

**Purdue University**

**College of Technology**

**Department of Organizational Leadership  
and Supervision**

**Strategic Plan**

**2001-2008**

Rev. 1/14/2004

# Department of Organization Leadership and Supervision

## Strategic Plan

### 2001-2008

*For discussion only – baseline and targets are yet to be determined for many variables, charts are incomplete and data is either in the process of being obtained or verified]*

#### Preamble

The Department of Organizational Leadership and Supervision (OLS) was established in response to the nation's call for an increased number of first-line manufacturing production supervisors during World War II. Through the years, the Department of Organizational Leadership and Supervision evolved to accommodate the changing needs of business and industry, governments, and communities.

Innovation, adaptation, and adoption determine, to a large degree, the economic fate of nations, business, and industry. The key to survival for many organizations is the ability to capitalize on the potential of advancing new knowledge/technology. In spite of its promise, however, new knowledge and technology transfer and assimilation demands substantial changes in the way in which organizations operate. Successful organizations recognize that the introduction of new knowledge/technology alone does not guarantee or advance organizational survival. Rather, successful organizations recognize that when new knowledge/technology is introduced, there is generally a counterbalancing human response which requires *leadership* in the management of the change.

While the benefits of adopting a new knowledge/technology are undeniable, human factors and organizational relationships either enhance or constrain potential quality, productivity, and financial gains. Successful organizations do not put their faith in new knowledge/technology (the "hard-sided" elements of operations) alone. Successful organizations know that human considerations (the "soft-sided" elements of operations) are of equal importance and often demand even greater attention than technology. Successful organizations know that even if they can justify the purchase of new knowledge/technology based on projected gains, they must still implement and integrate it successfully in order to realize its benefits.

According to research, the need to focus on such "high-touch" people-driven considerations is greatly pronounced in today's "high-tech" e-Business environments. In today's e-Business environments, professionals must be adept at communicating new knowledge/technology and interacting with individuals in all areas of an organization, and, often, with individuals from all corners of the world. Today's e-Business environments demand that professionals acquire both "high-tech" and "high-touch" competencies.

Historically, leadership was regarded as an inherent trait and/or an ability of people holding specific organizational positions. Today it is regarded as a capability and process that can be taught, nurtured and developed. Rather than being perceived as a role expected only of a few in organizations, today it is regarded as a key role and responsibility of everyone. Today, organizations seek leadership talent and encourage continuous leadership development in an effort to realize their full potential. People who are employed with or come to acquire leadership competencies that are based on knowledge, skills, behaviors, and experiences add value to organizations by taking actions that result in organizational gains. More than an individual competency, leadership is regarded as a valued

organizational competency. More than an organizational competency, leadership is regarded as national asset.

### **Values, Cultures, and Shared Principles**

The Department of Organization Leadership and Supervision's mission is grounded in the following land-grant institution values and shared principles:

- Providing talented faculty, staff, and students career enhancing opportunities
- Supporting the growth and development of a diverse student body, faculty, and staff
- Providing undergraduates and graduate students with a quality learning experience
- Providing opportunities for faculty, undergraduates, and graduate students to conduct applied research and scholarship
- Engaging in partnership with business and industry, government and communities for mutual benefit

### **Mission**

The mission of the Department of Organizational Leadership and Supervision is to develop professional practitioners, conduct applied research and scholarship, and provide access to faculty expertise in organizational leadership and human resource development through:

- **Learning:** OLS promotes learning by providing a variety of instructional settings whereby students and faculty explore and students acquire requisite leadership knowledge, skills, and behaviors
- **Discovery:** Grounded in theoretical, empirical, and applied methods, OLS seeks to conduct and disseminate results of research and scholarship of faculty and students to advance the body of organizational leadership and human resource development
- **Engagement:** Through its programs and people, OLS provides expertise to business and industry, government and communities for enhancing social and economic development

### **Vision**

The Department of Organizational Leadership and Supervision will be nationally recognized as a primary source for organizations seeking leadership talent, applied research and scholarship, and access to faculty expertise in organizational leadership and human resource development.

Program characteristics include:

- Creating and delivering high-quality undergraduate and graduate degree programs in organizational leadership and human resource development through learning, discovery, and engagement initiatives that are responsive to the changing needs of employers and society throughout the State of Indiana, the nation, and around the world
- Recruiting and retaining an outstanding, diverse faculty skilled in interactive learning methods, quantitative and qualitative research, and forging partnerships with business and industry, government and community organizations
- Collaborating with colleagues within and across disciplines, and in partnership with business and industry, government and communities to enhance learning, discovery, and engagement opportunities

### **Future Directions**

The Department of Organizational Leadership and Supervision (OLS) *focuses on organizational leadership and human resource development, and technology transfer and policy in business and industry, governments, and communities.* As one of eight departments that comprise the School of Technology, the Department of Organizational Leadership and Supervision supports and aligns its resources and efforts in support of the College of Technology's signature areas and further defines its areas of excellence within the signature areas.

College of Technology Signature Areas:

- Advanced Manufacturing
- Intelligent Healthcare Systems and Technology
- Life Sciences Based Technology
- Security and Forensics

Areas of Excellence within the Department of Organizational Leadership and Supervision include:

- Change management
- Ethics
- Workforce development
- Mentoring/coaching
- Training
- Program Assessment
- Technology transfer and policy
- Communications

### **Peer Institutions**

The Department of Organizational Leadership is an interdisciplinary program that draws upon curriculum most often presented in business programs, organizational psychology, human resources, and technology management departments. Peer institutions and programs identified include:

- University of Minnesota – Human Resource Education
- University of Illinois – Human Resource Development
- Texas A&M – Human Resources
- University of Richmond, Jepson School of Leadership

### **Priorities**

The School of Technology has identified strategic priorities that will enable the School to fulfill its mission and vision. Supporting and aligning with the School of Technology priorities, the Department of Organizational Leadership and Supervision priorities are identified as:

- Priority 1: Hiring and retaining outstanding faculty and staff
- Priority 2: Recruiting and retaining outstanding undergraduate and graduate students
- Priority 3: Developing a relevant undergraduate curricula
- Priority 4: Supporting the TECH graduate program; developing a relevant graduate curricula

- Priority 5: Developing and supporting discovery opportunities for faculty and students
- Priority 6: Developing and supporting engagement opportunities for faculty and students
- Priority 7: Increasing development/advancement efforts

**Department of Organizational Leadership and Supervision  
Strategic Plan: 2001-08**

[The OLS Strategic Plan: 2001-08 is a living document reflecting accomplishments from 2001 projected through 2008. As a living document, the establishment of priorities and data reported reflect a particular point in time and are subject to change. As of January 2005, priorities and goals are established. Operational actions and allocations/reallocations are identified in support of attaining priorities and goals. Metrics identified are designed to indicate progress toward goals.]

