

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW
DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN HUMAN ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
COLLEGE OF HUMAN ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA
October 5-8, 2008

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service
Washington, DC 20024
November 1, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. Summary of Recommendations	3
II. Introduction	5
III. Purpose and Objectives	7
IV. Recommendations for:	
A. College Doctoral Program	8
B. Interdisciplinary Degree Options	12
1. Department of Design, Housing and Merchandising	12
2. School of Hotel and Restaurant Administration	14
3. Department of Human Development and Family Sciences	16
4. Department of Nutritional Sciences	19
V. Appendix	
Itinerary for On-Site Review	22

I. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

A. College Doctoral Program

1. Continue to be an umbrella degree program and through departmental dialogue develop structures to facilitate the interdisciplinary nature of program. (page 10)
2. Continue and enhance multi disciplinary partnerships across campus. (page 10)
3. Right-size the graduate program to capitalize on faculty expertise, state/ national/ international needs, and available resources. (page 10)
4. Develop a series of minimum common admission criteria. (page 11)
5. Communicate and connect within the College to prioritize goals and allocate work load appropriately for achieving goals and to meet multiple priorities. (page 11)
6. Ensure continuous faculty development with support at each career stage. (page 11)
7. Continue strategic planning to identify and actualize “signature areas” that provide strong national identity and pursue funding in these areas. (page 11)

B. Interdisciplinary Degree Options

B1. Department of Design, Housing and Merchandising

1. Prioritize department goals and allocate faculty work load appropriately to meet multiple priorities. (page 13)
2. Use wisely faculty who are ready to contribute and develop those who are not. (page 13)
3. Discuss student targets/carrying capacity. (page 13)
4. Confirm key signature areas, consider with new faculty hires and develop courses to support. (page 13)
5. Better distinguish faculty identities and contributions. (page 13)
6. Stabilize Interior Design faculty and engage in collaborative work to build toward a PhD. (page 14)
7. Examine teaching assignments to avoid inequitable and heavy teaching loads. (page 14)
8. Consolidate funding for competitive stipends. (page 14)

B2. School of Hotel and Restaurant Administration

1. Articulate admissions requirements and work within College to standardize. (page 15)
2. Address the deficiency of languages that prevents students from teaching. (page 15)
3. Balance faculty and financial resources with number of PhDs to ensure quality students. (page 16)

4. Explore interdisciplinary opportunities for course work/ research at the doctoral level. (page 16)
5. Identify signature areas of excellence by which the department can be defined. (page 16)

B3. Department of Human Development and Family Science

1. Strengthen recruitment and marketing efforts around “signature areas.” (page 17)
2. Work purposefully to recruit, retain and graduate diverse doctoral students, considering “growing own” from diverse areas within the state. (page 17)
3. Continue to create competitive financial packages, balancing number of desired students with available resources. (page 18)
4. Monitor and evaluate competency matrix. (page 18)
5. Continue to strengthen time-to-degree rates and placements for doctoral students. (page 18)
6. Seek designated departmental research space in Scott Hall as available. (page 18)
7. Strengthen faculty development opportunities post-start-up. (page 18)
8. Continue to strengthen source of funding (multi-year federal grants) and publications (high impact journals). (page 18)

B4. Department of Nutritional Sciences

1. Decrease emphasis on thesis based MS + Internship program focusing more on PhD program even if less overall graduate students. (page 20)
2. Explore collaborative opportunities across campus to engage other researchers in unique aspects of PhD program. (page 20)
3. Consider novel ways of delivering didactic course information. (page 20)
4. Expand competitive funding potential with submission to USDA national needs fellowships and/or Higher Education Challenge grants. (page 20)
5. Develop a consistent admission process with clear criteria and work with College to standardize. (page 20)
6. Work with College to develop a marketing plan. (page 21)
7. Prioritize department goals and allocate faculty work load appropriately to meet multiple priorities. (page 21)
8. Support unfunded research with space as appropriate. (page 21)

II. INTRODUCTION

Dr. Stephan Wilson, Dean of the College of Human Environmental Sciences (HES) (College), Oklahoma State University, requested a comprehensive external review of the Doctoral Program in Human Environmental Sciences. In response to his request, Dr. Shirley Gerrior, Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service (CSREES), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) worked with Dr. Christine Johnson, Associate Dean, Research and Graduate Studies, to plan and organize the review which was conducted October 5-8, 2008. The Review Team members were recommended primarily by the College with consideration by CSREES, contacted by CSREES and approved in consultation with the College. The Team was composed of six external people, one of whom was a former Oklahoma State University alumna of the doctoral program and College faculty member. Each member of the team focused on a particular area of the program, to include departmental, graduate studies, or college level perspective but contributed to the overall program review. They were as follows:

Shirley Gerrior, PhD, RD, LD, Team Leader
National Program Leader
Families, 4-H and Nutrition
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service
1400 Independence Avenue SW
Mail Stop 2225
Washington, DC 20250-2225
Phone 202 720-4124
Fax 202 720-9366
sgerrior@csrees.usda.gov

External Reviewers, Departmental:

Pearl Brewer, PhD
Professor and Executive Director of Graduate Studies
William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration
University of Nevada, Las Vegas 89154-6021
Phone 702 895-3643
Fax 702 895-2713
pearl.brewer@unlv.edu
Hotel and Restaurant Administration

