have field experience with gerontology.

3 - 6. These questions concern graduate programs and therefore are not applicable to this review.
7. The quality of its undergraduate majors

The overall grade point average of the 51 students currently in the program is 2.55. The average grade point for undergraduates at Ohio University at the end of the 1987 fall quarter was 2.71.

8. The quality of its undergraduate educational experience

The high percentage (14 out of 16 in 1986-1987) of Gerontology Certificate recipients who became licensed by the State of Ohio as nursing home administrators after taking state and national examinations indicates that the undergraduate educational experience is good. Lack of records, however, prevents adequate analysis of the quality of undergraduate experience at this time.

9. Demand for its undergraduate major by students

See topic # 11.

10. Projected demand for its undergraduates

Of the 16 certificate recipients in 1986-1987, 14 have been licensed by the State of Ohio as nursing home administrators; 12 of the 14 are employed as nursing home administrators. The demand for recipients of the Gerontology Certificate is high.

11. The present demand for its undergraduate program by nonmajors

There are currently 51 students in the Program. Fifty are majors in the College of Health and Human Services; one is a major in the College of Arts and Sciences. Efforts are being made to increase awareness of the Program among students and faculty throughout the University.

12. Its advantages in relation to other institutions

The Program is closely associated with the LTC Administration program in the College of Health and Human Services. The LTC Administration program, the largest in the state, was the first undergraduate program of its type licensed in the state.

Of the members of the LTC Consortium in Ohio, only Ohio University offers a certificate for gerontology. The Program is advantageous to persons already in the field, who would like to strengthen their background in gerontology without pursuing either a baccalaureate or master's degree program.
13. The quality of its library holdings

The library holdings are adequate for background materials because during 1980-1983 the Institute on Aging was supported in part by a $420,000 grant from the Administration on Aging. There is no specific library budget for gerontology at the present; new additions are made through academic units with faculty who teach gerontology courses.

14. The quality of its facilities and equipment

N/A

15. The quality of its honors program

N/A

16. The quality of its offerings through workshops, independent study, or experiential learning

One special topics workshop that is approved by the State Licensing Board is offered each quarter.

17. The quality of its programs on regional campuses

Eight students at Belmont are participating in the Program on a trial basis. Instruction at the Belmont campus is carried out by the Program's director and a full time faculty member at the Belmont campus with a Ph. D. in public health. Quality of the program at Belmont is considered by the Program's director to be the same as what is on the Athens campus.
A. Program Description

Located in the Office of Graduate and Research Programs, the Interdisciplinary Program (I.I.P.) is lodged in, and administered by, the Office of Graduate Student Services. Graduate work may be pursued leading to a Ph.D. degree, or one of several Masters degrees. The degree pursued depends upon the departments/schools which are involved in the students' areas of interest.

The student pursues work in at least three fields of study. The hope is that the interdisciplinary nature of the course work will evolve into a research project which will be synthetic in nature. For the Ph.D. degree at least two of the three fields of study must be in departments/schools which grant the doctoral degree.

The course of study is individualized for each student. Upon receiving an application the student is interviewed by the director of the Office of Graduate Student Services. At this interview the reason for selecting a non-traditional program is ascertained, as well as the direction which the proposed course of study will take. The applicant is then sent to the graduate chair of each of the selected disciplines for implementation of the proposal. An advisory committee is formed with at least one representative from each discipline. While the appointment of each member is the prerogative of the appropriate graduate chair, the actual finding of a person able and willing to serve on this committee generally rests upon the applicant.

After admission students in the I.I.P. are treated as regular graduate students. The Office of Graduate Student Services handles the housekeeping details for this program.

The I.I.P. has no faculty of its own, but depends upon the departments/schools which are involved with the students. No provision is made for work as teaching assistants. The program presently has twenty-one (21) students actively pursuing a degree, nine (9) of which are on the doctoral level.

B. Strengths of the Program

The program attracts students whose needs are not satisfied within the traditional academic structure. Over the years these persons have proved to be both bright and highly motivated. The ability to be instrumental in the design of one's academic program is consistently cited by students as the central strength of the I.I.P.

By the very nature of the program students are able to move freely across department/school boundaries. Whatever positive things can be said for such an interdisciplinary approach to learning can be said of this program.

There is a sense in which the I.I.P. unlocks the vast resources of the University to the inquiring mind.
C. Weaknesses of the Program

The very strength of the program can also be its weakness. Students can drift in uncharted areas without enough guidance to steer a course which will achieve their educational goals while at the same time achieving academic expectations within a reasonable time framework.

There appears to be a problem of understanding the unique nature of the I.I.P., especially among faculty who have had little contact with interdisciplinary studies.

There is a lack of clearly defined guidelines for minimum and maximum expectations in course work and research.

There is no incentive built in for the departments/schools to participate in the I.I.P. Resources are used with no apparent pay back.

D. Recommendations

1. While there is general approval of the quality of the work of the Office of Graduate Student Services, that office should assume more direction and monitoring of the program.

2. Provisions should be made for students to talk through their program with others who understand its unique nature. This could be accomplished by providing for a system of networking among students and graduates of the I.I.P. coordinated by the Office of Graduate Student Services.

3. The Associate Provost investigate the possibility of a reward system for those departments which actively participate in the I.I.P.

4. A re-examination should be made of the place of interdisciplinary education as it relates to the departments/schools involved. The scope of the decision making authority of the student's committee, as well as the extent of course work requirements seem to be areas of special student concern.

5. The availability of this degree option should be widely disseminated in the Ohio University recruiting efforts.

6. There is no need for further review until the next review cycle.

E. Review Topics

1. Quality of the scholarship and creative activity of its faculty (where evaluation is based on the analysis of publications, research, performances, presentations, research projects, awards, and recognition).

The Individual Interdisciplinary Program has no faculty of its own, but rather makes use of the resources of the participating departments/schools. There is no formal evaluation of the faculty outside that which the individual departments/schools have in place.

2. The quality of the teaching of its faculty (where evaluation is based on student evaluations, teaching awards, written peer evaluations, and
outside evaluations).

Students in this program are integrated in the course work with regular departmental/school programs. The quality of teaching reflects the overall standard of Ohio University.

Those students interviewed were positive in their appraisal of the quality of teaching at Ohio University.

3. The quality of its graduate students (where evaluation is based on the analysis of test scores, merit awards, research projects, and grades in all classes).

The program requires a minimum G.P.A. for entering Master Degree graduate students of 3.3 and for entering Doctoral Degree students of 3.5.

The average Ohio University G.P.A. for 1987 for all students in the program was 3.665. There was a consensus by faculty participating in the program that the quality of students involved in interdisciplinary studies is above average.

4. The quality of its graduate educational experience (where evaluation is based on reports of current students, alumni and/or employers).

The responses received have generally been positive on the question of the graduate educational experience. While there is unanimous support for the philosophy behind the program of individualized study, there are occasional problems of various kinds experienced by students in the implementation of the program.

There are a rather large number of inactive students, a situation which evolved several years ago when the admission policy was less rigorous in informing and screening students than presently appears to be the case. This problem should eventually resolve itself.

5. Demand for its graduate program by students (where evaluation is based on past placement records and projected employment demand).

The program is not large, numbering twenty-one (21) active students in both the masters and doctoral categories. The applications for entry into the program remains stable and should generate sufficient students to at least maintain the present strength. Several of those interviewed expressed the opinion that if the program were more widely known, there would be a much greater demand.

6. Projected demand for its graduates outside the university (where evaluation is based on projected placement of its students).

Because of the broad based nature of the program, its graduates have found employment in a great variety of areas. Since students enter the program with a life plan in mind, they are able to tailor their education to their work aspirations. So long as there is a need for creativity and variety in the world of work, there should be a demand for the graduates of the I.F.P.
7 - 11. These review questions apply to undergraduate programs and, therefore, are not applicable to the I.I.P.

12. Advantages in relation to other institutions (where evaluation is based on distinctiveness in its approach, curricular or other factors).

While the Ohio Board of Regents makes provision for the offering of combined degrees, those who administer the I.I.P. were not aware of any other program in Ohio which offers the interdisciplinary breadth in the construction of an academic degree program as the one offered by Ohio University.

13. The quality of its library holdings (where evaluation is based on holdings and gaps in those holdings).

The program uses the resources of the entire University, therefore, the quality of its library holdings will be the same as that of each individual department/school and College which participates in the program. The adequacy of the resources to pursue a course of study is a major part of the discussion at the time of admission review by the advisory committee representing all the departments/schools involved.

14. The quality of its facilities and equipment (where evaluation is based on age, adequacy, and condition of equipment and facilities).

The program relies entirely upon the facilities that are available in the departments/schools and Colleges involved. A degree program will be approved only if the appropriate facilities and equipment are available.

15 - 17. Nothing in these three questions has application to the I.I.P.
**Ohio University**

**Program Review Information**

**Majors:** 6942, 6943

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OU GPA</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>3.661</td>
<td>3.698</td>
<td>3.519</td>
<td>3.655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fall Headcount**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>DOCTORAL</th>
<th>GRAD TOAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annual Degrees Awarded**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>DOCTORAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Description of Program

The associate degree in industrial technology (IT) is a two-year program offered by Ohio University-Lancaster. Students select one of the two options available, design or manufacturing, and take 72-75 hours of course work, which is common to both options. A student will take an additional 29 hours for the design option (total hours required 101) or an additional 23-25 hours for the manufacturing option (total hours required 96).

There are approximately 25 to 30 students currently enrolled in the program. The attrition rate for the program is about 30 percent, which is considered to stem from the rigorous demands of the second year of the program, the broad range of abilities of students entering the program and the desires of some of the students to achieve an expertise level in an area in response to specific job opportunities. Eight to ten graduates are anticipated for 1988.

Students graduating with the design option are prepared for positions as a design technician, product designer, engineering support staff or technical salesman. From the manufacturing option students are prepared for positions in production industries that could include technician, quality control specialist, foreman, etc. Graduates may also choose to finish the four-year industrial technology degree in Athens. Approximately 10% of the students pursue the four year degree.

The faculty for the past five years has consisted of two full-time faculty members, one in charge of each of the two options. Both of the faculty members are Assistant Professors with tenure. Adjunct faculty are employed on an intermittent basis. For example, three part-time faculty, professionals from the Lancaster area, were employed in 1986-87 to teach courses in the design option. Two full-time faculty members from the Athens Industrial Technology Department have been used to teach courses in the manufacturing option.

The required teaching load is 12 contact hours in the classroom per quarter. The normal teaching load is four courses in most quarters.

B. Program Strengths

The faculty is strongly dedicated to teaching.

The faculty has stayed abreast of the needs of local industry and responded to those needs with the academic experience
complementing the work environment; e.g., with the addition of Computer Aided Design (CAD), emphasizing drafting, to the curriculum and a planned course on robotics. The addition of the CAD laboratory with individual work stations will enhance the program further.

C. Program Weaknesses

A problem exists with the different course numberings used on the Lancaster and Athens campuses for comparable courses; e.g., using 300 level designations at the Athens campus, while 100 level designations are used at Lancaster. This presents problems when students transfer to the main campus and receive 300 level course credit for courses designated as 100 level courses at the branch. (This is perceived by the OU-IT Department Chair to be a problem that the main campus needs to address, since the numbers used by the branch more appropriately describe the actual course level.)

The catalog information provided on the AAS degree in IT does not address how and to what extent the 2 year program in design or manufacturing coordinates with the 4 year program. Conversations with the OU-IT chair and IT-Lancaster faculty indicate that the manufacturing option more closely fits the 4 year degree program requirements with all courses transferring directly to OU. Apparently, a number of the design option courses do not correlate directly to the 4 year program.

D. Recommendations

1. Planning meetings between the IT-Athens campus and Lancaster branch should be held periodically to plan and coordinate activities between the two programs, particularly in order to plan for the required adjunct faculty for the Lancaster program and to provide for smooth transitions for transfer students.

2. The course numbers for comparable courses offered at the main and branch campuses should be correlated.

3. Information provided to students, particularly in the catalog, needs to clearly articulate the transfer credits that are received for each of the two options.

4. An effort should be made to periodically survey graduates to assess the quality of their learning experience.

5. There is no need for further review until the next review cycle.
E. Review Topics

1. Quality of the scholarship and creative activity of the faculty.

Both of the faculty members are Assistant Professors with tenure. The design faculty member is pursuing a Ph.D. in Civil Engineering from OSU, and the other recently received certification as a Manufacturing Engineer from the Society of Manufacturing Engineers.

Adjunct faculty from outside OU are qualified in their teaching area. These have included the local high school drafting teacher, who teaches graphics, a local engineer, who teaches machine design and a local industrialist, who teaches tool design. Branch adjunct faculty must be approved by the IT-Athens Department Chairman.

2. The quality of the teaching.

Student evaluations are conducted for all classes every quarter.* In letters from former students one of the faculty was described as "demanding excellence and self-discipline" and "takes great strides to keep the quality of engineering up to standards with real world applications." Personal interviews conducted with two on campus and one transfer student were very positive regarding quality of instruction.

3. The quality of its graduate students.

Not applicable

4. The quality of its graduate educational experience.

Not applicable

5. Demand for its graduate program by students.

Not applicable

6. Projected demand for its graduates outside of the university.

According to the information provided, at the present there are more job openings for graduates or second year students than can be filled. There were no data provided to assess the actual demand. Graduates are reported to be entering professions as project engineers, quality control supervisors, engineering technicians, drafting supervisors, and other related fields. Salaries in the $20,000 range were cited by one of the faculty.

*One of the faculty for the DTCH 210 course, Winter Quarter 1987, scored above the campus average on each question.
7. The quality of its undergraduate majors.

The average gpa's of graduates was 3.17 in 1987, 3.31 (one student) in 1986, and 2.93 in 1985. Students that have continued on with a four year degree are reported to perform well and two to three have completed the four year IT degree. Three to four graduates had transferred into engineering curriculums, requiring about three additional years of course work beyond the AAS degree.