**Priority 1: Hiring and retaining outstanding faculty and staff to support learning, discovery, and engagement**

**Goal 1.1: Offer competitive salary and benefits**

- Metrics 1.1:
- a. Salary and compensation of new OLS hires, accounting for level of terminal degree, compared to Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP) data over time
  - b. Salary and compensation of OLS faculty compared to peer institutions across rank, accounting for level of terminal degree, and years of service
  - c. Salary and compensation of OLS faculty compared to sister departments in the College of Technology

**1.1a: OLS New Assistant Professor Salary Compared to SIOP Data**

	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
<b>West Lafayette</b>							
<b>New Assistant Professors</b>	\$44,000			\$55,000			
<b>Ph.D.</b>							
<b>M.S.</b>							
<b>Statewide System</b>							
<b>New Assistant Professor</b>				\$50,000			
<b>Ph.D.</b>							
<b>M.S.</b>							
<b>SIOP</b>							
<b>New Assistant Professor</b>	\$60,000*						
<b>Ph.D.</b>	\$86,000						
<b>M.S.</b>	\$58,000						

Note: Based on 1999-2000 data, an average was calculated.\* Data was reported by level of terminal degree.

**1.1b: OLS Salary Compared to Peer Institutions Across Rank**

	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
<b>West Lafayette</b>							
Assistant	\$44,000	\$49,710	\$53,750	\$56,618			
Associate	\$50,709	\$53,191	\$55,379	\$55,082			
Professor	\$65,285	\$69,983	\$71,272	\$72,671			
<b>Statewide System</b>							
Assistant	\$43,654	\$47,375	\$48,829	\$50,348			
Associate	\$48,924	\$50,414	\$52,771	\$54,761			
Professor	0	0	0	0			
<b>COT</b>							
Assistant	\$51,373	\$57,200	\$54,354				
Associate	\$57,542	\$59,307	\$61,435				
Professor	\$71,163	\$77,047	\$78,865				
<b>Purdue University</b>							
Assistant	\$56,743	\$58,053	\$60,587				
Associate	\$63,181	\$65,168	\$68,638				
Professor	\$90,065	\$92,584	\$96,597				
<b>Peer Institutions</b>							
<b>University of Minnesota: Human Resource Education</b>							
Assistant							
Associate							
Professor							
<b>University of Illinois: Human Resource Development</b>							
Assistant							
Associate							
Professor							
<b>Texas A &amp; M University: Educational Administration and Human Resources</b>							
Assistant							
Associate							
Professor							
<b>University of Richmond, Jepson School of Leadership</b>							
Assistant							
Associate							
Professor							

Note: Data represents all disciplines at the University and School level

**1.1c: OLS Salary Compared to COT Sister Departments Across Rank**

	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
<b>West Lafayette</b>							
Assistant	\$44,000	\$49,710	\$53,750	\$56,618			
Associate	\$50,709	\$53,191	\$55,379	\$55,082			
Professor	\$65,285	\$69,983	\$71,272	\$72,671			
<b>Statewide System</b>							
Assistant	\$43,654	\$47,375	\$48,829	\$50,348			
Associate	\$48,924	\$50,414	\$52,771	\$54,761			
Professor	0	0	0	0			
<b>Aviation Technology</b>							
Assistant							
Associate							
Professor							
<b>Building Construction Management</b>							
Assistant							
Associate							
Professor							
<b>Computer Technology</b>							
Assistant							
Associate							
Professor							
<b>Computer Graphics Technology</b>							
Assistant							
Associate							
Professor							
<b>Electrical and Computing Engineering Technology</b>							
Assistant							
Associate							
Professor							
<b>Industrial Technology</b>							
Assistant							
Associate							
Professor							
<b>Mechanical Engineering Technology</b>							
Assistant							
Associate							
Professor							

**1.1d: OLS Start-up Package Compared to Peer Institutions Over Time**

	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
<b>West Lafayette</b>				\$5-10,000			
<b>Statewide System</b>				\$5-10,000			
<b>Peer Institutions</b>							
<b>University of Minnesota: Human Resource Education</b>							
<b>University of Illinois: Human Resource Development</b>							
<b>Texas A &amp; M University: Educational Administration and Human Resources</b>							
<b>University of Richmond, Jepson School of Leadership</b>							

Note: not including department head

Base/Targets 1.1: a. see Tables 1.1.a - 1.1d

- Actions 1.1:
- a. Hire new faculty at competitive salaries based on SIOP and peer institutional data
  - b. Develop case of relative value of OLS faculty compared to faculty in sister departments in College of Technology
  - c. Offer start-up packages competitive with peer institutions

Allocations/ 1.1: a. \$53,500K-\$55,000K for new Assistant Professors (Ph.D., no prior faculty experience, Ph.D.)

Reallocations b. \$5-\$10 K for start-up package

**Goal 1.2: Retain and reward faculty based on valued productivity**

- Metrics 1.2: a. Percentage merit raise in proportion to productivity based on annual performance evaluation

**1.2: OLS Salary by Productivity Score Based on Annual Performance Evaluation**

(To be developed)
-------------------

Base/Targets 1.2: a. [In process of development]

- Actions 1.2:
- a. As part of the OLS Performance System, encourage faculty to align and set goals based on COT and OLS Strategic Plans
  - b. Assess initial merit raises based on faculty proportional contribution to the achievement of department and COT learning, discovery, and engagement goals as outlined in the COT and OLS Strategic Plans. Activities leading to learning, discovery, and engagement goals are

identified and defined in the COT Promotion and Tenure Handbook, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, and form the basis of the OLS Annual Review Process

- c. Distribute merit raises based on outcomes of annual performance evaluation
- d. Reward exceptional performers through special incentive programs based on programs' criteria, e.g., EMMEs, Provost's Strategic Plan Support, President's Annual Incentive Program

Allocations/ 1.2:  
Reallocations

- a. \$K – Merit raise funds, e.g., X% of the total OLS salary budget [WL and SW are calculated separately]
- b. \$K – Exceptional performer funds, e.g., funds received or reallocated to utilize special incentive programs, (e.g., EMMEs, Provost's Strategic Plan Support, President's Annual Incentive Program) [assumes funds are made available]

**Goal 1.3: Increase number of qualified full-time faculty**

- Metrics 1.3:
  - a. Number of full-time faculty members
  - b. Ratio of faculty to student contact hours

**1.3a: Base and Targets for Number of OLS Full Time Faculty**

Base/Target	West Lafayette	Anderson	Columbus	Kokomo	New Albany	Richmond	South Bend	Total
<b>2001-02</b>								
Fall	12.5	1	3	3	1	1	2	23.5
Spring	13.5	1	3	3	1	1	2	24.5
<b>2002-03</b>								
Fall	12.0	.5	3	3	1	1	2	22.5
Spring	12.0	.5	3	3	1	1	2	22.5
<b>2003-04</b>								
Fall	12.75	.5	3	3	1	0	3	23.25
Spring	13.75	.5	3	3	1	0	3	24.25
<b>2004-05</b>								
Fall	14.5	.5	3	3	0	1	2	24.0
Spring	14.5	.5	3	3	0	1	2	24.0
<b>2005-06</b>	15.5	1	3	3	1	1	2	26.5
<b>2006-07</b>	15.5	1	3	4	1	1	2	27.5
<b>2007-08</b>	16.5	1	3	4	2	1	2	29.5