Marsha Dickson, PhD
Professor and Chairperson
Department of Fashion and Apparel Studies
University of Delaware
211 Alison Hall West
Newark, DE 19716
Phone 302 831-8714

Fax 302 831-6081
dickson@udel.edu
Design, Housing, and Merchandising

Dennis Medeiros, PhD
Professor and Department Head/ Associate Dean, Scholarship and Research
Department of Human Nutrition/ College of Human Ecology
Kansas State University
213 Justin Hall
Manhattan, KS 66506
Phone 785-532-0150
Fax 785 532-5504
medeiros@ksu.edu
Nutritional Sciences

Penny A. Ralston, PhD
Professor, Dean Emeritus, College of Human Sciences
Director, Center on Better Health and Life for Underserved Populations
C2200 University Center
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-2641
(850) 645-8110
(850) 841-0407 cell
(850) 645-8109 fax
pralston@fsu.edu
Human Development and Family Science

External Reviewer, Graduate Studies:

Kay Pasley, Ed.D
Professor and Department Chair
College of Human Sciences
Family and Child Sciences
Florida State University
225 Sandels Building
Tallahassee, FL 32306
Phone 850 644-3217
Fax 850 644-3439
kpasley@fsu.edu

External Reviewer, College Level Perspective:

Laura Jolly, PhD
Dean, College of Family & Consumer Sciences
University of Georgia
224 Dawson Hall
Athens, GA 30602
Phone 706 542-4879

Fax 706 542-4862
Email: ljolly@fcs.uga.edu

The dean, associate deans, department heads, faculty, and staff of the College are commended for the time and effort dedicated to preparation for the review and participation in the site visit activities. In addition, Dr. Marlene Strathe, Provost & Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Gordon Emslie, Dean of the Graduate College and Dr. Mark Payton, Associate Dean of the Graduate College contributed to the review.

The team appreciated the creation of a dedicated website for easy access to College information and materials and receipt of a thorough and informative self-study prior to arriving on campus. These resources combined with information obtained from documents received on site, and formal and informal discussions with faculty and administrators were considered in the development of this report.

The team discussed all aspects of the review in developing this report. The findings and recommendations reflect a consensus of opinion based on all available information. To meet the expectations of the review, the team primarily focused on the interdisciplinary doctoral program within the College. However, this required that we look at operational and management aspects of each of the departmental programs as well as graduate college policy and procedures. This multifaceted review contributed to an understanding of current department relationships and interactions, how graduate college policy impacted graduate student admission and financial aid offers and, most importantly to this review, helped us determine if the PhD program in Human Environmental Sciences (HES) was truly “interdisciplinary.”

This report has been prepared to assist in the ongoing evaluation of the interdisciplinary doctoral degree in HES and provide information to assist college faculty and administrators with planning for the future direction of this program.

III. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The PhD program in HES is described as interdisciplinary and includes options in four areas: 1) Design, Housing and Merchandising, 2) Human Development and Family Science, 3) Hospitality Administration; and 4) Nutritional Sciences. The purpose of this review as stated in the request was twofold: for internal planning purposes to direct strategic goal setting for the College and to provide an external appraisal to inform the state required 5-year academic program review to shape the future of the doctoral program. This program review was timely. As of spring 2008, a new College Dean and University President were hired, and during the past four years each academic unit within the College has acquired a new department head/school director. Consequently, the College is actively engaged in establishing new goals and strategies for reaching those goals. The College Strategic Plan for the Future completed this past spring was shared with the review team and showed active HES engagement and future strategic thinking was underway. Of interest to the team was the destination goal of HES identified in this Plan as it provides a contextual reference. It states:

“The College of Human and Environmental Sciences will be an international leader in interdisciplinary research, education and outreach focusing on discovering and implementing creative solutions that enhance and sustain quality of life for individuals, consumers, and families in the state, nation and communities worldwide. HES faculty and staff work to improve the lives of people and organizations in arenas including:

- *Nutrition*
- *Childhood Development and Aging*
- *Family Resiliency*
- *Housing, Merchandising, and Design and Hospitality.”*

In addition, every five years the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education requires a review report of each academic degree program. A review of the doctoral program provided by CSREES will provide useful feedback to inform the report due to the State Regents for Higher Education in January 2009.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. COLLEGE DOCTORAL PROGRAM

Overview of the College Doctoral Program and Graduate Perspective

For planning purposes, the team took a brief look backward to see how the College doctoral program evolved and developed over the years so as to provide a context for the review with a goal of giving direction useful to College faculty and administrators to shape the future direction of the doctoral program. This program has a long history at Oklahoma State University with a strong academic reputation and a number of strengths evolving over time and identified since the last program review. Over the past 15 years, the College of HES transitioned from a college primarily focused on undergraduate teaching to a multifaceted focus including both undergraduate and graduate teaching, research, and outreach. This was driven by a sound conceptual model with stated professional competences offered as a strong foundation for commonalities across departments. During this time the doctoral program realized exceptional growth with an increase in student enrollment, an increase in the number of faculty who were tenured or tenure-track, and the active inclusion of Extension faculty in doctoral education.