8. The quality of the undergraduate educational experience.

The quality of the undergraduate educational experience is excellent based on interviews with on-campus students as well as one transfer student. Items cited were the personal attention students receive on the Lancaster campus due to smaller class size, confidence building aspects of the program, and the genuine rapport students have with the faculty, as well as more practical emphasis on instruction instead of theoretical. Students indicated that they were encouraged to go on to the main campus for a four year degree. It was noted that local industries have been pleased with their employees' learning experiences. This was evidenced by a donation to the program of a fork lift truck.

9. Demand for the undergraduate major by students.

The number of graduates for the past five years has been as follows: year(#), 1983(4), 1984(3), 1985(8), 1986(1), 1987(8). Eight to 10 graduates are anticipated for 1988. There are approximately 25 to 30 students currently enrolled in the program. (This figure is difficult to calculate because of the fact that there are a number of part-time students.) It was indicated that according to the Ohio Board of Regents there should be at least 5 graduates per year for the program to be viable.

Students following the design option are generally traditional students; i.e., recently graduated from high school and taking a full load each quarter. In contrast, many of the students in the manufacturing option are non-traditional students, who have returned to the classroom after several years of working in local industries and pursue their degree work, while maintaining at least part-time employment outside the university. As a result, most of these students take an average of about 6 years to get an associate degree.


Data were not available for national trends for graduates with AAS degrees in Industrial Technology. Results of a report from the College Placement Council showed 1986 graduates, who received Bachelor of Science degrees in Industrial Technology, were being offered average salaries of about $26,000, while industrial manufacturing engineers were being offered about $27,000. Salaries were above those for the previous year.
11. Demand for the undergraduate program by non-majors.

Data were not available on the numbers of students that enroll in the IT courses from other academic units. Non-majors do take the IT courses, primarily electronics technology students, and some business administration students. It was estimated that non-IT students comprise about 15-20% of particular courses.

In addition, it is anticipated that with the expansion and development of the CAD laboratory that additional non-major students will use these facilities. An upgrading or introduction of a new course in the robotics area is anticipated to be offered for both IT and Electronics Technology students.

12. Advantages in relation to other universities.

IT-L course offerings, for example the availability of CAD, and the planned CAD laboratory provide students with state-of-the-art curricula.

13. Quality of its library holdings.

Library holdings appear to be adequate. It was noted that in the past necessary support and resources have been made available and that this is expected in the future.

14. Quality of its facilities and equipment.

The physical facilities are spacious and quite adequate for the courses being taught at the present time. Plans have been made and approved for the addition of approximately 20 CAD workstations and the conversion of one room at OU-Lancaster to serve as the CAD/Drafting center. The projected completion date is within two years. The planned addition and expansion of the CAD facilities and equipment will update this area to the state-of-the-art.

15. Quality of its honors program.

IT-L does not have an honors program.

16. Quality of its offerings through workshops, independent study and experiential learning.

Experiential learning is more prevalent and plausible for those students in the manufacturing option, since these students are returning from industry and have acquired skills and knowledge, which qualifies them for courses offered in this area. For example, students with extensive experience in an area such as drafting are advised to apply for course credit by examination for IT 101 and IT 102 through the IT Department-Athens. These examinations are handled completely by this department. In the design area only one student has used experiential learning for
Due to the demand of local industry, workshops have been offered on the following topics:

- MTCH 299(2) Beginning Welding 13 students
- MTCH 263(3) Quality Control 52 students*
- MTCH 299(2) Experimental Design 11 students

*There were three sections over three years of this workshop.

Continuing demand by industry for workshops would indicate the quality is good. No data were available to assess quality. The Lancaster campus Dean commented that the workshops had been instrumental in "saving some of the local industries." A for credit training program for a local industry has been proposed beginning in the Spring quarter, which would involve 40 people for 1 1/2 years.

17. Quality of its programs on regional campuses.

This program is only offered on the Lancaster campus.

F. Enrollment Data

The following table presents data on enrollments and credit hours produced for the last 5 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FALL</th>
<th>WINTER</th>
<th>SPRING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>53(21)</td>
<td>81(21)</td>
<td>48(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>58(16)</td>
<td>86(19)</td>
<td>44(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>52(19)</td>
<td>85(23)</td>
<td>58(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>74(21)</td>
<td>68(27)</td>
<td>46(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>40(15)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of Program

Located in the College of Communication, the School of Interpersonal Communication offers an undergraduate degree (B.S.C.) with six tracks: Communication Theory, Organizational Communication, Communication in Human Services, Legal Communication, Political Communication, and Communication Education. All undergraduates must take a 24-hour sequence of "core" courses. Except for the University's general education requirements, no courses outside the School are required. The School reported 299 majors in the Fall of 1987, 368 in Winter, 1988.

Ph.D. and M.A. programs are also offered. There were 66 graduate students registered in Fall, 1987.

In addition to serving its majors, the School provides a service to the University broadly through its courses on public speaking. InCo 103, in particular, enrolled 2300 students in 1986-87.

The School is also responsible for a number of special activities such as debate and speech and an internship program.

There are 17 faculty (15.5 FTE), including seven women, two of whom are full professors. There are 30 graduate teaching associates.

Program Strengths

1. Both the undergraduate and graduate programs continue to experience high demand. Undergraduate majors were down to 299 in 1987 from 418 in 1982, and had stabilized at an average of 270 since 1984. However, by Winter 1988, the number of majors had escalated to 368. Both applications and admissions for Fall 1988 are exceeding those for Fall 1987. A college-wide policy of selective admissions is helping to improve the quality of its undergraduates. Graduate enrollments have remained steady, according to compendium data, at an annual average of about 65 students.

A recent national survey of Communication programs indicated that OU's program ranked in the top ten for annual enrollments in selected interpersonal/speech communication courses. The program was second among 364 surveyed in enrollments for public speaking.

2. A 1985 curricular restructuring provided for one major with six tracks, instead of two majors and one certificate program. This gave more focus and coherence to the program.
3. The competitive extra-curricular forensics program is consistently ranked among the nation's best by the National Forensic Association.

4. Eight faculty have been named University Professors over the past five years.

Program Weaknesses

1. Although the Compendium indicates 33 registered doctoral students, the School lists an additional 22 as actively working on their degrees. Fifty-five doctoral students is a large number relative to the small size of the faculty (15 full time graduate faculty). This raises questions about the quality and quantity of guidance that can be provided to these students, particularly in light of the rather high teaching loads. In addition, there are about 33 registered M.A. students. The School's five-year plan does not discuss the question of optimal size of the graduate program nor is it seen as a pressing problem for the immediate future.

2. The workload for some Graduate Associates may be excessive. Virtually all Gas are expected to both teach and provide support to faculty. For those assigned to InCo 103, a normal load is two sections of that class, which requires six hours per week in the classroom, plus preparation, grading and advising for 40 to 44 students. In addition, these TAs are assigned 5 to 7 hours per week for faculty research. Students regard this extra assignment as excessive, although the School sees it as fulfilling a 15-hour obligation.

3. Concern was expressed in the 1983 UCC five-year review that standards for admission to the graduate program were unspecified and imprecise. This situation has not noticeably changed. Beginning in 1988, GRE scores will be required, but no minimum will be specified. No minimum GPA is indicated, and no undergraduate major is suggested. A masters degree (in no specified field) is required for entry to the Ph.D. program. Admission to both the Ph.D. and M.A. programs is determined by the rather vague criteria of a student's "academic ability, experience and personal recommendations." The School is currently reviewing its admissions policies.

4. Five of the full-time faculty and one part-time faculty member have their Ph.D. degrees from Ohio University. The dates of the Ph.D.s range from 1967 to 1986; three were hired prior to 1972 and the 1986 graduate was a joint appointment with the College of Health and Human Services. While OU may be a major producer of doctorates in Communication, for the School to continue to hire its own graduates as late as the 1980s raises concern about the variety of views and approaches that can be introduced into the program.
5. In sum, the School may be attempting to accomplish too much. The large graduate program, coupled with a large and growing undergraduate program, along with a standard teaching load of seven courses per year (although about half the faculty have reduced loads), and an increasing commitment to professional activity and publication, places an extraordinary burden on faculty. To serve all these demands well may be beyond the capacity of the 15 to 17 faculty members—despite the evidence of good will and cooperation in the School.

Recommendations

1. If, in fact, there are 55 "active" doctoral students, an effort should be made to bring the size of the program in line with the number of faculty available to provide adequate supervision of research. In any event, those graduate students receiving regular advice and support from the faculty should be registered.

2. Precise criteria for admission to graduate programs should be developed and published.

3. An attempt should be made to reduce the research work load of those Graduate Associates who also have major responsibilities for teaching.

4. Given the difficulty of defining what constitutes a "component of liberal education," the School, in its publications, should refrain from describing its program as a comparable to a Liberal Arts curriculum.

5. A major effort should be made to attract new faculty with Ph.D. degrees from outside Ohio University.

6. There is no need for further review until the next review cycle.

Review Topics

1. Quality of the scholarship and creative activity of the faculty. In professional activity, research and publication (in books and refereed journals), three faculty have been highly active, five active, four moderately active and four have a low level of activity.

   Faculty vita give an impression of general activity, but also indicate a lack of the long-term, in-depth research that would result in major projects or the publication of scholarly books.

   Recent efforts have been made, without success, to obtain external grants to pursue major research projects.
2. The quality of the teaching. In general, the faculty are highly regarded by their students for their teaching. Eight University Professors in five years, plus overall strong student support in course evaluations point to a program that takes teaching seriously and does a very good job at it. The teaching associates in InCo 103 received good teaching evaluations as well.

Although beginning TAs are enrolled in a workshop and seminar related to pedagogy, according to some TAs, they usually "learn on the job." Moreover, there are no faculty visits to the TAs' classrooms nor faculty evaluation of TA teaching performance.

All courses are evaluated by their students and the evaluations are explicitly considered for promotion and tenure—as are a number of other factors that constitute "instructional effectiveness."

The standard teaching load for faculty is seven courses per year. However, half of the faculty are on reduced loads for a variety of service and research activities.

3. The quality of its graduate students. Although no minimum admissions standards are specified, the average undergraduate GPA of students admitted unconditionally to the M.A. program was 3.52. In 1986-87, 107 applications were received; 63 were admitted (21 conditionally).

The average graduate GPA of entering doctoral students was 3.72. Of the 84 active graduate students, 62 have current GPAs of about 3.5; 30 have GPAs above 3.75.

A further testimony to the quality of the School is that 129 of the 449 individuals who have received advanced degrees from the program are currently serving as professors at 102 different colleges and universities throughout the U.S.

4. The quality of the graduate educational experience. The very few comments available from alumni indicate a favorable view of the program. Some alumni expressed an interest in having more "career-oriented" courses.

Among those students remaining on campus, the average time taken to complete the Ph.D. degree is three years. This timely completion record may be attributable to the three-year limit on financial support.

Approximately four students per year drop out of the graduate program. Most of them are unsupported, part-time commuting students who leave for non-academic reasons.
It is also commendable that 7.5 percent of the current graduate students are minority group members. Forty-six percent are female; 18 percent are international students. Questions have been raised within the program about the language difficulties faced by a number of international students whose verbal skills appear below those expected for a program in communication.

A sampling of current students indicated a generally positive view of the graduate program. Minor complaints concerned the size of some of the graduate classes (InCo 600, for example, had 90 students.), and the large number of students from International Studies, who had little preparation, in InCo 545 (Organizational Communication).

5. **Demand for its graduate program by students.** In light of the number of applicants and the current enrollment, demand continues to be high. The discrepancy between the School's count of 84 "active" students and the Compendium's figure of 66 is attributed to the number working on theses or dissertations who have not registered.

6. **Projected demand for its graduates outside of the university.** The very sketchy data provide no basis for assessing the demand. The School points out, though, that 129 of its graduates are professors and that "an indeterminant number" serve as administrative or staff professionals at institutions of higher learning--including three at Ohio University.

The School reports that recent doctoral graduates have found positions without difficulty.

7. **The quality of its undergraduate majors.** A 1987 survey indicated that the grade point averages of InCo majors are somewhat below the university-wide average (2.69 v. 2.71). However, only five percent have GPAs below 2.11. The recently introduced selective admissions policy for the College should contribute to an improvement in the quality of InCo students. New students must have graduated in the top half of their high school class and present ACT or SAT scores in the top one-third. Internal transfers must have a GPA of at least 2.5.

8. **The quality of the undergraduate educational experience.** Little information is available, but a 1985 survey of alumni elicited a variety of responses. Positively noted were InCo's contribution to "people management" and the courses in organizational communication.

Some alumni were concerned, however, about the program being "too vague and general" and lacking in a "concrete idea of what [the] major really is." Such a broad program, according to some, did not seem to prepare or train students for a specific career.

9. **Demand for the undergraduate major by students.** Demand remains high, with undergraduate majors averaging about 260 per quarter over the last three years. The high demand is reflected in the student/faculty and TA ratio of 29.3. Recent enrollment and application data reinforce the trend toward increased demand.
10. **Projected demand for its undergraduates.** A survey of 1981-85 BSC graduates provided some very sketchy data on employment trends. Over 50 percent of those responding were in some form of private business position (sales, advertising, public relations and management). Fourteen percent were in human resources and organizational development.

The School contends that it is difficult to assess the future demand for its graduates since its curriculum is so broad and thus not linked to any particular profession. Instead, the program hopes to enhance "the student's ability to adapt our training to the practical demands of the workplace."

11. **Demand for the undergraduate program by non-majors.** The demand by non-majors is primarily in the introductory public speaking class, InCo 103, which enrolls 2300 students per year. Certain other skills courses also attract students from outside:

Forty percent of the enrollment in InCo 234 (Communication Theory) and 245 (Organization Communication), and 404 (Interviewing Techniques) is from outside the school, although largely from within the College. Inco 205 (Group Discussion) and 206 (Interpersonal Discussion) attract students from outside the College.