Note: FTE includes Department Head and Location Directors. Academic year 2003-04 includes Visiting Professor

**1.3b-1: Ratio of Student Enrollment to Faculty FTE: West Lafayette**

	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08
Number of students						
Total student credit hours						
Faculty FTE						
Student FTE						
Student FTE/faculty ratio						

Note: Enrollment required to maintain/improve current level of program health and level of faculty

**1.3b-2: Ratio of Student Enrollment to Faculty FTE: Anderson**

	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08
Number of students	48	55	62	69	76.0	
Total student credit hours	375	541	608	676	745	
Faculty FTE	1.5	1.5	1.5	2.0	2.0	
Student FTE	25.0	36.1	40.0	45.0	50.0	
Student FTE/faculty ratio	16.7	24.0	26.6	22.5	25.0	

Note: Enrollment required to maintain/improve current level of program health and level of faculty

**1.3b-3: Ratio of Student Enrollment to Faculty FTE: Columbus/SE**

	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08
Number of students	141	130	139	149	158	
Total student credit hours	844	1038	1113	1188	1263	
Faculty FTE	3	3	3	3	3	
Student FTE	56.3	69.2	74.2	79.2	84.2	
Student FTE/faculty ratio	18.7	23.1	24.7	26.4	28.0	

Note: Enrollment required to maintain/improve current level of program health and level of faculty

**1.3b-4: Ratio of Student Enrollment to Faculty FTE: Kokomo/Lafayette**

	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08
Number of students	149	151	171	179	189	
Total student credit hours	1237	1288	1364	1439	1514	
Faculty FTE	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	
Student FTE	82.5	85.9	90.6	95.9	100.9	
Student FTE/faculty ratio	47.1	49.1	51.8	54.8	57.6	

Note: Enrollment required to maintain/improve current level of program health and level of faculty

**1.3b-5: Ratio of Student Enrollment to Faculty FTE: New Albany**

	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08
Number of students	44	39	47.6	57	66.4	
Total student credit hours	424	306	381	456.5	531.4	
Faculty FT-FTE	1	1	1	1	1	
Student FTE	28.3	20.4	25.4	30.4	35.4	
Student FTE/faculty ratio	28.3	20.4	25.4	30.4	35.4	

Note: Enrollment required to maintain/improve current level of program health and level of faculty

**1.3b-6: Ratio of Student Enrollment to Faculty FTE: Richmond**

	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08
Number of students	74	67	74	83.6	93	
Total student credit hours	437	519	594	669	744	
Faculty FTE	1	1	1	1	1	
Student FTE	29.1	34.6	39.6	44.6	49.6	
Ratio student FTE/faculty	29.1	34.6	39.6	44.6	49.6	

Note: Enrollment required to maintain/improve current level of program health and level of faculty

**1.3b-7: Ratio of Student Enrollment to Faculty FTE: South Bend**

	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08
Number of students	77	37	56	65	75	
Total student credit hours	329	275	450	525	600	
Faculty FT-FTE	2.25	2.25	2	2	2	
Student FTE	21.9	18.3	30.0	35.0	40.0	
Ratio student FTE/faculty	9.7	8.1	15.0	17.5	20.0	

Note: Enrollment required to maintain/improve current level of program health and level of faculty

Base/Targets 1.3: a. see Table 1.3a, 1.3b-1 through 1.3b-7

- Actions 1.3:
- a. Convert continuing lecturer/adjunct positions to full-time positions
  - b. Encourage faculty to be involved in enrollment drives, e.g., visit high schools, businesses and industries, hospitals to retain current level of faculty positions and potentially garner new ones
  - c. Petition Dean for new faculty lines as enrollment grows and in support of potential OLS contribution to COT signature areas and strategic initiatives
  - d. Support SW faculty transfers to balance student demand across locations under that condition that all parties involved in a potential transfer must agree to the transfer

Allocations/ 1.3: a. \$K from continuing lecturer/adjunct positions

Reallocations b. \$K for increased number of faculty lines, given enrollment growth

**Goal 1.4: Increase diversity representation of staff and faculty**

- Metrics 1.4:
- a. Number of diverse staff compared to population in SOT, Purdue, and Indiana populations in 2004
  - b. Number of diverse faculty compared to population in SOT, Purdue, and Indiana holding advanced degrees

**1.4a-1: Staff Baseline Diversity Statistics: 2003-04 (WL)**

	OLS(WL)	SOT	Purdue	Indiana
Black or African American	0%	0%	0%	8.40%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0%	0%	0%	.30%
Asian	0%	0%	2.85%	1.00%
Hispanic or Latino	0%	0%	1.42%	3.50%
Native Hawaiian/Islander	0%	0%	?%	?%
White	100%	100%	?%	?%
Multi-ethnic	0%	0%	?%	?%
Gender - Female	100%	?%	?%	?%

**1.4a-2: WL Staff Diversity Statistics Over Time**

	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
Total Staff			4	4			
Black or African American	0%	0%	0%	0%			
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0%	0%	0%	0%			
Asian	0%	0%	0%	0%			
Hispanic or Latino	0%	0%	0%	0%			
Female			4	4			
			100%	100%			

Note: Will seek to increase the number of qualified and diverse applicants

**1.4b: WL and SW Baseline and Target Faculty Diversity Statistics Over Time**

	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
Total Faculty			25	26	25.5	26	27
Black or African American	0%	0%	0%	1 (4%)			
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0%	0%	0%				1 (4%)
Asian (Visiting Professor from China)			1 (4%)				
Hispanic or Latino						1(4%)	
Female			10 (40%)	11 (42%)	10.5 (41.5%)	11.5 (44%)	12.5 (46%)
Male			15 (60%)	15 (58%)	15 (59%)	15 (56%)	15 (54%)

Note: Will seek to increase the number of qualified and diverse applicants

Base/Targets 1.4: a. see Tables 1.4a 1-2; 1.4b

- Actions 1.4: a-b. Advertise in ethnic-rich professional organizations
- c. Utilize Provost's diversity bridge program
- d. Seek joint hires with other departments and colleges

Allocations/ 1.4: a. \$3K advertising and moving costs  
 Reallocations

**Priority 2: Recruiting and retaining outstanding undergraduate and graduate students**

**Goal 2.1: Increase quality of undergraduate students**

Metrics 2.1: a. Undergraduates - SAT scores

**2.1: SAT Baseline and Target Scores of Undergraduates and Graduate Students Over Time**

	01-02		02-03		03-04		04-05		05-06		06-07		07-08	
Undergraduate SAT-Verbal/Math	V	M	V	M	V	M	V	M	V	M	V	M	V	M
Purdue University	551/585		555/595		558/591		556/598							
School of Technology	531/574		539/589		549/580		541/576							
OLS West Lafayette	474/477		523/556		521/557		510/545		515/550		515/550		515/550	
OLS Statewide	458/465		485/472		484/494		478/493		483/498		483/498		483/498	
<b>Graduate students - GRE</b>							1,000		1,025		1,025		1,025	