Uniformly, faculty members report a strong commitment to doctoral education and have identifiable expertise within their fields that can contribute effectively to the program. In particular, the inclusion of Extension faculty is both unique and valuable to better meet the engagement competencies identified in the conceptual model. Throughout this period the College worked hard to provide excellent facilities for meeting much of its research and training needs, although with the increase in its faculty doing research, there remain some unmet space needs. More recently the Graduate College established several categories of monies and tuition waivers to help with financial support of graduate students. The College of HES wisely managed this support for the benefit of its PhD students in each of the four departments. In part, this

contributed to a higher quality of student evidenced in the sample of dissertations made available for review.

Strengths:

The review team recognized strength in the College and its support of the Doctoral Program to meet challenges and address new opportunities.

1. Strong academic reputation of the College in the University.
2. Strong support from the Academic Provost for the efforts of the College.
3. Strong support from Graduate School and Dean for this degree.
4. Strong group of committed faculty with identifiable expertise. Critical mass of recently hired and young faculty to bring new perspectives to the College and program.
5. Impressive facilities for research and instruction; attractive, functional and well maintained.
6. Integration of Extension faculty with doctoral program.
7. Strong external support.

Although there are numerous strengths within the College and the HES interdisciplinary doctoral program itself, it is not without challenges that will require a good deal of attention and effort on the part of individual faculty, collective groups of faculty, and HES administrators. A number of these challenges were raised as critical issues early on by the College leadership and set the stage for the focus of this review. We identify several primary challenges of concern and offer recommendations for meeting them.

Challenges:

1. Interdisciplinary nature of the program does not exist operationally.
2. Enrollment numbers and targets
 - a. Limited pool of qualified applicants for the various PhD program options (see 3 a.); a substantial proportion of the graduate faculty are pre-tenured and do not have PhD chair privileges.
3. Admission requirements
 - a. Departments vary greatly in the admissions criteria applied within the doctoral program. We recognize that for some departments there are clearly communicated criteria applied for admission, whereas for others faculty were unable to clearly articulate the criteria they applied when making admission decisions. Such lack of clarity has the potential for resulting in the admission of students who vary greatly on their indicators of excellence. It makes it more difficult to determine the overall quality of the students attracted and admitted to the program.
 - b. Inadequate admission data were maintained. Having such data can facilitate planning and provides the foundation for requests for additional or targeted support.
4. Stipends and financial packages.
5. Space needs and use
 - a. Lack of space to support students with unfunded research.

- b. Limited space for research and instruction.
- 6. Allocation of faculty resources to meet multiple priorities.
- 7. Recruitment and marketing strategies.
- 8. Preparation of students in university teaching and outreach/extension experiences.
- 9. Funding for ongoing faculty development at both the University level and within the College is lacking.

Recommendations:

1. Continue to be one program finding ways to unify program offerings within departments, standardize baseline policies and procedures and establish a clear set of links across departments to realize interdisciplinary nature of program
 - a. Identify graduate course content that is universally attractive, so resources could be shared, curriculum streamlined and individual departmental investments reduced.
 - b. Consider potential “core” courses for operational efficiency:
 - i. Create a course on “how to teach” for graduate students who are instructors to enhance the educational experience of both undergraduate and graduate HES students (consider EDUC5993 as prototype).
 - ii. Offer a series of one-credit courses early on that provide an overview of the history of HES and introduces new students to the research programs by the various faculty within the College.
 - iii. Offer other limited credit (1-credit) courses to address professional development issues such as professional ethics, writing for publication and preparing for the job search process.
 - iv. Explore ways to teach “common” required courses across departments or in partnership with other disciplines university wide such as teaching philosophy/strategies, statistics, advanced research methods, and grant writing technique.
 - c. Identify, seek and nurture partnerships and external funding opportunities to support graduate student assistantships and fellowships.
 - d. Investigate approaches for increasing interdisciplinary research and extension research activities.
 - e. Leverage resources and streamline graduate curriculum to encourage faculty/student research across disciplines.
 - f. Build a high quality College website to promote the doctoral program.
2. Continue and enhance multi disciplinary partnerships across campus
 - a. External disciplinary work very important.
 - b. Seek partnerships and external funding to create opportunities for student experiences that integrate instruction, research and outreach/public service.
 - c. Build external relations of HES via identification and nurturing of potential partnerships with external constituencies.
 - d. Build leadership teams composed of faculty researchers and extension personnel across departments and campus.
3. Right-size the graduate program to capitalize on faculty expertise, state/ national/ international needs, and available resources