12. **Advantages in relation to other institutions.** The curriculum and approach of the program are typical of those at other comparable institutions. Other Ph.D. programs in communication are offered by Ohio State, Kent State and Bowling Green State universities in Ohio. In comparing those programs:

a. OU's undergraduate program offers more courses and tracks than the programs at Bowling Green and Ohio State, and is similar to the one at Kent State.

b. OU's graduate program offers more options than those at the other Ohio institutions.

c. OU has the only interpersonal communication/speech and rhetoric program affiliated with a college of communication. As a result, InCo sees itself as having a higher profile than it would have if it were part of a college of fine arts (as at Kent State), or social and behavioral sciences (as at Bowling Green) or arts and sciences (as at Ohio State).

13. **Quality of its library holdings.** The library acquisitions budget has increased over five years from $3,500 to $12,900. The program draws on collections in a number of fields and considers the library holdings as adequate.

14. **Quality of its facilities and equipment.** Space problems of the past are being alleviated by the pending move to Lasher Hall. The School could, though, use extra space for human interaction laboratories. Equipment is adequate to meet the School's needs. All Group I and II faculty have computers and extensive video equipment is available.
15. **Quality of its honors program.** From 1980 to 1987, twelve Honors Tutorial students have enrolled in InCo. Five have completed their degrees; only one has withdrawn. The quality of these students is uniformly high and all graduates have gone on to either law school or to graduate study.

Only eight of the School's faculty participate in the Tutorial program, although plans are to increase this number. Honors students are encouraged to participate in forensic activities and conferences, and a number have delivered papers at professional meetings.

16. **Quality of its offerings through workshops, independent study and experiential learning.** Approximately four workshops per year have been offered over the past five years. Degree credit is permitted, with some restrictions.

No data were available for a five-year picture of the School's participation in Experiential Learning, but in 1986-87, 16 projects were assessed, most (7) for InCo 103. This is regarded as a typical year. The School does not view these numbers as excessive, given the number of credit hours taught. The Experiential Learning office regards the number of cases as above-average for a program this size, but notes that many of InCo's courses are well-suited for experiential credit.

17. **Quality of its programs on regional campuses.** InCo 103 is the most frequently offered InCo course at the regional campuses (18 of the 24 offerings in 1986-87). Only four of the 24 courses were taught by Athens campus faculty; the remainder were taught by branch campus and "ad hoc" faculty. The School is satisfied that the courses are consistent with those on campus. No data to the contrary were available.

The School also administers an innovative series of summer workshops for teachers and professionals on the regional campuses.
### FALL HEADCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRESHMEN</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPHOMORE</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRAD TOTAL</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORAL</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE TOTAL</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANNUAL DEGREES AWARDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BACCALAUREATE</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORATE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TEACHING FACULTY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TENURED</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-TENURED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENured (Non-Tenured)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLY RETIREES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT TENURED</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUDGETED FTE STAFFING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>15.26</td>
<td>15.26</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD. ASSISTANTS</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIL SERVICE</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Description of Program

The primary mission of the Department of Mechanical Engineering is to prepare students for careers in machine design as well as energy and power systems design. Thus, the required technical preparation is far reaching. In the undergraduate curriculum, the concentration is on providing the broad background required. The undergraduate program leads to a bachelor of science degree in mechanical engineering. Graduate students specialize in thermal/fluids/energy engineering, mechanical design, materials processing for manufacturing, computer-aided design or computer control of machines and processes. The department offers a master of science degree in mechanical engineering.

The faculty consists of eight full-time members, one early retiree, and two adjunct faculty members. During the past five years one faculty member resigned, and one took early retirement. Over the same period, three faculty members were added--two new faculty and one to replace the resignation. In any given quarter there are about 180 undergraduates and 50+ graduate students in full-time status.

The courses offered by the Department of Mechanical Engineering serve its own majors. However, there are two service courses, one of which is taken by all engineering majors [Thermodynamics] and the other [Dynamics] is taken by students in two other engineering departments. A Tier II course, ET 280 and a Tier III course are also available. A member of the mechanical engineering faculty teaches two courses in computer methods in engineering. These courses are taken by all engineering students. In addition, the department offers courses in manufacturing engineering, a new interdisciplinary specialty, which draws on all engineering disciplines.

In October 1986 the Department of Mechanical Engineering, along with all other departments in the College of Engineering, was reviewed by the Accreditation Board of Engineering and Technology (ABET). The undergraduate Mechanical Engineering Program has been fully and continuously accredited by ABET since 1951. The latest review reaffirmed this accreditation.
B. Strengths of the Program

a. There has been much increase in the demand for the graduate program.

b. Faculty who have been recruited and hired have placed a greater emphasis on the graduate program.

c. The size of the faculty has actually increased.

d. In the last review cycle, the UCC recommended that the department continue its efforts to strengthen its graduate faculty. This has been achieved.

e. The new Stocker Center is well equipped, modern and has excellent physical facilities for instruction.

f. During the 1987-88 academic year, the faculty have received $660,000 in externally sponsored research contracts.

C. Weaknesses

a. There is no formal mechanism for gathering information about students who graduate from the program.

b. Library holdings of technical publications are not sufficient. While the department makes use of interlibrary loan, however, the service is not adequate in meeting student and faculty needs.

c. Finding suitable space to conduct research is a problem for the faculty. The operation of heavy presses creates a major noise problem.

D. Recommendations

1. Mechanical engineering is one of the stable engineering disciplines and the department should be encouraged to make students more aware of the opportunities available for those who are entering the profession. There should be a process for follow-up of graduates of the program.

2. Space for research is constrained. The department should be supported in its efforts to find alternative locations for conducting research. This is particularly important since the influx of new faculty has brought about a shift of interest towards more research.

3. With an increasing emphasis on the graduate program, graduate
stipends should be enhanced to a level comparable to those offered by other institutions.

4. The department should continue to pursue funding for computer aided design as an essential component of its programs.
5. The library budget be enhanced for the Department of Mechanical Engineering.
6. No further review is needed until the next review cycle.

E. Review Topics

1. The quality of the scholarship and creative activity of its faculty.

Faculty in this department are judged by the extent of activity in (1) professional engineering activity such as consulting or work with industry or government agencies; (2) research; (3) papers, books, research proposals; and (4) development of new resources and techniques in engineering education.

Five faculty members are regarded to be very active professionally, based on present research activities, proposal preparation and publications. Three faculty members are considered to be moderately active professionally based on participation in sponsored research, consulting and development of educational resources.

2. The quality of the teaching of its faculty.

All courses and instructors are evaluated by the students each quarter. These results are considered in promotion, tenure, and merit pay. Student evaluations constitute one component of the teaching evaluations. Other components include the quality of the course material, thorough presentation of the material, rigorous assignments and testing, and general effectiveness of the course as evidenced by the student's preparation for subsequent courses.

Composite results of the spring quarter, 1987, student evaluations for the entire Mechanical Engineering department reveal an aggregate means of 3.00 on a 1.00 to 4.00 scale.

3. The quality of its graduate students.

The department reports that the average GPA for entering graduate students is 3.00. The thirteen American graduate students currently enrolled in the program have a 3.28 GPA. International graduate students have comparable grade point averages.
4. The quality of its graduate educational experience.

The average length of time required to complete the MS degree is six quarters. Some students complete the degree in four quarters. When compared with similar programs at other institutions, these figures are comparable. The following statistical information shows the enrollment and numbers of students graduating from the program over the last five years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Total enrollment/ US students</th>
<th>Total graduated/ US students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83-84</td>
<td></td>
<td>13/1</td>
<td>2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-85</td>
<td></td>
<td>16/1</td>
<td>7/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-86</td>
<td></td>
<td>19/6</td>
<td>4/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-87</td>
<td></td>
<td>47/11</td>
<td>6/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-88</td>
<td></td>
<td>53/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Demand for its graduate program by students.

The demand for the graduate program has shown a marked increase over the past few years. Accordingly, the number of graduate students has more than doubled. It is important to note that the demand for mechanical engineers in industry is relatively constant; however such demand is strongly tied to manufacturing productivity and government spending on technical programs.

The department has a high percentage of international students enrolled in its graduate program. Many of these students return to their native countries. The department has indicated that approximately 50% of the graduates pursue a Ph.D. degree and 50% enter the engineering profession. The department does not have exact figures on employment rates and placement of its graduate students.

6. Projected demand for its graduates outside the university.

Nearly all of the graduates from mechanical engineering enter the engineering profession or go on to graduate school. This is true for undergraduates as well. There is considerable demand for mechanical engineers owing in large part to the importance of the state of manufacturing in the United States.

7. The quality of its undergraduate majors.

The average ACT scores of 33 fall quarter freshmen is 23. The average SAT scores of a group of 10 freshmen is 1013. These scores reflect the average quality of undergraduates in the College of Engineering and Technology since the entrance requirements are the same for all disciplines. Undergraduate students in Mechanical Engineering are typically in the upper half of their high school graduating class after taking a full
complement of math, science and English courses. The average GPA of students in Mechanical Engineering is 2.82.

8. The quality of its undergraduate educational experience.

Of the thirty-one students who graduated during 1986-87 (including 2 women and 5 international students), it is known that six of the students entered graduate school. The department does not have complete data regarding placement of its undergraduate students. However, the faculty have had personal contact with former graduates who indicate that they were satisfied with the quality of the undergraduate experience and feel well prepared. Further, the students state that they compare favorably with their peers from large, well-known engineering schools. The following statistical information shows the enrollment and numbers of undergraduate students graduating from the program over the last five years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>83-84</th>
<th>84-85</th>
<th>85-86</th>
<th>86-87</th>
<th>87-88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>enrollment</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduated</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women/graduated</td>
<td>9/2</td>
<td>9/0</td>
<td>14/1</td>
<td>10/2</td>
<td>13/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internatn'l/grad.</td>
<td>50/5</td>
<td>39/10</td>
<td>21/12</td>
<td>17/5</td>
<td>13/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black/grad.</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>4/1</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The demand for its undergraduate major by students.

There are 172 students currently enrolled in the Department of Mechanical Engineering. An analysis of enrollment figures over the past five years shows that this is a fairly consistent average enrollment figure. The department enrollment decreased to 156 students in 1985-86.


A thriving manufacturing industry insures a strong demand for mechanical engineers. This demand is likely to remain stable in the future.

11. The present demand for its undergraduate program by non-majors.

Department faculty are engaged in teaching courses in Tiers II and III. In addition there are service courses designed for majors in other engineering disciplines. For the most part, there
is not a great demand for mechanical engineering courses by non-
majors.

12. Advantages in relation to other institutions.

The quality of the faculty gives the department a distinct advantage. The new Stocker Center provides the department with a tremendous advantage in attracting students to the program. In addition, the department enjoys an advantage compared to other institutions in that it is the only mechanical engineering program that is not in a large city environment. Transfer students in particular note the environment at Ohio University allows for greater interaction among faculty and students than is possible at large urban universities.

13. The quality of its library holdings.

There are several journals for which the faculty have indicated a need. Students do have adequate resources in the library in order to conduct their research.

14. The quality of its facilities and equipment.

Stocker Center provides updated physical facilities for the department. Recent house bills and the College of Engineering Fund Drive, Project '85, have given the program much needed new instructional equipment. The greatest concern now is finding a solution for maintenance and general upkeep of the equipment. In addition, there is a concern for maintenance and replacement of computer hardware and software. As computer aided design becomes increasingly important for engineering students, the department is interested in gaining the necessary funding to support the program.

15. The quality of its honors program.

Mechanical Engineering does not have an honors program.

16. The quality of its offerings through workshops, independent study or experiential learning.

One faculty member does an occasional correspondence course. However, this is a rare occurrence. There have been minimal credits given in experiential learning. The department has not been involved in workshop offerings recently.

17. The quality of its program on regional campuses.

There are no courses taught on regional campuses.
DATA FROM THE HISTORICAL COMPENDIUM

The attached information is from the Historical Compendium showing enrollment trends, staffing, majors and degrees granted. The information is taken from items 1, 2, 3, 9, and 11 of the Compendium.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. FALL HEADCOUNTS BY MAJOR:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>65 MECH. ENG.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESHMAN</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPHOMORE</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRAD</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. ANNUAL DEGREES AWARDED:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACCALAUREATE</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COURSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. FALL STUDENT CREDIT HOURS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-TOTAL</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ET48</strong></td>
<td>258</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-TOTAL</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME</strong></td>
<td>929</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-TOTAL</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>1442</td>
<td>1337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. TEACHING FACULTY:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUED:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT TENURED</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. BUDGETED FTE STAFFING:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD. ASSISTANTS</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIL SERVICE</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>10.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohio University Curriculum Council
Five-Year Review
Department of Philosophy
Spring 1988

A. Description of Program

Within the College of Arts and Sciences, the Department of Philosophy offers an undergraduate program leading to the A.B. degree and a graduate program leading to the M.A. degree. During the past five years, the Department has averaged twenty undergraduate and fifteen graduate majors each year. For students whose major field of study is related to a specific area in philosophy, minors are designated in esthetics, logic, philosophy of science, religion, social and political theory, ethics, and history of philosophy.

B. Strengths of the Program

The Department has a group of dedicated faculty who are accessible to students, responsive to changing needs of the University, and highly active in scholarly endeavors. In addition, the Department's methodology for developing the instructional skills of its graduate assistants is innovative and effective.

C. Weaknesses

The Department does not have a logician to teach upper level and graduate courses in logic. Reliable evaluation information from alumni is not available because the Department has not formally surveyed alumni.

D. Recommendations

1. Working closely with the Dean's Office, the Department should endeavor to identify resources to recruit a logician to teach the upper level logic courses.

2. The Department should periodically survey graduates to assess the quality of their learning experiences.

3. There is no need for further review until the next review cycle.
Review Topics

1. The quality of the scholarship and creative activity of the faculty. The Department annually evaluates the scholarly activity of the faculty on the basis of the number and quality of published books and journal articles and the number and quality of papers read at conferences. All ten fulltime members of the Philosophy Department are involved in scholarly activity, with eight considered highly active and two considered moderately active. Within the past two years, faculty in the Department have published an impressive number of books (7), have seven books under contract, and have published forty-three journal articles.