Base/Targets 2.1: a. see Table 2.1

- Actions 2.1: a. Accept University-established minimum as OLS minimum [minimum for acceptance may vary based on student demand and additional considerations as defined by the University and COT]  
 b. Increase advertising efforts

Allocations/: a. \$1 K for advertising  
 Reallocations

**Goal 2.2 Increase quality of graduate students**

**2.2: GRE Baseline and Target Scores of Graduate Students Over Time**

	01-02		02-03		03-04		04-05		05-06		06-07		07-08	
Graduate Student GRE SAT-Verbal/Math	V	M	V	M	V	M	V	M	V	M	V	M	V	M
Purdue University														
School of Technology														
OLS							1,000		+		+		+	

Metrics 2.2 a. Graduate students – GRE scores

- Actions 2.2 a: Accept COT-established minimum as OLS minimum, applicants in Fortieth Percentile of GRE [minimum for acceptance may vary based on student demand and additional considerations as defined by the University and COT]  
 b. Increase advertisement efforts

Allocations/:a. \$1 K for advertising  
 Reallocations

**Goal 2.3 Increase diversity within undergraduate student body**

- Metrics 2.3 a. Number of diverse students  
 b. Number of females and males

**2.3: WL Baseline and Target Undergraduate Student Diversity Statistics Over Time**

	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
<b>OLS</b>							
<b>Black or African American</b>	6.70%	7.20%	8.60%	9.00%			
<b>American Indian/Alaskan Native</b>	.70%	.60%	.70%	.60%			
<b>Asian</b>	2.10%	1.58%	3.15%	9.00%			
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	2.75%	2.00%	1.50%	1.50%			
<b>Caucasian</b>	92.90%	96.15%	91.57%	92.90%			
<b>Other</b>	.50%	.60%	1.30%	1.10%			
<b>Unreported</b>	2.90%	1.0%	2.10%	2.40%			
<b>Female</b>	39	36%	38%	37.5%			
<b>Male</b>	71%	74%	72%	72.5%			
<b>SOT</b>							
<b>Black or African American</b>	2.00%	3.00%	3.00%	4.00%			
<b>American Indian/Alaskan Native</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%			
<b>Asian</b>	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%			
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%			
<b>Caucasian</b>	87.00%	87.00%	86.00%	87.00%			
<b>Other</b>	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%			
<b>Unreported</b>	2.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%			
<b>Female</b>	15.00%	15.00%	13.00%	12.00%			
<b>Male</b>	85%	85%	87%	88%			

<b>Purdue University</b>							
<b>Black or African American</b>	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%			
<b>American Indian/Alaskan Native</b>	.00%	.00%	.00%	.00%			
<b>Asian</b>	4.00%	4.00%	5.00%	5.00%			
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%			
<b>Caucasian</b>	81.00%	80.00%	80.00%	80.00%			
<b>Other</b>	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%			
<b>Unreported</b>	2.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%			
<b>Female</b>	42.00%	42.00%	41.00%	41.00%			
<b>Male</b>	58.00%	58.00%	59.00%	59.00%			

- Actions 2.3:
- a. Support and participate in diversity recruiting programs on campus
  - b. Support and participate in University and COT student diversity initiatives

- Allocations/ 2.3:  
Reallocations
- a. \$1K advertising

#### **Goal 2.4 Increase diversity within graduate student body**

- Metrics 2.4
- a. Number of diverse students
  - b. Number of females and males

#### **2.4: WL Baseline and Target Graduate Student Diversity Statistics Over Time**

	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
<b>OLS</b>							
<b>Black or African American</b>							
<b>American Indian/Alaskan Native</b>							
<b>Asian</b>							
<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>							
<b>Caucasian</b>							
<b>Other</b>							
<b>Unreported</b>							
<b>Female</b>							
<b>Male</b>							

SOT							
Black or African American							
American Indian/Alaskan Native							
Asian							
Hispanic or Latino							
Caucasian							
Other							
Unreported							
Female							
Male							
Purdue University							
Black or African American							
American Indian/Alaskan Native							
Asian							
Hispanic or Latino							
Caucasian							
Other							
Unreported							
Female							
Male							

- Actions 2.4:
- a. Support and participate in diversity recruiting programs on campus
  - b. Support and participate in University and COT student diversity initiatives

Allocations/ 2.4:  
Reallocations

- a. \$1K advertising

**Goal 2.5 Balance Freshman, CODOs and transfer students, and graduate student enrollments**

- Metric 2.5:
- a. Number of freshmen
  - b. Number of CODOs and transfer students
  - c. Number of graduate students

## 2.5: Base and Targets Undergraduate and Graduate Enrollment Over Time

<b>Undergraduate Enrollment/Retention</b>	<b>01-02</b>	<b>02-03</b>	<b>03-04</b>	<b>04-05</b>	<b>05-06</b>	<b>06-07</b>	<b>07-08</b>
Number of Freshmen				48	30	50	50
Number of CODOs and TS				459	468	468	468
Percentage of retained students				100%	100%	100%	100%
Total number of students		528	488	507	498	498	498
<b>Graduate Student Enrollment/Retention</b>							
Number of graduate students				23	23	25	25
Percentage of retained graduate students				100%	100%	100%	100%

Base/Targets 2.5: a. see Table 2.5 Student Body

Action 2.5:

- Enlarge Freshmen Class
- Recruit CODOs in OLS service courses
- Recruit CODOs in University Division
- Attend functions designed for recruitment, e.g., State Fair, Day on Campus, etc.
- Develop and offer OLS 100: Introduction to OLS
- Support TECH 100: Women in Technology
- Update and distribute OLS undergraduate and graduate brochures
- Offer Teaching and Research Assistant ships based on funding available

Allocation/ 2.5:  
Reallocations

- 25% of one faculty to support both OLS 100: Introduction to OLS and TECH 100: Women in Technology
- \$250 student/faculty mixers
- \$500 student organization events, e.g., PAL, SIFE
- \$1K advertising

## Goal 2.6 Balance OLS undergraduate and graduate student demand with service to the University and COT

Metrics 2.6:

- Number of majors, A.S. and B.S.
- Number of graduate students in OLS Area of Specialization
- Number of minors (service)
- Number of non-OLS technology students
- Number of non-Technology students

## 2.6: Demand for Seats in OLS Courses: Baseline and Targets

	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
<b>OLS Enrollment Demand by majors*</b>	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
<b>OLS Graduate Student Enrollment Demand</b>				25	25	25	25
<b>Non-OLS Technology Demand</b>	1,056	897	704				
<b>University Demand outside Technology</b>	3,009	2,933	2,396		4,000	4,000	4,000

Note: \*Assumes 500 OLS majors taking 6 courses a year demanding 3,000 seats.  
 Drop in non-OLS technology students is due to decrease in dual degree seekers in Technology.  
 Drop in university demand was due to confusion experienced during transitions from old to new minor, e.g., different courses, different course numbers, adjusting to increase in required total credit hours.  
 OLS upper level course were restricted to majors only or open only to those departments that negotiated space in advance with the schedule deputy, or on a name-raise basis by faculty member in charge.