- a. Determine the optimum number of prospective students to admit annually to the various program options, as well as the carrying capacity or overall number of students enrolled in the program. This requires a thoughtful review of enrollment trends, departmental capacity, and program goals tempered with the need to carefully balance the multiple demands for meeting educational needs.
 - b. Develop strategies for effectively attracting a much larger pool of prospective PhD students nationally and internationally and students of higher quality. Include a plan to reach minorities and under-represented groups. This will allow the faculty in the respective options to admit the very best students rather than to admit students from a much smaller and less strong pool. High quality students can readily further the work of individual faculty, as well as bring valued attention to the program, College, and University.
4. Develop a series of minimum common admission criteria
 - a. Require departmental representatives to think in terms of common values and minimum standards that can be applied, understanding that departments might elect to set more stringent policies and additional procedures, but that include at least minimum standards.
 - b. Maintain information on such data so as to strengthen case for additional support.
5. Prioritize goals and allocate work load appropriately for achieving goals and to meet multiple priorities
 - a. Prioritize what needs to be done and do better and identify what does not need to be done anymore and stop doing it.
 - b. Balance individual department commitment to successfully meet educational needs of undergraduate, masters and doctoral students, as these levels of education compete for the time and energy of the faculty and resources available. Departments may be faced with some highly difficult choices regarding how to best streamline curriculum offerings at one level to expand efforts at another.
6. Ensure continuous faculty development
 - a. Develop strong and ongoing start up packages to support faculty at each career stage.
 - b. No structure is in place to seed interdisciplinary projects to encourage new research or the large number of new pre-tenure faculty that need support to develop research, instruction and outreach programs. In many Universities F & A funds are held back to support university-wide competitions for research funding. However, at Oklahoma State University, there are no initiatives that encourage interdisciplinary or interdepartmental research efforts of faculty and/or students, nor are there resources for use as “bridge” funds and/or to promote needed pilot studies. Making available small amounts of money for research purposes through a competitive process would do much to enhance faculty morale.
7. Identify/implement signature strategic focus and clarity
 - a. Each department needs to develop a strategic focus or identifiable signature area(s) to establish unique and competitive balance. This allows department faculty in each of the four degree options to communicate a clear identity within the College, across the University, among other professional colleagues, and to prospective doctoral students. Also, it is one way to label and link the expertise of the faculty within the option, as well as the expertise of faculty in other

- options. Developing a clear strategic focus can be an effective recruitment and marketing tool for each of the departmental options and across options.
- b. Gaining clarity about a strategic focus helps set work priorities.

B. THE INTERDISCIPLINARY DEGREE OPTIONS

B1. Department of Design, Housing and Merchandizing

Design, Housing and Merchandising (DHM) significantly contributes to the College mission and shares its core values. It strives to be internationally recognized for producing high quality scholars and scholarship focused on solutions to significant contemporary problems and challenges of the future. The review team found a strong spirit of collaboration with department faculty eager to work with each other and with others in the College. Despite the fact that DHM departments in general are not often able to get into funding areas where there are substantial dollars, this department has some excellent research and financial support in place, a recognized focal area of research in protective clothing and a strong base of research in merchandising, business, development, and entrepreneurship.

The interim department head is commended for the leadership which he has provided during a period of instability within the department due to faculty turnover, limited number of faculty with PhD chair privileges, and large teaching loads.

The department is creatively moving forward and will benefit from the stronger interdisciplinary focus of the College level PhD program as recommended. In addition, the team has identified specific department strengths and challenges with recommendations to guide the department for the future.

Strengths:

1. Strong spirit of collaboration
 - a. Faculty are eager to work with each other and with others in the college (e.g. interior design with gerontology, hotel administration).
2. Identified and recognized “signature area” of research
 - a. Protective clothing research has developed into a signature area with strong funding and external collaboration.
 - b. Expertise in merchandising, business development, and entrepreneurship has potential for being developed into a signature area that combines the strength of several faculty.
3. Outstanding funding accomplishments and grantsmanship. The department has achieved external funding that far surpasses peer programs.
4. Good breadth of productive senior faculty who can contribute to the doctoral programs with expertise in creative scholarship, aesthetics, and psychological/historical/cultural areas.
5. Impressive facilities

- a. Institute for Protective Apparel Research Technology (IPART) and labs in HES include important equipment and provide beautiful space to work.

Recommendations:

1. Prioritize department goals and allocate faculty work load appropriately to meet multiple priorities
 - a. Faculty is over extended in meeting program needs for a large undergraduate program. Look at ways to reduce that load while maintaining quality programs with a focus on the PhD program.
 - b. Discuss and decide on the right size of the undergraduate, masters, and doctoral programs and select areas for priority. This will require selecting areas to trim or even stop doing: look to eliminate courses and labs that are not critical to achieving goals.
2. Use wisely faculty who are ready to contribute and develop those who are not
 - a. A doctoral program needs a critical mass of faculty to support it. Look at the faculty resources available and consider how to more effectively involve them in doctoral education. This may mean making better use of the broad range of faculty able to chair doctoral committees. As well junior faculty should be more involved in teaching graduate courses and advising.
3. Discuss student targets/carrying capacity
 - a. Discuss target numbers of students and carrying capacity given individual faculty advising, length of time to complete degree, and numbers of incoming students each year. Bigger is not always better. Providing a quality education to a few well-funded doctoral students will have longer-term and greater impact on program reputation than providing quantities of doctoral degrees.
4. Confirm key signature areas, consider with new faculty hires and develop courses to support
 - a. Discuss and identify “signature areas” for strategic emphasis. Protective clothing is a signature area and merchandising, business development, and entrepreneurship could be combined in a creative way for another. These areas should represent what department faculty can do better than any others across the country; therefore, if students desire that expertise, they will have to come to OSU to obtain it. Recruits should contribute to but not duplicate expertise in the signature areas.
 - b. Develop doctoral level courses to support signature areas. For the signature area in protective clothing, consider that learning and coursework related to creative scholarship would both benefit and contribute to good functional design.
 - c. In addition to courses developed for the signature areas, consider developing courses in strategically selected supporting areas. Students benefit from learning from a variety of perspectives and faculty. Also, when they become apparel faculty they will need to teach across a few subject areas. This requires some coursework that assures the needed breath, as well as coursework in their focal area. Other expertise among the existing faculty supports both design and merchandising-related areas.
5. Better distinguish faculty identities and contributions to the doctoral program