   In contrast, the 1983 UCC Review indicated that only three of the faculty could be considered highly active (2-3 quality works per year) while six could be ranked moderately active (one quality publication or paper per year).

2. The quality of the teaching of its faculty. The normal teaching load in Philosophy is two courses per quarter, and each faculty member assumes responsibility as needed for independent studies, tutorials, and thesis and dissertation advising.

   Every quarter every Philosophy course is evaluated by students enrolled using a questionnaire provided by the College of Arts and Sciences. The results of these evaluations are used by the Department in making decisions relating to promotion, tenure, and annual merit raises. An analysis of a sample of student responses indicates that students generally rate Philosophy instructors and courses positively with most means falling in the range of 3.5 to 4.6 on a 5-point continuum.

   In addition to the quantitative data from student responses, the Department routinely analyzes the following items in evaluating a colleague's teaching performance: restructuring of existing courses, innovative pedagogical techniques, quarters during which an overload was taught, special studies directed, honors tutorial students directed, and thesis and dissertation advising.

   The Department takes pride in the quality of its teaching and notes that three of its members have been named "University Professor."

3. The quality of its graduate students. To be admitted to the Master of Arts degree program in Philosophy, students must have received a minimum of a 3.0 GPA in at least 27 quarter hours of undergraduate course work in philosophy and a 2.5 GPA in all undergraduate courses.
Since 1983, 47 students have been enrolled in the Master's program. Thirty-one have attained a GPA of 3.5 or above, fourteen a GPA of 3.0-3.49, and two have a cumulative GPA of less than 3.0.

4. The Quality of its graduate education experience. Eight graduate students were interviewed. The consensus was that the primary program strength was a very dedicated and accessible faculty. For those who were currently teaching, the Department's methodology for developing instructional skills was a very positive factor. Each week throughout the academic year the graduate assistants attend a two hour Supervised Teaching Seminar conducted either by the Department Chair, Assistant Chair, or Logic Coordinator. The seminar focuses on (1) university regulations related to teaching, (2) course construction, (3) methods of evaluation, (4) learning styles, (5) philosophy of education, and (6) classroom techniques and strategies. In addition, each teaching assistant is video taped while teaching and reviews his/her performance with a faculty supervisor.

The graduate students noted two problem areas. The Department does not have a logician, a factor which they believe could lead to difficulties as they pursue a doctoral degree. Additionally, because of retirement and early retirement of several faculty over the past few years (compounded by the small number of fulltime faculty), the graduate students have found it somewhat difficult to establish and maintain thesis committees.

Reliable evaluation data from alumni are not available because the Department has not formally surveyed them (although it was noted in the 1983 UCC Report that such survey data would be helpful to the Department).

5. Demand for its graduate program by students. Based on Compendium data, the graduate enrollment has fluctuated from a low of 6 graduate students in Fall of 1981 to a high of 19 in Fall 1985. With the graduation of a large number in June 1986 (12), the graduate population decreased to 11 in Fall 1986 and 13 in 1987.

Departmental records indicate that approximately 10% more students apply for the graduate program than are admitted.

6. Projected demand for its graduate students outside the university. Although no formal means of communication with graduates of the program exists, faculty have maintained contact with several. Five are teaching, eleven are enrolled in doctoral programs, one has an academic administration position, and one works in security.
7. The quality of its undergraduate majors. During the past five years, the number of undergraduate majors in philosophy has shown a modest increase from twelve students in Fall 1983 to twenty-two students in Fall 1987.

The Director of Institutional Research has supplied the following ACT, SAT, high school rank, and GPA information for all undergraduate philosophy majors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT COMP</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td>19.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT VERBAL</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT MATH</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS RANK</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU GPA</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department points out that there are no additional admissions standards for acceptance as a Philosophy major and that any student admitted to Ohio University may, therefore, major in Philosophy.

One can observe from the data presented above that as Ohio University's admission standards have increased over time, the philosophy majors have lower standardized test scores and are lower in class rank when compared to the cohort of earlier years.

8. The quality of its undergraduate educational experience. The Department has surveyed neither its graduates nor employers. A small sample of undergraduate students indicated that quality of instruction was high and that the faculty members were very accessible and helpful.

The Department has been very flexible in meeting the changing needs of the University and the students. Faculty have created numerous Tier III courses and have established interdisciplinary relationships with the Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine, Engineering, and Education.

9. Demand for its undergraduate major by students. As noted above (under item 7), the number of undergraduate majors is small in comparison to most other departments and schools in the University, but there has been a modest increase in majors over the past five years. The undergraduate students who were interviewed also speculated that more students would be attracted to philosophy as a major if significant specialty areas were more thoroughly developed and marketed (e.g. pre-law, medical ethics, philosophy of science).
10. Projected demand for its undergraduates. Philosophy majors do not have a clearly defined career track to pursue after graduation, unless they plan to enroll in graduate studies leading to position as a teacher of philosophy. According to the American Philosophical Association, philosophy graduates are now successfully pursuing careers in business (advertising, hotel management, investment banking, marketing, publishing, real estate, technical writing), government, journalism, law, and medicine.

In the absence of information gained from formal communication with their graduates as well as other factors, the Department has not projected future demand for its graduates.

11. The present demand for its undergraduate program by non-majors. Even though the Department of Philosophy has averaged 20 undergraduate and 15 graduate majors over the past five years, it has still produced an average of 30,293 weighted student credit hours each year (and therefore generates more WSCH per FTE faculty member than most academic units in the University). From this information, it is obvious that the Department teaches far more non-majors than majors. Philosophy 120 satisfies a Tier I requirement and is a requirement for all Journalism majors. It therefore continues to be a course in high demand (8 sections per quarter with an average section size of 50). In addition, the faculty have created 7 Tier III courses several of which have also experienced high student demand.

12. Advantages in relation to other institutions. There are no apparent advantages.

13. The Quality of its library holdings.

With a very limited library allocation, the Department has not been able to secure the necessary foundational works in religion studies. An increase in the library budget of 38.4% for 1987-1988 has been very helpful but still does not adequately address the problem.

14. The quality of its facilities and equipment. The Philosophy Department is housed primarily on the third floor of Gordy Hall with several GA offices located on the second floor. During the summer of 1987, some of the Department's physical facilities were remodeled. As a result, the Department is generally very pleased with its facilities.

With regard to equipment, with the Department's recent involvement in offering the introductory logic course by computer, the number of PC's in the laboratory will need to be increased.
15. **The quality of its honors program.** Honors College personnel indicate that the Philosophy Honors Tutorial Program is small but of very high quality. One strength is the weekly group practicum which is supervised by a faculty member. Activities at these sessions include invited presentations by faculty on topics of interest to the students: presentations by the students themselves; and discussions with distinguished visiting philosophers.

An analysis of the GPA's of the fourteen students who have been enrolled in the program during the past five years indicates a mean GPA in excess of 3.6. All who have graduated are either attending graduate school, employed, or in the military service.

16. **The quality of its offerings through workshops, independent study, or experiential learning.** Information from the Office of Continuing Education indicates: a) that the workshops conducted by the faculty of the Department are of high quality and are well received by the participants; and b) that the independent study guides are well written and there is substantial enrollment in the courses.

The Department does not offer credit for experiential learning.

17. **The quality of its programs on regional campuses.** Three regional campuses—Belmont, Lancaster, and Zanesville—each have one full-time faculty member in Philosophy. Four Athens-based faculty also travel to regional campus sites to teach courses. Information from a sampling of regional deans, the Vice Provost, and faculty indicates that the Philosophy courses taught on the regional campuses are of high quality. In fact, on the Zanesville campus, the Philosophy professor is one of the few full professors in the regional campus system and consistently is among the five most highly rated faculty members on the campus.
F. Data From the Historical Compendium

UCC PROGRAM REVIEW INFORMATION

PHILOSOPHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FALL HEADCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRAD TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANNUAL DEGREES AWARDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Master of Social Sciences is an interdisciplinary degree directed by a coordinator who is appointed by the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The coordinator supervises the policies which guide the program and coordinates such matters as admission, the assigning of advisors within the social science departments, and the selection of a committee for the terminal oral examination.

The major, minor and auxiliary areas are chosen from among the following social sciences: history, political science, economics, sociology/anthropology and geography. Other subjects, such as psychology and social work, may be approved as minor or auxiliary areas. Ten graduate courses and at least 45 credit hours are required for completion of the degree.

The target audience for this graduate degree is public school teachers though candidates from other occupations are admitted to the program. The degree program is designed for graduate students whose profession invites the study of two or more subjects within the social sciences.

B. PROGRAM STRENGTHS

Ohio University's Master of Social Science degree is the only one of its kind approved by the Board of Regents for the state of Ohio.

The degree is interdisciplinary so it encourages cooperation of students and faculty across departmental lines.

The program is flexible to allow teachers and other professionals to earn the degree.

The program is growing rapidly on the Lancaster campus (29 students).

C. PROGRAM WEAKNESSES

The Master of Social Science program offers no financial aid for students starting their graduate work.
The program appears to have a paucity of information about itself.

The breadth of the program can lead to a lack of focus or direction.

The program does use GPA but does not use GRE or other standard measures to assess admissions.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS

The coordinator of the program should survey graduates of the program concerning their satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the program.

The program should consider using GRE scores or other standard measures and a higher GPA standard for admission to graduate work.

The program needs to maintain more complete records and information.

The program should be subjected to a full five year review again in academic year 1990-91.

E. REVIEW TOPICS

1. QUALITY OF THE SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY OF THE FACULTY.

Each teacher in the program must be a member of the graduate faculty of the social science department offering the course. That department, subject to the approval of the Ohio University graduate council, determines the faculty member fitness to teach a graduate course.

2. QUALITY OF THE TEACHING.

The program has no faculty of its own. Faculty are evaluated by their respective departments. The large number of faculty and courses in this program precludes course and instructor evaluations for everyone who participates. However additional information about course and teacher evaluation could be attained by examining more closely the regional campus program at Lancaster which has more students and fewer courses than does the Athens campus program.

3. QUALITY OF ITS GRADUATE STUDENTS.

According to the coordinator of the program GPA, work experience, and letters of reference are used to evaluate candidates. All candidates must have been employed for at least one year in a related area. Most students have above a 2.75, but occasionally a graduate student with a lower GPA is admitted conditionally. These conditional admissions are usually grade school teachers who have taught social science in elementary schools.
Ten of the first twenty-five students admitted to the program did not complete the program.

4. QUALITY OF GRADUATE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE.

Graduate students usually take three years to complete the program because they are earning the degree while practicing their profession. The students take one course per quarter and summer school courses.

No surveys have been completed concerning graduate student satisfaction with the program.

5. DEMAND FOR ITS GRADUATE PROGRAM BY STUDENTS

As of Fall 1987 fifteen students had completed the Master of Social Sciences degree.

The coordinator of the program reports that new state standards for teachers has escalated demand for content courses. For instance, twenty-nine new students enrolled for the MSS program offered through the Lancaster campus. At least one other regional campus has expressed interest in adopting the program for teachers.

Demand appears to be light to moderate but growing.

6. PROJECTED DEMAND FOR GRADUATES OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITY

Nearly all students who earn the MSS degree are already gainfully employed as teachers in elementary or secondary schools. Normally these graduate students are not on the job market when they graduate.

As long as the state continues to expect elementary and secondary teachers to pursue professional development, the MSS program will experience demand for the degree from teachers.

7-11 refer only to undergraduate programs.

12. ADVANTAGES IN RELATION TO OTHER UNIVERSITIES

No other university in Ohio offers the degree. The nearest providers are the University of Illinois and Eastern Michigan University which offer similar programs.

13. QUALITY OF LIBRARY HOLDINGS

Library holdings are satisfactory. The regional campuses have access to library holdings on the Athens campus.

14. QUALITY OF ITS FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

This program does not demand special facilities or equipment.
15. QUALITY OF ITS HONORS PROGRAM

NA

16. QUALITY OF ITS OFFERINGS THROUGH WORKSHOPS, INDEPENDENT STUDY AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING.

NA

17. QUALITY OF ITS PROGRAMS ON REGIONAL CAMPUSES

Although a version of this program is offered through the Lancaster campus, it is taught by Athens campus graduate faculty and the courses offered are regular Ohio University graduate courses.
A. Description of Program

Within the College of Fine Arts, the School of Theater specializes in training undergraduates and graduates in both performance and production areas of professional theater work. Undergraduate degrees include the BFA in Performance, Production, Design and Technology; and Theater Arts and Drama. Graduate work in theater training can lead to the terminal degree of MFA in Acting, Directing, Production, Design and Technology, and Playwriting. There is, in addition, an academically-oriented MA offered in Theater History and Criticism based on scholarly research and criticism of theater and drama.

The faculty consists of 13 full-time members and two early retirees who teach full-time in Fall and Winter Quarters—down from 14 full-time at the last Five Year Review.

Courses offered by the School of Theater are primarily for majors, and 90% of the faculty primary instruction goes to BFA and MFA candidates within the program. The Curriculum Council in November of 1987 did approve the School's proposal to eliminate or modify prerequisites for six courses in order to open them to more students outside the School of Theater. Thus, there are currently 7 courses offered to non-majors. A three quarter sequential course is taught to Broadcasting majors. Theater School faculty are also involved in three Tier III courses. One aspect of the Theater School's curriculum that differs from most parts of the university is in the production of plays for the entire community as on-the-job training for its students. These minimum of five "main-stage" plays produced during the year are the core of the theater graduate students' training program. An additional 20 some "laboratory shows" are produced for limited audiences. These provide experience primarily for undergraduate majors who also work on crews behind the scenes on the "main-stage" plays. The acting roles in main-stage plays are primarily open only to graduate students and a few undergraduate upper-classmen.

B. Strengths of the Program:

Students are involved in live theater through the minimum of five main-stage plays produced each academic year. These generally high quality presentations are also a major cultural resource provided for the university.
community as a whole and the region. An outreach program takes theater appreciation to the Athens school system with study guides and discussion of those plays in production.