Base/Targets 2.6: a-d. see Table 2.6

- Actions 2.6:
- Meet student demand through large lecture plus recitation in OLS 252 and 274; meet student demand through large lecture in OLS 284; meet student demand through multiple sections of OLS 386 and 385 [students must meet prerequisites for 386 and 388]
  - Beyond 200 level courses, limit enrollment to 35-50 to support University interest in quality undergraduate teaching [U.S. News and World Report defines courses over 50 as large when calculating university rankings, e.g., student to instructor ratio. University monitors actions affecting quality its national ranking]
  - Schedule to meet OLS demand first; COT undergraduate and graduate demand second; University demand third

- Allocations/ 2.6: a. Continuing Lecturers assigned to OLS 252, 274, 284 [full-time Reallocations faculty are discouraged from teaching OLS 252, 274, 284 due to expectations that they contribute, in addition to COT and departmental learning/teaching goals, to the COT and departmental discovery and engagement goals]

## Goal 2.7 Develop articulation agreement between Ivy Tech campuses OLS programs

- Metrics 2.7:
- Progress on Articulation Timeline, see Table 2.7a
  - Number of transfer students from Ivy Tech, see Table 2.7b

### 2.7a: Ivy Tech Articulation Timeline

Base/Target	Activity
2001-02	Explore issues related to Ivy Tech Articulation – Assign to Curriculum Subcommittee
2002-03	Develop Ivy Tech Articulation Agreement
2003-04	Submit Ivy Tech Articulation Agreement to Dean
2004-05	Revise Ivy Tech Articulation Agreement
2005-06	<i>Submit Ivy Tech Articulation Agreement to Dean</i>
2006-07	<i>Develop Ivy Tech contacts and relationships in support of inter-institutional grants</i>
2007-08	<i>Develop and submit grants in support of a transfer programs between IVY Tech and Purdue</i>

### 2.7b: Over Time, Number of Ivy Tech Transfer Students to Statewide Locations

Base/Target	West Lafayette	Anderson	Columbus	Kokomo	New Albany	Richmond	South Bend	Total
2001-02								
2002-03								
2003-04								
2004-05					10			
2005-06	0	10	10	10	15	10	10	65
2006-07	0	15	15	15	20	15	15	95
2007-08	0	20	20	20	25	20	20	20

Note: IvyTech/OLS test site, 2004-05, New Albany

Base/Targets 2.7: a. See Table 2.7a-b

Actions 2.7: a. See Table 2.7a  
b. Determine baseline

Allocations/ 2.7: a. \$500 to develop relationship with Ivy Tech  
Reallocations

**Priority 3: Developing an effective and relevant undergraduate curriculum and serving the student body**

**Goal 3.1: Certify quality of undergraduate programs, A.S. and B.S.**

- Metrics 3.1: a. Accreditation by nationally recognized agency, or conduct a self-study against peer institutions  
 [The process of accreditation includes customarily accepted metrics such as graduating senior satisfaction, alumni satisfaction, employer satisfaction, advisory council review, self-study, etc.; ergo, many sub-metrics are included in this metric.]

**3.1: Program Accreditation Plan**

Base/Target	Activity
2004-2005	Conduct accreditation preliminaries
2005-2006	<i>Develop a self-study report for compliance with standards</i>
2006-2007	<i>Submit program review for evaluation and hold campus visit</i>
2007-2008	<i>Accreditation: Full</i>

- Base/Targets 3.1: a. see Table 3.1 Accreditation Timeline

- Actions 3.1: a. Discuss accreditation options with faculty  
 b. Employ accreditation advisor and set up meetings with faculty  
 c. Discuss accreditation fees with Dean

- Allocations/ 3.1: a. \$500 for advisor  
 Reallocation b. \$4K for accreditation expenses, to be shared with Dean’s office  
 c. Appropriate time to WL, Chair of Curriculum Committee

**Goal 3.2: Provide faculty and students with enriching cross cultural and global opportunities**

- Metrics 3.2: a. Number of international exchange programs involved  
 b. Number of foreign exchange faculty received  
 c. Number of OLS faculty involved in international assignments  
 d. Number of OLS students involved in international opportunities, e.g., exchanges, summer study abroad, international internships  
 e. Number of international students received

### 3.2: International Undergraduate Program Activity

Baseline/Targets	01-02	02-03	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
Number of international undergraduate exchange programs		0	1	1	1	2	2	2
Number of foreign exchange undergraduate faculty received		0	1	0	0	0	1	1
Number of OLS undergraduate faculty involved in international assignments		2	5	5	5	5	5	5
Number of OLS undergraduate students involved in international exchanges or summer study abroad programs and international internships		5	8	14	14	15	15	15
Number of foreign exchange undergraduate students received		1	3	8	5	6	8	10

Base/Targets 3.2: a. see Table 3.2

- Actions 3.2:
- Identify and seek relationships with appropriate international universities, e.g., Tongji University, Shanghai, China; Tianjin University, Tianjin, China; Dublin Institute of Technology, Dublin, Ireland; Fachhochschule of Aachen, Germany; South Bank, London, England; Loughborough University, London, England; University of Kingston, England, India Institute of Technology at Mumbai, India
  - Develop proposals in support of international programs
  - Seek international student internships and opportunities for faculty sabbaticals through members of OLS Advisory Council, e.g., Motorola Headquarters, Beijing, China; Motorola Assembly Plant, Tianjin, University
  - Encourage faculty and students to apply for Fulbright Scholarships

Allocations/ 3.2: a. International Exchange Programs will be self-supported by grants. Funds may be used to support curriculum Reallocations development, exchange agreements, faculty and student travel

### Goal 3.3 Develop undergraduate Honors Program

Metric 3.3: a. Progress on Honors Program, see Table 3.3

### 3.3: Undergraduate Honors Program Plan

Base/Target	Activity
2004-2005	Determine faculty support Identify issues
2005-2006	<i>Develop and Implement program</i>

Baseline/Targets 3.3: a. see Table 3.3

- Actions 3.3:
- a. Determine faculty support
  - b. Identify issues with faculty
  - c. Develop and implement program (assuming support)

Allocations/ 4.1: a. % time WL, Chair of Curriculum Committee  
Reallocation

**Priority 4: Supporting TECH graduate programs, developing a relevant graduate curriculum and serving graduate student body**

**Goal 4.1: Certify quality of OLS involvement in TECH graduate programs, M.S. and Ph.D.**

- Metrics 4.1: a. Meet accreditation standards of a nationally recognized agency by conducting a self-study against peer institutions  
 [The process of accreditation includes customarily accepted metrics such as graduating senior satisfaction, alumni satisfaction, employer satisfaction, advisory council review, self-study, etc.; ergo, many sub-metrics are included in this metric.]