- a. Distinguish the unique aspects of faculty contributions to individual and collaborative projects to help prospective students find a good program/faculty fit. Many research articles and projects list numerous faculty in the department, but the team was unable to get a sense of individual expertise from information on the website and expect that a prospective student would have a hard time identifying a few individuals with whom s/he would want to work. You want to avoid losing a strong potential student if one advisor is too busy. Also, faculty web pages seem to de-emphasize research in some cases. It should be very clear to prospective students why they should choose to come to this University and enroll in this PhD program—and the breadth of possible advisors that might be able to guide them.
- 6. Stabilize Interior Design faculty and engage in collaborative work to build towards PhD
 - a. To stabilize faculty, begin working collaboratively in areas where possible strategic focus exists in preparation for attracting PhD students in the future. Continue to explore collaborations across the department that allows participation in the PhD program by Interior Design.
- 7. Examine teaching assignments to avoid inequitable and heavy teaching loads
 - a. Faculty conducting scholarship and advising graduate students need time to do so. The team observed relatively heavy and inequitable teaching loads.
- 8. Consolidate funding for competitive stipends
 - a. Consolidate funding into fewer full-time positions that are more attractive to potential students. Additional funding is always valuable, but available stipends need to be used effectively to attract the best students.

B2. Department of Hotel and Restaurant Administration

The department of Hotel and Restaurant Administration (HRAD) enjoys an excellent reputation and ranking among hotel programs in the United States and internationally, and its PhD program has grown to reflect its many strengths. The Atherton Hotel and Hospitality Center is a beautiful blend of functional and aesthetic quality which serves education, service, and potential research functions. In the past a strong group of senior faculty has guided the programs curriculum, research, and service activities. These faculty members, along with outstanding facilities are the foundation of a solid doctoral program. In addition, the current flexibility of the curriculum is considered a strength for recruiting PhD students. This flexibility has also enabled the faculty to develop a unique program targeted to tourism faculty at international universities throughout the world.

The program has recently undergone a change in leadership and some changes in the graduate level faculty. The newly appointed department head is committed to the doctoral program and recognizes its strengths and has identified a number of challenges since taking this position. The department is actively moving forward and will benefit from the stronger interdisciplinary focus of the College level PhD program as recommended. In addition, the team has identified specific department strengths, and challenges with recommendations to guide the department for the future

Strengths:

1. Strong national reputation
 - a. Recent research ranks the graduate programs in HRAD very high with regard to peer graduate programs in hospitality education. The Faculty should be proud of their accomplishments.
2. Strong senior faculty who guided the program and curriculum to date
 - a. Clearly senior faculty have work very hard to achieve such an excellent program. While the program is strong, it will need continued guidance by the faculty to continue to excel and fit within the guidelines of the college moving forward.
3. Outstanding facilities with implications for graduate student use and research
 - a. The facilities for the school of HRAD are world class and provide the foundation for sound academic programs. The combination of classrooms, food laboratories, hotel and meeting facilities, while not directly benefiting graduate education can provide both research and teaching opportunities for doctoral students.
4. Flexibility of curriculum
 - a. In an applied research environment the ability to focus or tailor curriculum to the specific needs of the student is paramount. The faculty has designed such a curriculum and now has the opportunity to include the core areas necessary to develop the interdisciplinary nature of the college degree.
5. Unique international involvement
 - a. Involvement at the international level is a special feature of the OSU program. While there are other programs delivered internationally, they are more typical in that they may have an "international location" or campus. The faculty of HRAD at OSU has looked for opportunities to deliver their academic programs to various groups internationally on an ad hoc basis. This cohort delivery of the program to the students' location is unique in graduate level hospitality education.

Recommendations:

1. Articulate admissions requirements
 - a. Identify admission criteria that will result in the acceptance of student who will succeed in the program and further in their professional career.
 - b. Include language proficiency criteria such that a student is required to pass the University's speak test. The team was concerned by the report that some students were unable to teach before graduation because their English speaking skills were not sufficient to pass this test. Use of an interview might help identify students who will have the ability to pass this test, and therefore have a teaching experience before graduation.
 - c. Standardize specific criterion for admission and publish on doctoral and program website. Consider at least minimum GMAT/GRE scores along with hospitality related work experience. These standards need to be formalized and articulated for potential students.
2. Address the deficiency of languages that prevents them from teaching at admissions (see 1 b above).