Both undergraduates and graduates appreciate the positive atmosphere that has come from the relatively small number of majors and a core of faculty devoted to teaching. The allocation of budget for numerous visiting artists provides students with regular access to outside expertise through production artists from nationally known theaters.

Students also noted the excellent support from the School of Theater in placement into required outside internships and publicity as to opportunities for auditions in regional and national theaters. An expanding network is seen as contributing to career entry for graduates.

C. Weaknesses

The historical data shows a steady decline in majors which follows the national trend in demand for theater degrees. The shrinking numbers results in insufficient numbers of students available to produce a performance so that a student may be involved not only in time consuming rehearsals but in work on the crew behind the scenes as well. One positive result of the numerical decline has been the drop in the student: faculty ratio from 15+ to 10:1 in 1987, which could be considered beneficial in a program which requires much demonstration of skills and hands-on direction of many projects. A new director of the School of Theater has instituted a number of approaches which may halt the decline on both undergraduate and graduate levels. Projections available indicate that the recent efforts will pay off with an increase to 56 incoming graduate students in fall of 1988, up nearly 25% from 44 in fall 1987. Supported well by the Dean of the College of Fine Arts, the director is expanding O.U. contacts in the tri-state area which should attract the attention of drama-oriented young people to a growing theater program here. She has also recruited faculty that are highly respected by students.

Another weakness is in the partial dependency of play production financing on ticket and subscription sales. Although the plays are the core of the curriculum, these expensive productions are currently not fully covered by the allocation from the College of Fine Arts and the university. Only two thirds of the production costs, including royalties for use of plays and music, can be funded, resulting often in significant restriction in the scale of the productions. Even at that minimal level of production, due to the dependence on ticket sales, the price of student tickets discourages student support for the plays. Relatively few students outside the school attend theater performances.

Inability to mount large-scale productions reduces important training opportunities, especially for undergraduate majors. Even laboratory shows, which feature
undergraduates in small-scale settings that provide their major form of experience in acting and production, are generally inadequately funded. Limited resources are generally concentrated on main-stage plays in which primarily graduate students perform. The general insufficiency of space cited in the last five year review will remain, a major complaint within the school despite the recent approval for a $4.9 million renovation effort on Kantner Hall.

D. Recommendations

1. The School should continue its efforts to add to the space available for the support shops required for play production.

2. Funding should be sought to meet the need for adequate equipment and production materials.

3. The School should continue to seek solutions to the high state of dependency of the Theater School on ticket sales to complement internal funding for high quality productions that are primary to the educational curriculum.

4. Closer attention needs to be given to undergraduate education. The laboratory productions (Lab Shows) so basic to undergraduate theater education require increased support for adequate production materials and necessary equipment.

5. Although the School does have a considerable informal network of feedback from graduates through its newsletter, it should plan for a more comprehensive polling of its graduates as to the demand for their degrees and their entry into theater related careers.

6. There is no need for further review until the next review cycle.

E. Review Topics

1. The quality of the scholarship and creative activity of its faculty.
As criteria, the school director considered: 1) invitations to teach or perform at other universities, 2) performances in professional theaters, 3) exhibitions of designs by those in the production end of theater, 4) invitations to produce papers, master classes, workshops, and act as judges. Of 13 full-time faculty, six are highly active as directors, actors, designers, and dramaturgs in professional theaters in the region, and in New York and on the West Coast. Six of the faculty are rated as moderately active through participation as workshop leaders, consultants to community dramatic groups, and as leaders in organizations.
2. The quality of the teaching of its faculty. The school does use student evaluations for each course as well as peer evaluation and class visitations. On the ratings for 1986 the faculty mean ratings were in the range of 1.05 to 2.4 where 1 indicates that the student strongly agreed that the teacher was effective, 2 indicating that the student agreed that the teacher was effective, and 5 indicates strong disagreement. Eleven of the faculty were between 1 and 2 and six had ratings from 2 to 2.4 which may be interpreted as showing that all the faculty were at least rated as effective by most of their students, and that the majority were rated as highly effective. Interviews with undergraduates corroborate the view that the newly added faculty members are especially appreciated for their expertise and their enthusiasm with undergraduates.

3. The quality of its graduate students. GRE scores were not available for students in the school, but the average GPA for entering graduate students was 3.2. The grades attained on the graduate level are high, witness the average GPA of 3.687 ranging from 3.788 in Directing down to 3.463 in interdisciplinary studies for theater majors.

4. The quality of its graduate educational experience. The sample response provided from graduates indicates that while they were satisfied they were relieved that major changes in leadership and direction had taken place recently. The director indicated that responses from recent graduates had been lost during the transition in administration. The newsletter for Theater School graduates: The Ohio Network published November, 1987, was directed to and for graduates with considerable space devoted to their letters which were invariably positive. The newsletter responses corroborate the school's conclusion that the graduates "regard their training highly, particularly with respect to preparing them for the realities of the profession." During the past summer, "almost all" graduate students found relevant employment in a variety of professional summer theaters, such as the Monomoy Theater on Cape Cod which is affiliated with O.U.'s School of Theater.

5. Demand for its graduate program by students. There has been a declining graduate enrollment pattern in the fall quarters since the last 5-year Review: with 66 in 1983 down to 60 in 1986, and then a rather precipitous drop to 44 for the fall of 1987. The new director's efforts at establishing a wider network for recruitment and the offer of the off-campus internships is apparently beginning to show results. The projections for the fall of 1988 based on acceptances are higher than enrollments in recent years. If some of the prospective candidates enroll the increase will be over 25%. Although five graduate students dropped out of the program in the class of 1986 for reasons which included dissatisfaction, this number dropped to three for the class.

6. Projected demand for its graduates outside the university. Although theater related professions are nationally limited due to a plentiful supply of would-be professionals, the School concludes based on regular contact between graduates and its faculty that the percentage of O.U. graduates who remain in, and advance in their chosen fields in theater has been well above the national average. Although there is no formal polling, the response via letters, the grapevine, and letters to the newsletter editor indicate that the demand has been significantly high over the past five years and should rise as the current reforms are implemented.

7. The quality of its undergraduate majors. Since 1983 the School has instituted an audition/ interview procedure for the admission of candidates and is convinced that the quality has risen and that there is a more homogenous pool of talent with adequate prior preparation. There is a restriction placed on the number of students admitted to each of the specializations. The ACT scores of undergraduates for the past 5 years have risen modestly from 19.65 to 20.51 as has their average high school rank moved up from 57% to 60%.

8. The quality of its undergraduate educational experience. The response of graduates through the media of correspondence, contacts with faculty, and in response to the alumni newsletter The Ohio Network, has been favorable. There is no formal polling of alumni through questionnaires. The students interviewed were generally satisfied with coursework except in the area of opportunities for freshmen and sophomore acting majors in "main stage plays".

9. Demand for its undergraduate major by students. The School of Theater has experienced a steady decline of undergraduate majors from 109 in 1983 to 70 in 1987, which is nearly a one third reduction. FTE students numbering 166 in Fall of 1987, contrasts with the 223 FTE students listed for 1983. The 70 undergraduates on the Fall 1987 headcount of majors, was down from 109 in 1983. The Dean states that this is in line with the demand for degrees in the Fine Arts nationally, and that this slide has apparently reached the nadir and demand is recovering, which may be observable in the projection for the fall of 1988.

10. Projected demand for its undergraduates. The informal alumni network which includes the readers of the newsletter, respond that graduates are working in practically every aspect of the profession. They are primarily involved in regional theater rather than in Manhattan and Los Angeles. They generally test the professional market upon graduation
through jobs in theater combined with temporary "survival" jobs until they either gain internships, full-time jobs, or go on to graduate schools once they have defined their training goals. Fewer students enter graduate schools immediately: one did in 1986 and three in 1987.

11. The present demand for its undergraduate program by non-majors. There are seven courses designed for non-majors such as students from telecommunications, film, photography, communications, and the interdisciplinary fine-arts program. Acting courses are specifically aimed at lower-division non-majors. Broadcasting majors take a three-quarter sequence of courses. Non-major enrollments average 215 each quarter plus several enrolled in Practicum. ThAr 110Y for non-majors enrolled 16 students in each of seven sections in the Spring Quarter 1988, with 30-40 on a waiting list. This enrollment has been steady during the prior two quarters. There were 48 non-majors in ThAr 210Y, 16 in ThAr 211Y, from 10-20 in ThAr 218 A, B, & C; an average of 15 in each quarter of ThAr 101, 102, and 103; and 20-25 in ThAr 130, 131, and 132.

12. Its advantages in relation to other institutions. The School offers unusual opportunities both to undergraduate and graduate students for internships at major British and American theaters. Through the University Resident Theater Association and National Association of Schools of Theater it is known that less than half of comparable schools have required internships, and very few have a mandatory quarter of internships in a major British theater. The director considers the graduate internships to be the most effective recruiting means in use.

In comparison with other schools of theater, the visiting artist program is uncommon in that it provides valuable contact between students and artists from major theaters with specific production skills. These production artists make up the majority of the visitors, 18 during 1987-88, which work directly with students rather than performing before an audience. The director has gained support through the Provost Pool that will also allow the School to implement The New Theatre Ensemble, an innovative workshop that will bring in professional guest directors and writers for the Summer of 1988.

13. The quality of its library holdings. The annual budget of $9,400 is supplemented by acquisitions by the English Department of books on Shakespeare, English, and oriental drama. Theater acquisitions focus on books dealing with play production, post-1900 plays, and translations of dramas. Students indicate that most of their reading is in the form of textbooks which they purchase but that when they do need works from the library its collection is adequate. The School hopes to improve deficient areas including set
design, foreign-language design books and scripts. Most frequently used scripts require the purchase of additional copies. The school plans to expand a collection of videotapes of dramatic productions in a wide range of theaters.

14. The quality of its facilities and equipment. There is a continuing frustration among the faculty and administration of the school over the inadequacies of the support shops (for crafts, scenery, props, and costumes) and storage spaces in Kantner Hall. Space for classes rented on Court Street are seen as quaint but barely adequate. There have been cases where professionals who were recruited to come here to teach turned down the offer when they saw the spaces and materials available for production work. The grant of $4.9 million for renovation will only begin to meet the space problem. Much of the grant will go into making the building accessible to the handicapped through an elevator and ramps. Of the many needs in the various production shops, it is likely that only those of the scenery shop may be met with the current funding. Audience and actor comfort will also have to wait later efforts. There remains the need for more portable equipment to use in the several theaters.

15. The quality of its honors program. The School considers the Honors Tutorial Program to draw in some of its best students. These students are primarily interested in Theater Arts and Drama, and Production Design and Technology. The program is rich in diversity since the students are not only studying theater but are also studying dramatic literature, history, social sciences, and related fine arts.

16. The quality of its offerings through workshops, independent study, or experiential learning. Students enrolled for credit in the workshops have dropped in numbers from 216 in 1982 to 66 in 1987. The format for theater workshops has been changed to include non-credit as well as enrollment for credit in order to appeal to a wider market in the summer of 1988.

In the past 5 years there have been 35 courses requested through the Experiential Learning Program, by students with generally strong professional backgrounds in theater. Their success rate according to the assessment available has been high. There is no evaluation from the Office of Continuing Education as to the quality of the offerings, but merely a listing of workshops and student enrollments.

17. The quality of its programs on regional campuses. There are courses offered by part-time instructors at Belmont, Chillicothe, and Portsmouth. Only at Lancaster are the courses taught by a full-time Associate Professor.
### UCC Program Review Information

#### Theater

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baccalaureate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT COMP</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>20.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT VERBAL</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT MATH</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS RANK</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU GPA</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Headcount</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESHMEN</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPHOMORE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNIOR</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRAD TOTAL</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE TOTAL</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Degrees Awarded</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACCALAUREATE</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Student Credit Hours:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>2145</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-TOTAL</td>
<td>3345</td>
<td>2984</td>
<td>3009</td>
<td>2950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-TOTAL</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staffing and Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Faculty:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENURED</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-TENURED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERM (NON-TENURED)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLY RETIREES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT TENURED</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budgeted FTE Staffing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>16.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grad. Assistants</strong></td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>11.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrators</strong></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil Service</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30.19</td>
<td>29.74</td>
<td>30.11</td>
<td>30.21</td>
<td>31.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program: MASTER OF ADMINISTRATION IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
(MAPA)

1. Program Description:
The two-year graduate program in the Department of Political Science is designed to develop skills that are needed for careers in local government administration including: leadership, data analysis, personnel management, computer usage, program evaluation, public budgeting, and development of finances and the local economy.

PROGRAM STRENGTHS

1. MAPA faculty has been shown by student evaluations to be in the top 1/3 of the department's faculty, and two have been nominated and/or received the Outstanding Graduate Faculty Award from the university. Two new faculty members have been brought into the program since its inception.
2. Coursework is integrated with teaching assistantships in the Institute for Local Government Administration and Rural Development (ILGARD) and internships in state and local government. The Program can be utilized by public servants on leave for training as well as by pre-service candidates. The program is especially useful to students who have immediate career needs rather than as preparation for further academic degrees in public administration.
3. The program is able to function utilizing existing faculty in Political Science and Economics, and without additional funding outside of Political Science and ILGARD.
4. The program benefits from an external advising committee and has a good record in placing graduates.

PROGRAM WEAKNESSES

1. Lack of financial aid from the department specifically designated for program participants limits recruitment. Department aid that does become available is restricted to one year assistance for a two-year program.

2. Participants in the program are not easily identified or differentiated from the academic track of public administration among departmental majors. The program administration finds it difficult to monitor the candidates at any given point. There is no polling of graduates as to their employment, although the program does have an annual reunion luncheon in Columbus for those alumni who have gained positions in the state bureaucracy.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Pursue additional sources of support for student aid for participants.
2. Develop a regular system of polling graduates in order to evaluate the relationship of the program to the needs of public servants and the market for graduates.
3. The program sub-committee has completed the review of the MAPA program after its first two years and it will not require another evaluation until its five year review in 1993.