**4.1: Certification Plan**

Base/Target	Activity
2004-2005	Determine faculty support Identify issues Identify accreditation agency; conduct preliminaries
2005-2006	<i>Develop a self-study report for compliance with standards</i>

Note: The process of accreditation includes customarily accepted metrics such as graduating senior satisfaction, placement data, salary of new graduates, alumni satisfaction, employer satisfaction, industrial advisory review, self-study, etc; ergo, many “sub-metrics” are included in this metric.

- Base/Targets 4.1: a. see Table 4.1

- Actions 4.1: a. Discuss accreditation options with faculty, determine support  
 b. Employ accreditation advisor and set up meetings with faculty  
 c. Discuss accreditation fees with Dean

- Allocations/ 4.1: a. \$500 for advisor  
 Reallocation b. \$4K for accreditation expenses, to be shared with Dean’s office  
 c. 25% time WL, Chair of Curriculum Committee

**Goal 4.2: Continue to support TECH MA and Ph.D. Programs through OLS Area of Specialization**

- Metrics 4.2: a. Number of OLS graduate courses offered  
 b. Number of students in OLS graduate courses  
 c. Number of Tech M.S. students seeking OLS Area of Specialization  
 d. Number of Tech Ph.D. students seeking OLS Area of Specialization

#### 4.2: OLS Involvement in TECH M.S. Program

	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
<b>Courses Offered</b>				6	6	6	6
<b>Students in OLS Courses</b>				90	90	90	90
<b>OLS M.S. students</b>				23	25	25	25
<b>OLS Ph.D. students</b>				3	3	3	3

Base/Target 4.2: a. see Table 4.2

- Actions 4.2: a. Continue to offer OLS courses in evening and weekend programs  
b. Recruit students

Allocations/ 4.2: a. 25% of faculty time per course  
Reallocations

#### Goal 4.3: Develop OLS Masters and Ph.D. programs

- Metrics 4.3: a. Development of MS curriculum  
b. Number of courses developed and approved  
c. Develop Field of Study  
d. Develop MS program

#### 4.3: Master Program Timeline

Base/Target	Activity
2002-03	Graduate Committee conducted benchmark study
2002-XXX	Developing, revising, and approving OLS courses [This is an on-going process, course are expected to be revised and new courses proposed for consideration by the OLS Graduate Committee]
2004-05	Develop and submit proposal for Field of Study under MS TECH
2005-06	Determine faculty support Identify issues <i>Develop proposal for MS degree</i>
2006-07	<i>Submit MS proposal for feedback to SOT Graduate Office and Purdue Graduate Office</i>
2007-08	<i>Awarded OLS MS degree program</i>
2008-09	<i>Seek accreditation of M.S. program [Consider developing Ph.D. program]</i>

Base/Targets 4.3: a. see Table 4.3 M.S. Timeline

- Actions 4.3: a. Determine level of graduate faculty support  
b. If supported, develop proposal  
c. Recruit students

Allocations/ 4.3: a. 25% time to WL, Chair of Graduate Committee  
Reallocations

**Goal 4.4: Provide graduate faculty and graduate students with enriching cross cultural and global opportunities**

- Metrics 4.4:
- a. Number of international exchange programs involved
  - b. Number of foreign exchange faculty received
  - c. Number of OLS faculty involved in international assignments
  - d. Number of OLS students involved in international opportunities, e.g., exchanges, summer study abroad, international internships
  - e. Number of international students received

**4.4: International Graduate Program Activity**

Baseline/Targets	01-02	02-03	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
Number of international graduate exchange programs		0	0	0	0	1	2	2
Number of foreign exchange graduate faculty received		0	0	1	0	1	1	1
Number of OLS graduate faculty involved in international assignments		2	5	5	5			
Number of OLS graduate students involved in international exchanges or summer study abroad programs and international internships		5	8	2	4	4	4	4
Number of foreign exchange graduate students received		1	3	2	1	2	2	2

Base/Targets 4.4: a. see Table 4.4

- Actions 4.4:
- a. Identify and seek relationships with appropriate international universities, e.g., Tongi University, Shanghai, China; Tianjin University, Tianjin, China; Dublin Institute of Technology, Dublin, Ireland; Fachhochschule of Aachen, Germany; South Bank, London, England; Loughborough University, London, England; University of Kingston, England, India Institute of Technology at Mumbai, India
  - b. Develop proposals in support of international programs
  - c. Seek international student internships and opportunities for faculty sabbaticals through members of OLS Advisory Council, e.g., Motorola Headquarters, Beijing, China; Motorola Assembly Plant, Tianjin, University
  - d. Encourage faculty and students to apply for Fulbright Scholarships

Allocations/ 4.4:  
 Reallocations

- a. International Exchange Programs will be self-supported by grants. Funds may be used to support develop curriculum, exchange agreements, faculty and student travel

## Priority 5: Developing scholarship and applied research opportunities

### Goal 5.1: Increase faculty and undergraduate and graduate student involvement in scholarship

- Metrics 5.1:
- a. Number of national textbooks
  - b. Number of refereed journal articles
  - c. Number of refereed conference proceedings
  - d. Number of reviewed conference proceedings
  - e. Number of professional journal articles or technical reports
  - f. Number of invited papers
  - g. Number of published abstracts
  - h. Number of published reviews
  - i. Number of presentations without publishing
  - j. Number of editorships
  - k. Number of times served as reviewer for journal, conference, national funding agencies
  - l. Number of scholarship awards
  - m. Number of articles/papers published with students

#### 5.1: Number and Type of Publications

Baseline and Targets	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
National textbooks	4	4	5	5	6	6	6
Refereed journal articles	5	4	13	9	10	11	14
Refereed conference proceedings	19	22	11*	15	16	17	18
Reviewed conference proceedings	13	13	24	20	19	18	18
Trade journal article/technical report	1	3	2	2	2	2	4
Invited papers		5	1	2	2	2	3
Published abstracts		4	4	4	4	4	6
Published reviews	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Professional presentations w/o publishing	12	13	5	5	3	3	3
Editorships	1	0	1	1	2	2	2
Reviewer for journals/conference/agencies	6	4	11	8	8	8	8
Scholarship awards	1	0	1	0	1	1	1
Student co-authored papers	0	0	2	3	3	4	4

Note: \*ASEE proceedings were classified as refereed prior to 2003/04

Base/Target 5.1: a. see Table 5.1 Number and Type of Publications  
[Increased proportionately refereed journal articles and/or refereed conference proceeding with each new hire]

- Action 5.1:
- a. Encourage the development of supportive relationships that will result in collaborative research groups within and between departments on campus
  - b. Encourage involvement with Discovery and Research Park
  - c. Encourage faculty to attend grant writing workshops