3. Balance faculty and financial resources with number of PhDs to ensure quality of students
 - a. Reflect thoughtfully and strategically with regard to the number of PhD students the faculty believes can be adequately supported. Recruit and attract students who strategically fit the strengths of the faculty and support competitively. This support would include assistantships, faculty time and expertise, and workspace. Include other faculty workload such as undergraduate courses and service
 - b. Look carefully at the ratio of international students currently admitted in the program with an eye for the future. International students often bring an additional burden in terms of faculty time, resources, and the students' ability to have a teaching experience prior to graduation.
 - c. Examine faculty/student ratio to determine the optimum mix of students and formulate a recruiting plan to support this decision. In addition to recruiting students, the faculty might consider pairing incoming students with faculty on arrival based on stated area's of interest.
 - d. Balance the faculty teaching load with regard to undergraduate and graduate course work and the number of doctoral students that the faculty advises.
 - e. Ensure a competitive level of graduate financial support for PhD students. Avoid not funding or underfunding some students in an attempt to fund more students. Although understandable, this strategy may reduce the number and overall quality of the student entering the program with the best students accepting offers at other institutions simply based on financial need.
4. Find more interdisciplinary opportunities for course work at the doctoral level
 - a. Work within the College and seek more interdisciplinary experiences for the students by identifying areas of synergy within the college in terms of core courses. This would help produce the critical mass of doctoral students necessary to allow regular offerings of these courses.
5. Identify signature areas of excellence by which the department can be defined
 - a. Identify the areas of strength within the department with regard to doctoral studies and market this strength to potential students.

B3. Department of Human Development and Family Science

The Department of Human Development and Family Science (HDFS) offers a Ph.D. in Human Environmental Sciences with options in human development and family science. Program graduates are prepared to apply knowledge in HDFS in a collaborative manner in diverse settings through *breadth* of knowledge, *depth* in at least one discipline (either human development or family science), *integration* or knowledge synthesis, and *experience* in research, instruction or other applications. Faculty members are energetic and talented and include an impressive number of junior faculty. The department is adequately housed in the HES Building with space for classrooms, research and faculty/staff offices. The research/instructional space includes an observation and coding lab, child development lab, and the center on family services. Graduate students have a designated office in Scott Hall and also share research facilities with faculty.

The last review noted the strength of the HDFS doctoral program curriculum and how it was being shaped around the interests and expertise of the faculty. However, it was recommended

that the department recruit more full-time students; enhanced methods of tracking enrollment, degrees earned and career placements; and increased opportunities for classroom teaching for graduate students. Since that time, the enrollment has stabilized with a higher number of full-time graduate students. Also, there has been a shift from the qualifying exam to a competency-based system, using a matrix of HDFS competencies that must be mastered during the doctoral program.

The program has recently undergone a change in leadership. The newly appointed department head is committed to the doctoral program. She directed a strategic planning exercise to best serve the department earlier this year and has been instrumental in identifying the “signature area” in Individual and Family Risk and Resiliency. The department is creatively and actively moving forward and will benefit from the stronger interdisciplinary focus of the College level PhD program as recommended. In addition, the team has identified specific department strengths, and challenges with recommendations to guide the department for the future.

Strengths:

1. Identified signature area in individual and family risk and resiliency with buy in by faculty.
2. Increased research focus in the department resulting in support for and experiences of doctoral students.
3. Good publication and external funding record for many faculty.
4. Integration of Extension faculty with a focus on applied research.
5. Endowed professorships, including two new positions and two existing ones
6. Established collaborations across college and University (e.g., HDFS and NSCI, OSU-Tulsa).
7. Use of conceptual model for competencies in a more in depth way through competencies matrix.
8. Excellent facilities (unique observation and coding lab, child development lab, Center for Family Services) for teaching and research.

Recommendations:

1. Use strategic focus on “risk and resiliency” to strengthen recruitment and marketing efforts for doctoral students to increase pool of highly qualified applicants, especially those from outside of Oklahoma
 - a. Develop a web presence for this focus area so that prospective students can see clearly the department’s signature emphasis. Include in the website highlights of faculty achievements related to this focus. Consistently use signature area in all recruitment materials.
 - b. Communicate clearly with prospective students how faculty’s current research program is consistent with risk and resiliency and consider seeking funds collaboratively that draw on this focus area.
2. Work purposefully to recruit, retain and graduate diverse doctoral students. Considering that the domestic diversity numbers for graduate students in the

- department are below other programs nationally, it is important for the department to be more aggressive in recruitment efforts
- a. Seek opportunities to “grow your own”. Consider the Tulsa campus programs and Extension programs in targeted counties as possible places to begin building relationships with diverse communities. Also consider recruiting diverse students at OSU who may be in other departments.
 - b. Identify funding programs available nationally that will help to jumpstart this effort (i.e., USDA Challenge Grants and Multicultural Scholars Programs).
 - c. Invite key scholars from diverse backgrounds to visit campus to give lectures to provide more visibility to the department and to promote a welcoming environment.
3. Continue to create competitive financial packages, balancing number of desired students with available resources. Seek to identify the capacity of the department to support high quality students and to support them well. With the research grant activities of faculty along with the growing endowments, careful management of funds should help in the recruitment of the highest quality of students.
 4. Carefully monitor and evaluate competency matrix to ensure its maximum effectiveness. The department has developed a very creative way to assess doctoral students throughout their academic programs. With this creativity, however, there can be instances where the process becomes complex and thus does not meet the intent. Careful monitoring of the process, with substantial student and faculty input, will ensure that use of the matrix is meeting its full potential.
 5. Continue to strengthen time-to-degree rates and placements for doctoral students. The department has made strong efforts to address these problems. It is important, however, to continue to carefully analyze data to make sure that all students are moving forward in their programs and getting placed
 - a. Strategically work with students who have not completed their programs to either get them finished or to make decisions about their academic plans.
 - b. Continue to recruit high quality students who are focused on research careers and who can meet the time-to-degree goals.
 - c. Mentor students to provide them with exposure and opportunities in top tier universities, thus helping them to look more broadly for possible positions.
 6. Seek designated departmental research space
 - a. Aggressively seek space in Scott Hall as available to support faculty scholarship.
 - b. Continue efforts to expand other laboratories to increase research space.
 7. Strengthen faculty development opportunities post-start-up. A major issue will be retaining the highly talented faculty members who have joined the department. Start-up funds and mentoring activities make the department very competitive for acquiring faculty talent. However, when the funds dry up and new grants are perhaps not in place, the faculty are often left without support and become recruitable elsewhere. The department needs to monitor faculty and reach out to assist so that they can move forward in their careers at OSU.
 8. Continue to strengthen source of funding
 - a. Seek multi-year federal grants that provide visibility for the department and more long-term support for graduate students. The movement from seed funds to state and foundation funding appears to be occurring in the department, yet the next