REVIEW TOPICS

1. THE QUALITY OF SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY OF ITS FACULTY. The faculty connected with the program are involved in applied research through ILGARD and supervising the MAPA internships.

2. THE QUALITY OF THE TEACHING OF ITS FACULTY. The faculty are evaluated on their teaching of the courses in the curriculum by students who rank them among the top one third of their department. The student/ faculty ratio is 29:1 for the department and the average size of classes in public administration is 20. There are now 7 faculty members from Political Science who participate, including two new members with specializations in public administration. Adjunct faculty include Ohio Senate Chief Executive Officer James Tilling, President Neil Clark of NSC Consultants, and Ohio House of Representative member Jolynn Rosser. The program is housed in the Department of Political Science and is directed by Mark Weinberg, who chairs the Public Administration Committee made up of all full time MAPA faculty.

3. THE QUALITY OF ITS GRADUATE STUDENTS. The GPA required for admission is 3.0 and the average GPA for those in the program is 3.5.

4. THE QUALITY OF ITS GRADUATE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE. The curriculum has been designed to meet the standards of the National Association of School of Public Affairs and Administration. The students in the program do receive considerable individual attention.

Of the 70 credit hours required, the core curriculum is as follows:
POLS 582 Quantitative Political Analysis
POLS 583 Statistical Packages for Social Science (new course)
POLS 511 Public Administration
POLS 514 Organizational Theory and Politics
POLS 586 Public Budgeting based the analysis used by the Ohio Legislative Budget Office.
ECON 503 Micro-economics has been added because it is a prerequisite for ECON 505 which is an option in economics.
ACCT 501 or POLS 587 provides study in Financial Management in Government.
POLS 614 Seminar in Public Administration
POLS 595 Internship: has been expanded from 4-6 credit hours to a possible 4-10 credit hours.
Students meet the additional hours required from a list of recommended courses which are to be clustered into personnel management, data analysis and computer skills, program evaluation and policy analysis, and budgeting and finance.

5. DEMAND FOR ITS GRADUATE PROGRAM BY STUDENTS. The level of demand estimated in the initial proposal was for 10-15, but the enrollment has expanded from 5 in 1986-87 to 7 in 1987-88. Ten students are seen as a reasonable projection for enrollment during the next several years despite a decline in similar programs nationally and the lack of GAships and stipends available through the university.

6. PROJECTED DEMAND FOR ITS GRADUATES OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITY. Many of the students have been those on leave from positions in local government who return to these jobs after retraining in the MARA program. All of the graduates have obtained employment either in local and state government or in private firms. Based on this record the projected demand is excellent for the relatively small number of graduates that are produced.

Questions 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 refer to undergraduate instruction and are, therefore, not applicable to this program.

12. ITS ADVANTAGES IN RELATION TO OTHER INSTITUTIONS.
The combination of theoretical coursework with the practicum available in ILGARD and local internships in Athens and with state administrators provide a useful mix.

13. THE QUALITY OF ITS LIBRARY HOLDINGS. Adequate.

14. THE QUALITY OF ITS FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT. The two new computer laboratories available to the students and faculty provide an excellent training resource.
Description of Program

The Computer Science Technology Associate is a two-year program offered at Ohio University-Lancaster. Students may choose one of two degree options depending on their particular career goals:

1. **Associate in Applied Business** - course work focuses on business data processing concepts and applications. This option prepares the student for entry level positions in the business data processing field, such as programmer or programmer-analyst.

   Students completing this option may elect to transfer into a four-year business administration program if they desire to further their education.

2. **Associate in Applied Science** - course work centers on mathematical and science related concepts and applications. This option prepares the student for entry level positions as programmer in the science and engineering oriented field.

   Students may choose to transfer into a four-year computer science program should they wish to continue their education.

To date, all of the students who have completed the program have been in the Associate in Applied Business option. One full-time Computer Science instructor teaches only in this program. He carries a load of 12 credit hours of courses per quarter. Three part-time instructors are available to teach in the Business Option. All are computer science professionals from the Lancaster area with job responsibilities in data processing in business and industry.

The enrollments into the program have grown steadily but are still significantly lower than those projected when the program was developed. At the present time, there are some 26 students enrolled in the two-year Business Option (none are enrolled in the Science Option) and a premature attrition rate of at least 50 percent is expected.
Program Strengths

At least the Associate in Applied Business two-year program seems to be meeting a regional demand for entry level technicians in business/industry data processing, e.g., programmers. Preliminary follow-up data would suggest at least 60 percent of the graduates are employed within their field as business programmers. Program administrators also contend the high premature attrition rate can be attributed to business and industry hiring the students prior to graduation.

Increasing enrollments in the Business Option would suggest the program is gaining in popularity with incoming students (1985 - 12 students; 1986 - 21 students; 1987 - 26 students).

The use of practicing computer science professionals is seen as a wise marketing strategy as well as an excellent academic strategy ensuring the relevant preparation of the students.

Program Weaknesses

The program appears to be struggling in a number of areas which will require attention.

First, the Applied Science Option would appear to be inappropriately designed and implemented. It remains an "option" but has never had any students. Its continued presence may even be detrimental to the successful Applied Business Option by diluting resources.

Second, the program administrators have yet to clearly define a comprehensive marketing strategy which would help them to define a student service area and to establish a uniqueness to market. In the absences of such a comprehensive strategy, the program will be less than competitive for an acknowledged shrinking pool of students.

Third, the program administrators should consider a more comprehensive interaction with business and industry. This should include field experiences and formal internships which are not requirements in the existing curriculum.

Fourth, the program administrators should consider addressing the very high attrition from the program in a much more formal manner. Instead of defending the attrition rate, they might consider instituting steps to prevent it.

Recommendations

1. The program administrators should develop and submit a prioritized plan for the marketing of the Business Option and for the increasing of enrollments into that option.
2. The program administrators should develop and submit a plan to make the Science Option a viable program or remove that option from the Computer Science Technology Program.

3. The program administrators should address the premature attrition from the program including the identification of alternative courses of action to reduce this problem.

4. The program administrators should include structured internships and/or field experiences for all students in the program.

5. The University Curriculum Council sees no need for further review until the next review cycle in 1991.

Review Topics

1. The need for at least the Business Option in Computer Science Technology does appear to have been assessed appropriately. This was not the case, however, with the Science Option. The latter probably accounts for the discrepancy between projected and actual enrollment into the overall program. If any resources are being utilized to sustain the Science Option, it should probably be discontinued.

2. The curriculum has not been revised since inception. All new courses were approved by the University Curriculum Council. The curriculum does appear to be appropriately focused to prepare these technical students.

3. The Business Option uses one full-time computer science instructor and three part-time practicing professionals to deliver the technical courses. This appears to be both advantageous to the students and to the program. The current ratio of FTE students to FTE faculty is 16:1 which is considerably lower than the projected 30:1 at the time the program was approved. Faculty evaluations are reported to be above average.

4. The admission criteria have remained as in the original proposal. Attrition exceeds 50 percent and there do not seem to be any strategies to reduce it. On the contrary, it is being defended as "expected".

5. There have been no significant changes in program administration.

6. An informal follow-up of graduates is being conducted and reportedly is becoming more structured and formal. A follow-up of those who leave the program prematurely is also being designed.
7. Revenue projections have not been met due to a significant overestimation of student enrollments. Program administrators remain optimistic that enrollments and revenues will increase. The fixed costs including one FTE faculty have remained the same for the duration of the program.
Mr. Russ presented and moved approval of the resolution. Mr. Smoot seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.

2. Centers and Institutes Review

RESOLUTION 1988--1009

WHEREAS, the continued review of academic programs is essential to the maintenance of quality within an educational institution, and

WHEREAS, Ohio University has had for many years a rigorous program of internal review, and

WHEREAS, section 67 of House Bill 694 provides for the review and evaluation of all programs of instruction conducted by the several institutions.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University accepts the 1987-88 reviews of centers and institutes.
September 21, 1988

TO:       Dr. Charles Ping, President
FROM:     James Bruning, Provost
SUBJECT:  Review of Centers and Institutes - 1987-88

Attached are summaries of the five year reviews of centers and institutes for 1987-88 completed by the colleges in which they are located.

These reviews are slightly different from the reviews of academic programs since a positive evaluation is required for continuation.

jm
Attachment
Reviews conducted during 1987-88 were:
- The Institute for Telecommunications Studies
- The Academic Advancement Center
- The Center for Business Enterprises

The full reviews and reports are available if desired. A brief summary is as follows:

The Institute for Telecommunications Studies
The institute began as a research support unit within the School of Radio-Television in the late 1960's. Its original name was the Broadcast Research Center. Initially, the main resource offered by the ITS was faculty consultation. In 1983 a computer laboratory was established in the ITS with funds granted to the School of Telecommunications under a Program Excellence award. The review committee found the institute to be beneficial in providing instructional and research support for faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate classes. They recommend continuation with a modest increase in financial support to enable it to update computer hardware and software.

Academic Advancement Center
The Academic Advancement Center provides support services to academically disadvantaged students who show potential for academic success. It successfully identifies, recruits and serves over 300 disadvantaged students each year in the college adjustment program. In 1986-87 it provided tutoring services to 4497 students. Basic skills instruction was given to 377 students and the learning lab provided services to 1789 students. The Center provides an essential service in administering the placement testing for Tier I courses. The review committee concluded that the Academic Advancement Center is performing effectively and recommends that all existing services be continued.

Center for Business Enterprises
The Center for Business Enterprises was established approximately 15 years ago as a mechanism to hold seminars/workshops/training sessions for the business community. The functions of this center have been subsumed by the Small Business Development Center which was established in 1985. The committee recommends that the Center for Business Enterprises be discontinued.

Center for Court Administration
No report was received for the Center for Court Administration. The 1986-87 Trustees' resolution noted that this center will be terminated in 1989 if no activity occurs. The center will continue to be monitored until that time.

Information
Ohio Coal Research Center. The Ohio Coal Research Institute will be redesignated the Ohio Coal Research Center. The Center expects to obtain five to seven million dollars of funding over the next five years from the Ohio Coal Development Office to fund a consortium composed of Ohio University, the University of Cincinnati, The Ohio State University, and Case Western Reserve University. The name change will more properly reflect Ohio University's role as the lead institution for the consortium.
Center will provide the organizational structure to handle the business of the consortium. It will be housed administratively in the College of Engineering and Technology and the director will report directly to the dean.

I concur with the recommendation of the three review committees. Attached is a prepared summary review for the Board of Trustees should you concur with the above recommendations.
Date: August 17, 1988

To: Lloyd Chesnut, Associate Provost
   Graduate and Research Programs

From: Sandra Haggerty, Assistant Dean
   College of Communication

Re: Review of the Institute for Telecommunications Studies

Our office endorses the attached self-study report and review committee recommendations prepared by the School of Telecommunications.
Review of the Institute for Telecommunications Studies

School of Telecommunications
Ohio University

Report of the Review Committee

August 1988

Submitted to: Paul Nelson, Dean, College of Communication
The Review Committee

In July 1988, a committee of four was named to conduct the review of the Institute for Telecommunications Studies (ITS), a research institute in the School of Telecommunications. The members of the committee were:

David Mould, Assistant Professor and Associate Director, School of Telecommunications (committee chair)

Charles Clift, Associate Professor and Graduate Coordinator, School of Telecommunications

Joseph Richie III, Instructor, School of Telecommunications, and Program Coordinator, Athens Community Television

Tim Myers, Public Radio Program Director, Telecommunications Center (WOUB AM-FM). The ITS has provided research services for the Telecommunications Center, and Mr. Myers served as the outside expert.

The committee reviewed the self-study document prepared by the Acting Administrator of the ITS, Drew McDaniel (copy attached.) It also requested and received additional information from the computer supervisor, Cathy Janes on ITS computer resources, and from a graduate assistant, Susan Ivers, on the holdings in the reading room.

a. Evaluation of the Current Viability of the ITS

The committee concluded that the ITS serves a useful function in promoting and providing facilities for faculty and graduate student research, and in undertaking contract research for public institutions, such as the Telecommunications Center, and private corporations. The research projects for Continental Cablevision and the Ohio Association of Broadcasters, and workshops for broadcasters on computer applications, have helped to establish valuable links between the university and the broadcasting and cable industries in the state. It seems likely that these initiatives will lead to further research projects and cooperative ventures between the ITS and industry.

Several audience studies for the Telecommunications Center (WOUB AM-FM-TV) have been undertaken as class projects, using the research facilities of the ITS. These studies have provided valuable training in research for graduate and undergraduate students, but the results have been mixed, with problems in data collection and reporting. The committee felt that these projects should be better planned, with the work spread across two or more quarters, and with closer supervision by faculty members. However, this may be an instructional rather than an institutional problem; as one committee member pointed out, these studies were undertaken as class projects, using the ITS facilities, and were not ITS research projects.
The research capability of the ITS seems to depend largely on its computer facilities. Almost every research project undertaken by the ITS in the past few years has used computers for data analysis. The opening of the computer laboratory with funds from the Program Excellence grant has made it possible for the ITS to undertake research that it could not have contemplated in its pre-computer days. More importantly, the computer laboratory has helped to close the gap between classwork and research, by enabling graduate and undergraduate students to work on real research projects, rather than research simulations.