- d. Encourage less faculty involvement in non-refereed publications while encouraging more involvement in refereed publications
- e. Present Minimum Workload options to faculty and accommodate preferences, if possible. 25-50% of a faculty member's time may be assigned to discovery, assumes faculty accept scholarship and grant expectations; assumes existing demand for OLS courses can be met with a reduction in time allocated to teaching
- f. Travel to funding agencies and conferences where presentations are to be published in a refereed conference proceeding or associate refereed journal, if resources permit
- g. Development of undergraduate honors program with focus on research
- h. Encourage faculty to publish with graduate students based on their collaborative work before graduation  
[issue of first authorship should be determined by who executes the majority of the writing for the article]

- Allocations/ 5.1:
- a. 25-50% of faculty time
- Reallocations
- b. \$12K faculty travel support  
[\$5.52K travel at \$500 each for Full and Associate Professors; \$4K at \$1K each for Assistant Professors. Travel for SW faculty is supported by SW budgets. When possible, WL may offer additional support.]
  - b. \$1K undergraduate and graduate student travel support [\$250 each]

**Goal 5.2: Increase Externally and Internally Sponsored Projects and Voluntary Support, Gifts-in-Kind activity**

- Metrics 5.2a: Externally funded grants
- a. Number of external grants submitted
  - b. Total dollar amount of all external grants submitted
  - c. Total dollar amount OLS requested of external grants submitted
  - d. Number of external grants funded
  - e. Total dollar amount OLS received from external grants funded

**5.2a: Externally Funded Projects (WL and SW)**

Base/Target	# WL Submitted	Total Amount Requested	OLS Amount Requested	# Funded	Amount Funded	# SW Submitted	Total Amount Requested	OLS - SW Amount Requested	# SW Funded	SW Amount Funded
2001-02	2	\$708,752	\$329,731	0	\$0					
2002-03	2	\$2,324,490	\$809,796	1	\$13,263					
2003-04	7	\$934,754	\$247,664	3	\$74,385					
2004-05*	4	\$1,239,371	\$187,156	1	\$5,800	1	\$2,360		1	\$944
2005-06	8	\$550,000	\$300,000	2	\$300,000	3	\$100,000		1	\$25,000
2006-07	9	\$750,000	\$400,000	3	\$400,000	3	\$200,000		1	\$25,000
2007-08	10	\$1,000,000	\$500,000	4	\$500,000	3	\$300,000		2	\$50,000

Note: \*YTD 1/15/05

Metrics 5.2b: Internally funded grants

- a. Number of internal program grants submitted
- b. Total dollar amount of all internal grants submitted
- c. Total dollar amount OLS requested of internal grants submitted
- d. Number of internal grants funded
- e. Total dollar amount OLS received from internal grants funded

**5.2b: Internally Funded Projects**

Base/Target	Number Submitted	Amount Requested	Number Funded	Amount Funded
2001-02	2	\$16,000	2	\$16,000
2002-03	2	\$205,000	2	\$180,000
2003-04	2	\$21,715	2	\$21,715
2004-05*	5	\$5,000	4	\$4,000
2005-06	6	\$90,000	2	\$60,000
2006-07	6	\$90,000	2	\$60,000
2007-08	6	\$90,000	2	\$60,000

Note: \*YTD 1/15/05

Metrics 5.2c: Voluntary Support

- a. Number of voluntary grants submitted
- b. Total dollar amount of all voluntary grants submitted
- c. Total dollar amount OLS requested of voluntary grants submitted
- d. Number of voluntary grants funded
- e. Total dollar amount OLS received from voluntary grants funded

**5.2c: Voluntary Support Projects**

Base/Target	Number Submitted	Amount Requested	Number Funded	Amount Funded
2001-02	1	\$8,000	1	\$8,000
2002-03	2	\$16,000	2	\$16,000
2003-04	1	\$8,000	1	\$8,000
2004-05*	2	\$40,000	1	\$40,000
2005-06	2	\$60,000	1	\$30,000
2006-07	2	\$60,000	1	\$30,000
2007-08	2	\$60,000	1	\$30,000

Note: \*YTD 1/15/05

Metrics 5.2d: Gifts-in-Kinds

- a. Number of gift-in-kind grants submitted
- b. Total dollar amount of all gift-in-kind grants submitted
- c. Total dollar amount OLS requested gift-in-kind grants submitted
- d. Number of gift-in-kind grants funded
- e. Total dollar amount OLS received from gift-in-kind grants funded

**5.2d: Gifts in-Kind**

Base/Target	Number of Partners	Amount of Gifts
2001-02		
2002-03	0	0
2003-04	2	9,250
2004-05*	3	\$11,095
2005-06	2	\$5,000
2006-07	2	\$5,000
2007-08	2	\$5,000

Note: \*YTD 1/15/05

Base/Targets 5.2: a. see Tables 5.2a – 5.2d

- Actions 5.2:
- a. Encourage faculty to work collaboratively e.g., brainstorm ideas, create teams, work across disciplines
  - b. Encourage faculty to visit funding agencies
  - c. Encourage faculty to attend grant writing workshops
  - d. Balance faculty learning, discovery, engagement activities based on departmental goals
  - e. Reward faculty for their efforts and successes

Allocations/ 5.2: a. \$1K faculty travel to funding agencies  
 Reallocations

**Priority 6: Developing and supporting engagement opportunities for faculty and students**

**Goal 6.1: Increase K-12 community awareness**

- Metrics 6.1: a. Number of visits to K-12  
 b. Number of visits to business and industry

**6.1a: Over Time, Number of K-12 Visits from Statewide Locations**

Base/Target	West Lafayette	Anderson	Columbus	Kokomo	New Albany	Richmond	South Bend	Total
2001-02								
2002-03								
2003-04								
2004-05	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	14
2005-06	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	14
2006-07	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	14
2007-08	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	14

**6.1b: Over Time, Number of Business Visits**

Base/Target	West Lafayette	Anderson	Columbus	Kokomo	New Albany	Richmond	South Bend	Total
2001-02								
2002-03	8							
2003-04	30							
2004-05	35							
2005-06	40	5	15	15	5	5	10	96
2006-07	45	7	21	21	7	7	7	105
2007-08	50	9	27	27	9	9	9	140

Note: An OLS WL faculty member is a .25% TAP Fellow

Base/Targets 6.1: a. see Tables 6.1a-6.1b

- Actions 6.1: a. Encourage faculty to make K-12 visits  
 b. Support Day on Campus days  
 c. Encourage faculty to make business and industry visits

Allocations/ 6.1: a. \$ in support of travel to K-12 and business and industry  
 Reallocations

**Goal 6.2: Increase funded projects with business and industry, government, communities**

- Metrics 6.2: Industry funded projects
- Number of business/industry technical agreements submitted
  - Total dollar amount of all business/industry technical agreements submitted
  - Total dollar amount OLS requested business/industry technical agreements submitted
  - Number of business/industry technical agreements funded
  - Total dollar amount OLS received from business/industry technical agreements funded

**6.2: Industry/Technical Assistance Agreements (WL and SW)**

Base/Target	# WL Submitted	Total Amount Requested	OLS Amount Requested	# Funded	Amount Funded	# SW Submitted	SW Amount Requested	OLS-SW amount Requested	# Funded	SW Amount Funded
2001-02										
2002-03	7	\$52,000	\$52,000	7	\$52,000					
2003-04										
2004-05*	1	\$38,000	\$38,000	1	\$38,000					
2005-06	3	\$60,000	\$60,000	3	\$60,000	2	\$40,000		1	\$20,000
2006-07	3	\$80,000	\$60,000	3	\$60,000	2	\$40,000		1	\$20,000
2007-08	3	\$80,000	\$60,000	32	\$60,000	2	\$40,000		1	\$20,000

Note: In 2003-04 OLS discontinued submitting training grants through Continuing Education, and began to submit through SPS.