step of garnering prestigious federal grants is not as apparent. This next step needs to be made.

- b. Continue to move toward publication in high impact journals to increase visibility of the quality of faculty research. This needs to be a concerted, strategic effort to move faculty forward in publishing in journals that will give them and the department maximum exposure.

B4. Department of Nutritional Sciences

The Department of Nutritional Sciences recently drafted a new mission and vision statement. The Department's mission is to advance health and quality of life of individuals and communities and prepare professionals through education, discovery, and application of scientific knowledge. Its vision is to be internationally recognized for excellence in nutrition discovery, learning and dissemination. The department is well on its way to realizing these goals with a dynamic department head, talented faculty with a variety of expertise, and some of the best facilities to conduct modern nutrition research.

It was difficult for the team to review the PhD program in isolation from the MS program. The nutritional sciences faculty appear overwhelmed with the numbers entering the MS program and the advising burden. The department has 24 slots per year for internships that are coupled with the MS program. Approximately half of the students complete the MS after completing the internship. Those who complete the MS conduct a thesis. However, some movement has been made to limit the number of entering MS students to 18 and to link the internship with the MS completion. Moreover, a move has been made to let MS students choose a non-thesis option. The latter are positive curricular changes to alleviate some advising burdens. The department is correct in attempting to focus more on doctoral level training, while simultaneously trying to maintain some MS training, as MS students can be a source of future PhD students. In any event, it is clear that this faculty is supportive of graduate education and PhD training in particular.

The department is creatively and actively moving forward. Although strong, it will benefit from the stronger interdisciplinary focus of the College level PhD program as recommended. In addition, the team has identified specific department strengths, and challenges with recommendations to guide the department for the future.

Strengths:

1. Outstanding research facilities.
2. Adequate financial aid for graduate students to maintain a critical level.
3. Consistent grantsmanship by faculty.
4. A mix of senior, mid-level, and junior faculty.
5. Cooperative Extension involvement with PhD program.
6. Good start-up packages.
7. Some focus on signature areas (eg. Bone, trace minerals)
8. Consistent publication record of faculty.

9. New initiative with Intercollegiate Athletics for Assessment offers a revenue stream and practical training for all students including PhD students.

Recommendations:

1. Decrease emphasis on thesis based MS + Internship program and focus more on PhD program, even if this reduces the number of overall graduate students
 - a. The department has large enrollments at the undergraduate level and has a large MS enrollment, mostly due to the ADA approved Internship with an MS degree. In addition, the department offers a PhD in HES with an option in nutritional sciences. Currently the program has 18 PhD students.
 - b. The number of PhD students is driven by several factors: 1) numbers that apply; 2) a match between student and faculty mentor; 3) the number of faculty mentors who can advise graduate students; and 4) the fact that all PhD students accepted are supported.
2. Explore collaborative opportunities across in the College and the campus to engage other researchers in unique aspects of PhD program
 - a. Look toward expanding the program with other departments inside and outside the college. Opportunities and collaborations with nutrition faculty in agriculture and biochemistry and some of the social sciences would benefit the program if a university PhD nutrition program would be feasible.
 - b. A most significant aspect has been the long standing involvement of one state extension specialist with graduate education and the promise of new faculty with specialist assignment will also be involved with graduate education.
3. Consider novel ways of delivering didactic course information
 - a. Some of the outcomes that PhD students should achieve during their program include grantsmanship, peer refereed publications, teaching experience, working with outreach, research ethics and academic integrity, and research methods and statistics. Whether this is delivered by course work or experiential learning should be left to the faculty.
 - b. The program does have a core program of study, albeit minimal. Along with recommendation made in College recommendation (A1 b) some consideration should be given to developing PhD level classes that are 1 credit and taught 3 times per week for 6 weeks on focused topics (nutritional immunology, cancer and nutrition, molecular aspects of nutrient control, etc). This is a modular approach used by the University of Illinois in its doctoral program in nutrition.
4. Expand competitive funding potential with submission to USDA national needs fellowships and/or Higher Education Challenge grants.
5. Develop a consistent admission process with clear criteria and work with College to standardize
 - a. Admission standards for the PhD program is rather non-descript. The graduate coordinator receives the applications and tries to match the applicants to faculty members. Faculty members evaluate the applicants based on potential student interest. There is no minimum required for the GRE even though it is required. The applicants do have a statement of research interest from which the potential faculty can make some informed evaluation. Sometimes a phone call between the

faculty and applicant occurs. If a faculty member does not accept an applicant, the graduate coordinator will route the application to another faculty if there is a potential fit, otherwise the applicant is rejected for admission.