One of the functions of the ITS is to provide information on grants and research opportunities for faculty and graduate students. Here, its performance has been somewhat uneven. The ITS has distributed some information on conferences, workshops, and grants, but not on a regular basis. This is not surprising, because the ITS's own information sources are limited; it does not subscribe to any data bases, and the reading room lacks some of the important periodicals and publications in the field. HERMES, the bulletin board service for educators in broadcasting, shows promise, but has been plagued by computer problems.

b. Evaluation on a Current Cost/Benefit Basis

On this basis, the ITS is more than paying its way. The operating costs are quite modest—$6,000 for the civil service computer supervisor, $2-3,000 for student assistants, about $5,000 for equipment maintenance and repair. There are numerous benefits: the ITS provides instructional and research computer facilities for faculty, graduate students, and graduate and undergraduate classes, operates a reading room, and undertakes contract research projects. Of course, some costs are more difficult to calculate—the time spent by the ITS director on administrative tasks, paper and supplies, phone charges, etc. These costs are borne directly by the School of Telecommunications from its operating and Academic Challenge accounts, so the actual cost is higher than $15,000. Still, the committee believes that the ITS, in its current form, justifies its operating costs.

c. Evaluation of Potential Future Viability

The future of the ITS will be shaped, to some degree, by its new director, to be appointed during academic year 1988-89. While the director will be expected to continue many of the current support and research activities, s/he will also have the opportunity, in consultation with the faculty of the School of Telecommunications, to set some new goals for the ITS. The committee would like the ITS to consolidate, to maintain and improve its current activities, before it launches new activities. The priorities identified by the committee are:

* To update computer hardware and software on a regular basis. Some computers should be equipped with hard drives and 640K memory to facilitate faculty and graduate student research; the expanded capacity will reduce dependence on the university's mainframe computer, which is often overloaded. The ITS may want to buy new statistical packages and SPSS software for research applications,
current software for broadcast ratings analysis, and a site license for a word-processing program.

* To provide regular information to faculty and graduate students on conferences and research opportunities in the field.

* To share information among broadcast educators through the bulletin board service, HERMES, on line. The potential of the system was clearly demonstrated by a faculty member, who used it to send student scripts to Los Angeles, where professional screenwriters edited them, added comments, and sent them back. The committee would like to see the HERMES system brought into regular operation, and some of its creative potential exploited.

* To update and expand the holdings in the reading room, and to provide finding aids. The collection currently consists of over 300 books and pamphlets, some periodicals and magazines, Arbitron ratings books, and other material. Most of these have been donated by faculty members. However, the collection lacks current textbooks and anthologies, and many journals have missing issues. Some important periodicals in the field are not included, while others are infrequently received. Some publications, such as Broadcasting Yearbook, need a yearly update. While it may be more appropriate to ask the Ohio University library to purchase the books and anthologies, the reading room would be a much more useful resource if it had subscriptions to a few current magazines and journals, such as:

  Broadcasting
  Channels of Communication
  Critical Studies in Mass Communication
  Electronic Media
  Journal of Broadcasting
  TV Guide

* To study the feasibility of issuing publications, using the ITS name and facilities. These could include papers and monographs by faculty and graduate students.

d. Evaluation on Future Cost/Benefit Basis

The committee does not anticipate significant changes in the ITS's costs and benefits. As long as it continues to provide instructional and research support for faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate classes, and undertakes research projects for the public and private telecommunications industries, the committee believes that the ITS will be able to justify its operating costs, even in years when it becomes necessary to replace old equipment.

e. Recommendation

The committee recommends a modest increase in financial support for the ITS, to enable it to update computer hardware and software, to improve the holdings in the reading room, and to provide funding for new activities.
a. Name: Institute for Telecommunications Studies

b. Operated by: School of Telecommunications
   Acting Administrator: Drew McDaniel

c. Purpose:

1. To provide research resources for Telecommunications faculty and graduate students.

2. To offer research assistance to media organizations, broadcasters, cable companies and others interested in the media.

3. To act as a clearinghouse for faculty and graduate student research projects, providing assistance in proposal development and project management.

4. To stimulate higher levels of research productivity among faculty and graduate students in Telecommunications.

d. Brief history

The Institute for Telecommunications Studies (ITS) began as a research support unit within the School of Radio-Television in the late 1960's. It was founded by James Saunders, who served as director of the school until he left Ohio University in 1971. Its original name was the Broadcast Research Center.

In the 1970's, under its new director, James Anderson, the ITS undertook several major research projects. Among these were a study of cross-ownership in broadcasting, funded by the National Association of Broadcasters, and a study of seasonal variations in broadcast advertising sales, sponsored by the Katz Agency.

In the beginning, the main resource offered by the ITS was faculty consultation, but a collection of research materials was compiled during the 1970's and made available in a reading room. The ITS is still responsible for this function, and today its holdings include copies of dissertations and theses in Telecommunications, a recent set of national TV ratings from ARB, and government documents on media issues.

In 1983, a computer laboratory was established in the ITS with funds granted to the School of Telecommunications under a Program Excellence award. The laboratory consists of 16 work stations: 12 IBM and 4 Macintosh personal computers. The ITS has acquired proprietary software for broadcasting and cable, which are used in classes and in faculty and graduate student research projects. A printer is connected to the university mainframe for output in ITS. Direct connection to the mainframe for input is provided. HERMES, a bulletin board service for educators in broadcasting has been in operation for about two years.
e. Current Activities and Status

The reading room and the ITS computer laboratory are in active use. There is a student staff of laboratory assistants hired by the School for this purpose. (UCLS is not a manager of this facility.) A civil-service employee, Cathy Janes, is responsible for the day-to-day supervision of the laboratory.

Research projects undertaken with ITS assistance in the last three years include market studies for the Continental Cable Company, an Ohio Association of Broadcasters study of women managers in broadcasting, and several smaller projects.

Dr. Karin Sandell, who headed ITS from 1983 to 1988, accepted a position as Associate Dean of the College of Communication in Fall 1987. The Director of the School of Telecommunications is serving as the interim director. A new director will be selected during the academic year 1988-89.

f. Anticipated Future Development

Plans have been drawn up for further development of the ITS computer laboratory. With the expansion in computing facilities, a need exists for improved wiring and air conditioning in the room. Improvements in lighting and computer furniture are being planned. There are also plans to provide more storage space and comfortable seating in the reading room.

Expanded holdings are expected to be acquired for the reading room. For example, one benefactor has offered a major collection of television scripts for class use. Other items of interest include databases for the media, collection of updated reference materials, and so on. Given the international activities in the school, international media resources are in particular demand.

Numerous research projects are under discussion. One major project would tie graduate students into studies throughout the Caribbean and Latin America. A continuation of market studies for Continental is being discussed. Another study on women media managers is also being contemplated.

g. Funding Commitments and Needs

In its present form, the ITS requires minimal funding. The student staff cost for the laboratory is on the order of a few thousand dollars. Ms. Janes' work in the laboratory amounts to about $6,000 (with benefits), and maintenance and repair of equipment is less than $5,000. Expenses are borne by the Academic Challenge grant given Telecommunications in 1986, or directly by its operating account. A rotary account is maintained by ITS to handle funding of research activities.

To: Samuel Crowl, Dean, University College

From: Patricia Baasel, Chairperson, Home Economics
       William Jones, Arts and Sciences
       Scott Malcom, Mathematics
       Arthur Wooley, English

A. EVALUATION OF CURRENT VIABILITY OF CENTER.

1. During the 5 year review period, the usefulness of the AAC has been confirmed independently by a number of organizations.
   a. There have been two three-year renewals of the Special Services Grant from the United States Department of Education (1984 and 1987).
   b. UPAC awarded financial support in 1983 to offset Regents cuts and in 1986 to make the one year experimental math basic skills instructor an ongoing position.
   c. PACE funding has been granted annually since 1984 for staffing assistance.
   d. In 1986, the Center was given national recognition in being selected for the Exemplary Developmental Education Award by the Center for Developmental Education at Appalachian State University.
   e. The University Curriculum Council approved the teaching of UC 110 A and 2 and UC 112 A and 3 as one credit courses in 1987.

2. The Center continues to successfully identify, recruit, and serve over 300 disadvantaged students each year in the CAP program. CAP program freshman participants continue to show higher retention rates and higher proportions with GPA > 2.0 than a control group matched on ACT scores each year.

3. The Center continues to serve large numbers of students needing academic support: in 1986-87, the tutoring services were used by 4,497 students, basic skills instruction was given 377 students, and the learning lab served 1,789.

4. The Center continues to perform an essential University function in administering the placement testing for Tier I (3,591 students tested in 1986-87).

3. EVALUATION OF CURRENT COST-BENEFIT RATIO.

First, the committee wishes to stress that it is the mission of the Center to provide support services to academically disadvantaged students with potential for academic success. While all the benefits may not be financial or even quantifiable,
the support services the Center provides enhance access to public higher education for many students who might otherwise not succeed at or even enter the University.

Several statistics suggest that the current cost/benefit ratio is favorable:

1. Student use of help sessions has gone up continuously since these services were first offered.
2. If the numbers of students served in the various service categories is totaled, we find that the number of students served has increased from 3,442 in 1982-83 to 6,563 in 1986-87, an increase of 93% in service, while the budget has increased from $223,291 to $293,716, an increase of only 27% during the same time period. This suggests that more students may be being served per budget dollar, although this is difficult to determine accurately since in some cases the same students may be receiving more than one service.

C. EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL FUTURE VIABILITY.

At present, the committee does not see any reason to anticipate a decreased need for services in any area. As the University admission requirements have been raised, it seems that the Center is serving a broader and not so radically ill-prepared group of students, and that the present trend is to be serving more students at less hours per student. Regarding tutoring, it appears that there is less stigma attached to being tutored than in the past and that more students are requesting this service.

As the population of learning disabled students attending college increases nationally and at Ohio University, it is anticipated that increased services may be needed for this group. International students who have graduated from OPIE, but who are still in need of help with English writing skills, are asking for more services than the Center can currently provide. Word processing skills are also an area of increasing need, although some committee members felt that this area should be a lower priority for the Center.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS.

The committee concludes that the AAC is performing effectively in fulfilling its main mission of serving academically disadvantaged and poorly prepared students as well as in additional functions such as the Tier I testing. We recommend that all existing services should be maintained.

The basic concept of CAP (College Adjustment Program) should certainly be supported locally if federal funds are not forthcoming at the conclusion of the present grant, although different guidelines for recruitment and acceptance into the program might be indicated. Currently CAP guidelines are federally determined. There was some feeling on the committee that these guidelines might be bringing students into the program who do not need the services as much as some other.
students. It is suggested that the AAC administrators and advisory board might want to examine the question of whether we at Ohio University should be advocating for different federal guidelines in order to serve the students who can best benefit from the program.

The Center's space needs seem to be adequately met in their present location, and the committee feels that the Alden Library location is ideal not only because of its central location, but because it is a location that students can enter with no stigma or embarrassment and in the process of being served by the Center, the students are also becoming comfortable with the library environment.

Through CAP and tutorial services in particular, the Center is becoming increasingly involved in providing services to Learning Disabled students. In order to better serve this population, we suggest that

1. The AAC should hire one staff person with expertise in the area of learning disabilities, and

2. The University may want to consider coordinating all special services to learning disabled students in the Center in order to reduce fragmentation and/or redundancy of services. The committee feels that the AAC made a wise decision in promoting coordination of minority support services by merging their program with the LINKS Program administered by University College. We believe it is time to examine whether some such merger of services for learning disabled students might not be advantageous.

February 12, 1989

Patricia Bassel
Review of Center for Business Enterprises

The Center for Business Enterprises was established some ten-to-fifteen years ago with its main objective as a funding mechanism (rotary) for the activities associated with small business administration in the College of Business Administration. If seminars/workshops/training session were conducted by faculty, fees for these services were channeled into the Center from which reimbursements were taken. The main person responsible for the Center in its initial years was Victor Grieco (who retired approximately five years ago).

After Dr. Grieco's departure, Dwight Pugh assumed the role as "small business spokesman" in the CBA and accepted the Center's Directorship. Funds from Small Business Institute Program (through the SBA - students working on real life business - writing cases to be funded by SBA at $400 per approved case) and from the seminars, etc. were deposited into the Center account as before. With Dr. Pugh's receiving the grant for the Small Business Development Center (funded initially in 1985 - located in the Innovation Center - supported by SBA and Ohio Department of Development), the Center for Business Enterprises took on a lesser role since the seminars/workshops, etc. were conducted through the SBDC. For the most part, the Center for Business Enterprises acts as an account mechanism which receives SBI (student case) monies and from which discretionary amounts are paid. The Director uses this account to pay for travel and activities associated with handling the Small Business Institute program. Why not use the SBDC account? At times, SBA gives extra mid-year funds to SBDC's, but will do so only if the unit can show need; i.e. does not have discretionary monies earned from other outside sources. Therefore, this separate account is necessary.

The Dean and Associate Dean of the College of Business Administration monitor the Center's activities and "sign off" on all requests for uses of funds.

DAP: is
Mr. Smooth presented and moved approval of the resolution. Dr. Strafford seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.

3. ZANESVILLE REGIONAL CAMPUS COORDINATING COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

RESOLUTION 1988--1010

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of Ohio University that the following persons be recommended for appointment by the President to membership on the Coordinating Council for the Zanesville Regional Campus of Ohio University.

Catherine Ann Cunningham 1-1-89 to 12-31-91. To fill the unexpired term of Dr. Gloria King who resigned 12-31-87.

Martha C. Moore 1-1-89 to 12-31-97. Replaces Mary Vashti Funk.


Date: September 22, 1988
To: Dr. James Bryant
From: Craig Laubenthal
Subject: Regional Coordinating Council Nominees

The Zanesville Campus Regional Council has selected the following individuals to fill four soon-to-expire terms and one incomplete term. It is respectfully requested that these names be submitted to the Secretary of the Board for approval by the Ohio University Trustees at the October meeting.

Catherine Ann Cunningham 1-1-89 to 12-31-91 To fill the unexpired term of Dr. Gloria King who resigned 12-31-87.

Martha C. Moore 1-1-89 to 12-31-97 Replaces Mary Vashti Funk.

Frederic J. Grant, III 1-1-89 to 12-31-97 Replaces Durbin J. Dunzweiler.

James P. Snider 1-1-89 to 12-31-97 Replaces The Honorable Ray G. Miller.

Thomas M. Lyall 1-1-89 to 12-31-97 Replaces G. Ronald Dice.

Enclosed are resumes or biographical outlines for all nominees.

cdl
### NAME and TERM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME and POSITION</th>
<th>HOME ADDRESS and PHONE</th>
<th>BUSINESS ADDRESS and PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert W. Amos (Hannah) (1983 - 1984) 1-1-85-12-31-83</td>
<td>1405 North Tenth Street Cambridge, Ohio 43725 432-5752</td>
<td>Retired THE JEFFERSONIAN COMPANY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. G. Ronald Dice (Gloria) 1-1-80-12-31-88</td>
<td>3012 West Drive Zanesville, Ohio 43701 453-4442</td>
<td>Retired MUTUAL FEDERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Durbin J. Dunzweiler (Melanie) 1-1-80-12-31-88</td>
<td>1001 Eastward Circle Zanesville, Ohio 43701 452-1152</td>
<td>DUNZWEILER DEVELOPERS, INC. President 1100 Brandywine Boulevard 452-2787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Mary Vashti Jones Funk</td>
<td>1251 Marwood Drive Zanesville, Ohio 43701 453-3081</td>
<td>JONES, FUNK and PAYNE Attorney at Law 45 North Fourth Street 452-5403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Albert H. Hendley, Jr. (Susan) 1-1-85-12-31-93</td>
<td>400 Yale Avenue Zanesville, Ohio 43701 452-7211</td>
<td>HENDLEY &amp; COMPANY, INC. President 822 Adair Avenue 452-4233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Fred Johnon (1977-1980) 1-1-81-12-31-89</td>
<td>2078 Yorkshire Road Columbus, Ohio 43221 488-0429</td>
<td>Retired RANKIN &amp; RANKIN, INC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rex F. Kleffer, Jr. (Ramona) 1-1-83-12-31-91</td>
<td>1475 Military Road Zanesville, Ohio 43701 453-3441</td>
<td>ZANESVILLE MEMORIAL PARK President and General Manager 1475 Military Road 452-2238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Milman H. Linn. III (Lynn) 1-1-81-12-31-89</td>
<td>1189 Parkview Drive Zanesville, Ohio 43701 453-2322</td>
<td>ZANESVILLE STONEWARE President 306 Pershing Road 452-7441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honorable Ray G. Miller (Martha) 1-1-81-12-31-88</td>
<td>2739 Ridgewood Circle Zanesville, Ohio 43701 452-7988</td>
<td>COURT HOUSE Common Pleas Court 455-7142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I. A. Wehr, M.D. (Gloria) 8-27-81-12-31-89</td>
<td>2800 West Drive Zanesville, Ohio 43701 453-0022</td>
<td>Retired Private Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfilled Term King Appointment 1-1-83-12-31-91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEGAL EXPERIENCE

Kincaid, Cuticle, & Geyer, 50 North Fourth Street, Zanesville, Ohio 43701. 1983 to date. General legal practice with a specialization in litigation. Have litigated in municipal, county and common pleas court, Ohio appellate courts and obtained an extraordinary writ from the Supreme Court of Ohio.

Solicitor for Village of New Concord, 1987 to date. Includes experience in municipal law and drafting of ordinances and resolutions.


EDUCATION

The Ohio State University College of Law, Columbus, Ohio. Juris Doctor, June, 1983.

Honors: Department of Political Science Senior Project Award for most outstanding senior thesis. Phi Gamma Mu, political science honorary. Recipient of Finnegan Foundation Fellowship Award in state government.

Honors: Received top honors in the Politics Department.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS/COMMUNITY SERVICE

American Bar Association, 1983 to date.
Ohio State Bar Association, 1983 to date.
American Trial Lawyer's Association, 1983 to date.
Scopetinist International of the Americas, professional women's group. 1983 to date. Secretary 1985-1987.
Y.W.C.A., Board of Directors, 1986 to date.
BIOGRAPHICAL OUTLINE

Martha C. Moore
501 Oakland Boulevard
Cambridge, Ohio 43725

Cambridge, Ohio native.

Employed: Recently retired Muskingum College faculty member in the Speech Department; served as executive secretary of the faculty; recipient of Muskingum College Alumni Association’s Distinguished Service Award.

Member of the Ohio Republican State Central and Executive Committee since 1950; served as Vice Chairman since 1963; and, has been a Republican National Committee Woman for Ohio since 1968; in 1980 she was the first woman elected to serve as chairman of the Presidential Electoral College.

Member of the Board of Directors of the Cambridge Bank One and Rotary Club.

Education: Attended Muskingum and Wellesley Colleges and Columbia University and received her Master’s of Arts from Ohio State University.

Awards: Award for Community Service from the American Association of University Women; Rotary Club Community Service Award; Guernsey County Hall of Fame.
BIOGRAPHICAL OUTLINE

FREDERIC J. GRANT, III, P.E., P.S.

Zanesville native.

Married to Mary "Bebe" Grant.
Three grown children - Four grandchildren.

Professional Engineer - 32 years experience in Civil Engineering and Construction Management.

Employed; City of Zanesville, since 1977, currently Public Service Director.

Graduated from Yale University, Bachelor & Master of Engineering. Ohio University, Master of Business Administration.

Veteran Naval officer, Civil Engineering Corps., Retired Navy Reservist. Active in U. S. Coast Guard Auxiliary.

Member: Amity No. 5 F & AM, Scottish Rite, Shrine and Elks Lodge No. 114, Rotary.

Director; Chamber of Commerce, Zanesville Development Corporation, YMCA and Community Leadership Academy.

Amateur radio operator. Sail and power boater.
RESUME
James P. Snider

EDUCATION:
University of Illinois. Bachelor of Science in Mining Engineering - 1953.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:
American Institute of Mining Engineers
Ohio Section - Society of Mining Engineers
Past Chairman
Executive Committee Member
National Industrial Sand Association
Board of Directors
Past Chairman - Engineering & Technology Committee

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES:
Board of Directors - Bethesda Hospital
Associate Board of Trustees - Bethesda Hospital
Past Chairman
Board of Trustees - Bethesda Foundation
Board of Directors - United Way
Rotary Club
St. James Episcopal Church
Treasurer
Past Vestry Member

EMPLOYMENT:
Central Silica Company - Zanesville, Ohio
Vice President & General Manager - 1983 to present
Responsible to parent corporation for all areas of performance of subsidiary company with 110 employees supplying industrial sand to the glass, foundry, and ceramic industries.
Vice President of Operations - 1978 to 1983
General Superintendent - 1969 to 1978

PERSONAL:
Address: 320 Plantation Circle
Zanesville, Ohio 43701
Telephone: (614) 453-0839
Birthdate: March 17, 1931
Married: Patricia E. Snider
Zanesville Day Nursery Secretary
Board of Directors

CHILDREN:
Michael J. Snider - B.B.A. Bowling Green State University
Catherine E. Snider - Ph.D. Ohio State University
Steven W. Snider - B.B.A. Ohio University
RESUME

NAME: Thomas M. Lyall

ADDRESS: 2474 Dunzweiler Drive
Zanesville, Ohio 43701

TELEPHONE: Home - 452-0589
            Business - 455-2521

FAMILY: Wife - Pamela
        Children - Julie and Jason

BUSINESS ADDRESS: Mutual Federal Savings Bank
                  14 South Fifth Street
                  Zanesville, Ohio 43701
EMPLOYMENT

President and Chief Operating Officer
Mutual Federal Savings Bank,
a Stock Corporation
1971 - to present

EDUCATION

Zanesville High School
Ohio University
Savings and Loan Educational Classes

CURRENT COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Campaign Chairman/Board Member - United Way of Muskingum, Perry and Morgan Counties
President - Zanesville Country Club
Board Member - Chamber of Commerce
Board Member - Port Authority
Board Member - Bethesda Hospital Associate Board
Member - MIG Transportation Committee

PAST COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Board Member - Big Brothers/Big Sisters
Member - Kiwanis

CHURCH AFFILIATION

Trinity Evangelical Lutheran Church
C. BOARD-ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Committee Chairman Heffernan, members Russ and Campbell met to consider the two resolutions being presented to the Trustees.
Mr. Campbell presented and moved approval of the resolution. Dr. Strafford seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.

1. Mutual Assistance Agreement with the City of Athens

RESOLUTION 1988--1011

WHEREAS, Ohio University and the City of Athens have had a long and productive history of mutual assistance and cooperation between their law enforcement agencies, and

WHEREAS, the Ohio General Assembly has enacted Section 3345.041 of the ORC to authorize formally the Board of Trustees of state universities to enter into such Agreements for police services with local municipalities, and

WHEREAS, The Board-Administration Committee has reviewed the draft of the proposed agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees hereby authorizes the President or his designee to reach an agreement in accordance with the above statute and for the President to execute it on behalf of Ohio University.
DATE: September 20, 1988

TO: President Charles J. Ping  
and Members, Ohio University Board of Trustees

FROM: Dr. Carol Harter, Vice President for Administration

SUBJECT: Mutual Assistance Agreement with the City of Athens

The Ohio General Assembly has enacted Section 3345.041 ORC to authorize state universities to enter into formal agreements with local political subdivisions, such as the City of Athens, to provide reciprocal police services when appropriate.

As you are aware, Ohio University and the City of Athens have had such agreements in the past and have acted cooperatively for many years prior to this recent legislative action. The passage of the new law, however, has led to a review of these cooperative arrangements with the goal of formalizing relationships under the provisions of the new law.

The legislation calls for such agreements to be of a duration not to exceed four years; the primary relationship between the University and the City will be mutual aid in terms of investigations and assistance when appropriate; and, the agreement will provide for the appointment of Ohio University security police officers as auxiliary City police officers. The Agreement is currently being reviewed by appropriate Athens city officials for their approval. (The basic terms have already been agreed to by the Ohio University Director of Security and the Athens City Police Chief.)

The Board of Trustees is empowered by the legislation to authorize such an agreement; in accordance with the attached resolution, I therefore request the Board to authorize the President or his designee to arrange for such an Agreement, to work with the City of Athens to identify the specific terms, and to authorize the President to execute it.
September 15, 1988

TO: Members of the Board of Trustees

FROM: Alan H. Geiger, Secretary

I have enclosed for your consideration the standard and annual resolution pertaining to faculty and staff access to classified information. Your action authorizes the President to act on behalf of the university and excludes your access to such information as well as responsibility for and liability within such matters.

Enclosure
Mr. Russ presented and moved approval of the resolution. Dr. Strafford seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.

2. Standard Security Resolution

RESOLUTION 1988--1012

WHEREAS, Ohio University periodically has faculty and staff involved in research activity that requires them to have access to classified information, and

WHEREAS, the United States Government requires that the University obtain security clearance as a precondition of its faculty and staff having access to classified information necessary for their research, and

WHEREAS, the University has a Managerial Group, as described in the Industrial Security Manual for Safeguarding Classified Information, consisting of the named persons occupying the following positions: Charles J. Ping, President; James Bruning, Provost; T. Lloyd Chesnut, Associate Provost for Graduate and Research Programs; Adam J. Marsh, Manager of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs; and William L. Kennard, Treasurer, and

WHEREAS, this Managerial Group is delegated all of the Board of Trustees' duties and responsibilities pertaining to the protection of classified information under classified contracts awarded to Ohio University, and

WHEREAS, members, as named below, of the Board of Trustees and all officers of the University not named as members of the Management Group shall be effectively excluded from access to all classified information in the possession of Ohio University and shall not be processed for a personnel clearance, and

WHEREAS, the Management Group shall review and approve any classified research proposals at the University.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Ohio University, Cutler Hall, Athens, Ohio 45701, authorizes the President to take all necessary steps for designating replacements to the Managerial Group and to indicate replacement members of the Board of Trustees for the herein described Board of Trustees exclusion status: Richard R. Campbell; Priscilla S. D'Angelo; Dennis B. Heffernan; Jeanette G. Grasselli; Fritz J. Russ; Ralph E. Schey; Lewis R. Smoot, Sr.; and J. Craig Strafford. M.D.
VIII. ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT STATED MEETING

Secretary Geiger announced the next stated meeting for Saturday, February 18, 1989, in Athens. Committee study/sessions are scheduled for Friday, February 17, 1989.

IX. GENERAL DISCUSSION - CALL OF MEMBERS

Mrs. D’Angelo stated she appreciated the new Trustees’ Comments section of the Friday sessions and that she enjoyed the opportunity to revisit the Ridges. She noted the dinner with the Contemporary History Institute folks, particularly the Russian guests, was most interesting.

Mr. Heffernan indicated he too enjoyed the Friday evening dinner and thanked the Trustees for a good meeting.

Mr. Russ welcomed Mr. Campbell to his new responsibilities as Board Chairman.

Mr. Schey commented he appreciated the upgrading and realignment done by the university and for the opportunities it created in providing an environment of learning to learn.

Mr. Smoot noted when he accepted the appointment as a Trustee that he never envisioned himself seated between two Russians having dinner on campus. He indicated he was looking forward to helping with matters relating to the Ridges and that he very much appreciated the university’s most favorable retention efforts.

Dr. Strafford stated he felt the visit to the Ridges was a moving experience when reflecting on the realities of empty buildings and the dramatic change in the delivery of mental health services. He thanked President Ping for arranging the luncheon with students and noted the similar emphasis of the Contemporary History Institute and Third Century Report on the World Community.

Mr. Voelker thanked Trustees for the opportunity of meeting with them the past two days. He stated the National Alumni Association Board will be meeting next week and that he will have a report for the Trustees at their February, 1989, meeting.

President Ping indicated that Frank Baumholtz was being honored by the National Alumni Association during Homecoming celebrations as the Alumnus of the Year—a richly deserved recognition. He noted the good results described in the reports given were in fact good results and based upon our critical look at ourselves. He noted students reported they enjoyed lunch with the Trustees.

Chairman Campbell thanked members for their attention to and participation in the activities of the Trustees this weekend.
X. ADJOURNMENT

Determining there was no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Campbell declared the meeting adjourned at 11:55 A.M.

CERTIFICATION OF SECRETARY

Notice of this meeting and its conduct was in accordance with Resolution 1975-240 of the Board, which resolution was adopted on November 5, 1975, in accordance with Section 121.22(F) of the Ohio Revised Code and of the State Administration Procedures Act.

Richard R. Campbell
Chairman

Alan H. Geiger
Secretary