6. Work with College to develop a recruitment and marketing plan
 - a. The department appears to have a good self image with respect to “signature areas,” namely bone and nutrition, trace element metabolism and those diseases associated with aging. These avenues should be used to recruit and market the program to prospective students. Moreover, in addition to the signature areas, there needs to be a more aggressive recruiting of PhD students occurring, and using the signature areas could be a useful tool. It is clear that the department and college do have resources to support GTAs and GRAs as well as tuition support from the university. This makes a strong supportive financial environment for graduate students. Funds are available for graduate students to attend national meetings.
 - b. There is evidence of success of obtaining extramural funding even among junior faculty which bodes well for them in such a tight fiscal environment.
7. Prioritize department goals and allocate faculty work load appropriately to meet multiple priorities
 - a. There are many new hires and junior faculty members in the department. It is critical that the department focus its efforts on mentoring faculty through tenure and promotion.
 - b. It is vitally important to recognize that it may be premature for the unit to have a separate PhD program. Here it is more important to first develop the faculty so they can achieve a level of external support to expand the number of PhD students to about 22 to 24 per year and graduate 4 to 5 new students per year. This can even be done currently by shifting resources from the MS to the PhD program.
 - c. Given the limited funding overall from external agencies, the department should consider having less overall graduate students, but focus on PhD training first and limit the number of MS students to those desiring a research outcome.
8. Support unfunded research with space as appropriate.

V. APPENDIX – Itinerary for On-site Review Visit

October 5, Sunday

Afternoon - Review Team to arrive in Stillwater

6:30 pm - Private Reception and Dinner with administrators of the College of Human Environmental Sciences, Provost, and Dean of the Graduate College. From CHES: Dean **Stephan M. Wilson**; Dr. **Christine Johnson**, Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies; Dr. **Shiretta Ownbey**, Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Services; Dr. **Glenn Muske**, Interim Associate Dean & Assistant Director for Cooperative Extension – Family and Consumer Sciences; Dr. **Randall Russ**, Interim Department Head, Design, Housing and Merchandising; Dr. **Byoungho Jin**, Graduate Coordinator for Design, Housing and Merchandising; Dr. **Sue Williams**, Department Head, Human Development and Family Science; Dr. **Laura Hubbs Tait**, Graduate Coordinator for Human Development and Family Science; Dr. **Richard Ghiselli**, School Director, Hotel and Restaurant Administration; Dr. **Radesh Palakurthi**, Graduate Coordinator for Hotel and Restaurant Administration; Dr. **Nancy Betts**, Department Head, Nutritional Sciences; Dr. **Brenda Smith**, Graduate Coordinator for Nutritional Sciences; Dr. **Marlene Strathe**, Provost & Senior Vice President; Dr. **Gordon Emslie**, Dean of the Graduate College.

Rancher's Club, on campus at the Atherton Hotel, Student Union

October 6, Monday

8:30-9:20am	- Dean Stephan M. Wilson	106D HES
9:30-10:20am	- Dr. Gordon Emslie, Dean of the Graduate College; and Dr Mark Payton, Associate Dean of the Graduate College	202 Whitehurst
10:30-11:20am	- CHES Graduate Council	106D HES
11:30am-1:00pm	- Lunch with PhD Students (2-DHM, 3-HDFS, 3-HRAD, 2NSCI)	Joe's Room of Taylor's Dining Room, 210
1:00-2:20 pm	- Review Team interactive time	106D HES
2:30-3:20 pm	- Drs. Glenn Muske, Associate Dean for Cooperative Extension-FCS; Shiretta Ownbey, Associate Dean for Academic Programs and Services; and Christine Johnson, Associate Dean for Research & Graduate Studies	106D HES
3:30-4:20 pm	- Design, Housing and Merchandising (DHM) Graduate Faculty	106D HES
4:30-5:00 pm	- Tour of DHM facilities by Randall Russ, Interim Department Head	

Evening - Review Team interactive time

October 7, Tuesday

8:30-9:00am - Tour of Graduate student TA offices and funded Graduate RA offices 3rd Floor Scott Hall

9:15-9:45am - Tour of NSCI facilities by Nancy Betts, Department Head

10:00-10:50am - Dr. Marlene Strathe, Provost & Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs 101 WH

11:00-11:50am - Nutritional Sciences (NSCI) Graduate Faculty 106D HES

12:00 - Working team lunch 106D HES

2:00-2:50pm - Human Development & Family Science (HDFS) Graduate Faculty 229 HES

3:00-3:25pm - Tour of HDFS facilities by Sue Williams, Department Head

3:30-4:20pm - Hotel & Restaurant Administration (HRAD) Graduate Faculty 106D HES

4:30-5:00 pm - Tour of HRAD facilities by Richard Ghiselli, School Director

Evening - Review Team develops executive report

October 8, Wednesday

8:30-9:20am - Exit meeting with Dean Wilson 106D HES

9:30-10:20am - Report to Dean Wilson and Executive Group 106D HES

10:30-11:30am - Report to College Faculty 326 HES

11:45am - Review Team departs for airport