Note\*: YTD 1/15/05

Base/Targets 6.2: a. see Table 6.2

- Actions 6.2:
- Support Group for Organizational Leadership and Development (GOLD)
  - Market GOLD
  - Develop grants
  - Deliver training modules

- Allocations/ 6.2:  
Reallocations
- \$1K for marketing
  - 20% of Administrative Assistant's time
  - Salary savings to department and faculty involved in GOLD for summer income or travel funds [if funds permit and a faculty member agrees, salary savings may be used to reduce teaching load by employing an adjunct to cover portion of teaching load]

**Goal 6.3: Increase student contact with business and industry, governments, communities**

**6.3: Number of Student Internships/Co-Ops, Service Learning Projects**

Base/Target	West Lafayette	Anderson	Columbus/ SE	Kokomo/ Lafayette	New Albany	Richmond	South Bend
2001-02							
2002-03							
2003-04							
2004-05	30						
2005-06	30	5	5	5	5	5	5
2006-07	30	5	5	5	5	5	5
2007-08	120	20	20	20	29	20	20

Base/Targets 6.3: a. see Table 6.3

Actions 6.3: a. Require students to take an experiential course, e.g., internship, co-ops, service-learning, practicum in HR, or independent projects

Allocations/ 6.3: a. % time toward faculty load  
 Reallocations

**Goal 6.4: Deliver courses through distance education**

Metrics 6.4: a. Number of courses delivered  
 b. Number of students served

**6.4: Distance Education Courses**

Base/Target	Number of courses delivered	Number of students served
2001-02		
2002-03	3	
2003-04	4	
2004-05	2	
2005-06	6	120
2006-07	6	120
2007-08	6	120

Base/Targets 6.4: a. see Table 6.4

Actions 6.4: a. Provide distance education courses  
 b. Explore master scheduling courses with SW faculty

Allocations. 6.4: a. X% time to develop course  
 Reallocations

**Goal 6.5: Support Purdue staff through Continuing Education, WL**

**6.5: Continuing Education OLS courses in WL**

Base/Target	Number of courses delivered	Number of students served
2001-02	3	81
2002-03	0	0
2003-04	0	0
2004-05	6	162
2005-06	6	170
2006-07	6	170
2007-08	6	170

Base/Targets 6.5: a. see Table 6.5

Actions 6.5: a. Provide evening education courses

Allocations/ 6.5: a. Continuing lecturer [paid by Continuing Education]  
 Reallocations

**Goal 6.6: Improve relationship with potential employers**

- Metrics 6.6:
- a. Number of companies attending OLS Fall Job Fair
  - b. Number of companies attending COT Spring Job Fair at the invitation of OLS
  - c. Number of companies interviewing through OLS Office for Career and Professional Services

**6.6: Employer Contact Through OLS Office**

Base/Target	OLS Companies in OLS Job Fair	OLS Companies in COT Job Fair	Companies Interview through OLS
2001-02	18		45
2002-03	19		32
2003-04	14		34
2004-05	16		28
2005-06	20		30
2006-07	24		34
2007-08	28		48

- Base/Targets 6.6: a. see Table 6.6
- Actions 6.6: a. Support OLS Professional Partners Program  
b. Support administrator for OLS Professional Partners Program
- Allocations/ 6.6: a. 80% time of Administrative Assistant in support of COT and OLS  
Reallocations advancement efforts

**Priority 7: Increasing development/advancement efforts**

Goal 7.1: Increase the department’s fiscal resources for technology education, technology discovery, collaborative interdisciplinary engagements, and related support functions

Metric 7.1a: Alumni Support

- a. Number of patrons
- b. Level of support

Metric 7.1b: Professional Partners Support

- a. Number of Partners
- b. Level of support
- c. Number of scholarships
- d. Total OLS gift support

Metric 7.1c: Dean’s Club Tech Pride Support

- a. Number of OLS Dean’s Club members
- b. Level of support of OLS Dean’s Club members
- c. Number of OLS COT Tech Pride members
- d. Level of support by OLS SOT Tech Pride members
- e. Number of endowed scholarships
- f. Level of scholarships
- g. Number of endowed professorships
- h. Level of endowed professorships

**7.1a-b: OLS Gifts: Alumni and Professional Partners Program**

Base/Target	Number of Patrons	Amount of Gifts	Number of Professional Partners	Gifts from Professional Partners	TOTAL Amount of Gifts
2001-02	206	\$22,836	18	\$18,000	\$40,836
2002-03	236	\$14,492	19	\$7,600	\$22,092
2003-04	235	\$21,051	16	\$9,000	\$30,051
2004-05*	163	\$12,605	14	\$12,615	\$25,220
2005-06	240	\$15,000	16	\$15,000	\$30,000
2006-07	240	\$20,000	18	\$17,000	\$37,000
2007-08	240	\$25,000	20	\$20,000	\$45,000

Note: \*To date 1/1/05

### 7.1b: Dean's Club and Tech Pride Participation

	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08
<b>Number of OLS - Dean's Club members</b>		6	6	11	13	15	17
<b>Level of support of OLS members to Dean's Club</b>				\$5,500	\$6,500	\$7,500	\$8,500
<b>Number of OLS - SOT Tech Pride members</b>				0	1	1	2
<b>Level of support of OLS members to SOT Tech Pride</b>		0	0	0	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$50,000
<b>Number of endowed scholarship</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Level of endowed scholarship</b>							\$25,000
<b>Number of endowed professorships</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Amount of endowed scholarships</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: Data source: Office of Annual Giving, to be confirmed 6/04

Base/Targets 7.1: a. see Table 7.1a-7.1b

- Actions 7.1:
- a. Develop relationships with alumni and friends of the department
  - b. Write letters on behalf of OLS
  - c. Develop OLS webpage
  - d. Identify concentration of OLS alumni and encourage the development of regional OLS Alumni Associations
  - e. Attend advancement/development functions, e.g., meetings, receptions
  - f. Participate in Distinguished Technology Alumni Program
  - g. Encourage sponsorship by OLS Advisory Council

- Allocations/ 7.1: a. 80% time of Administrative Assistant in support of COT and OLS advancement efforts
- Reallocations
- b. 20% time of Associate Department Head to webpage development and maintenance of electronic alumni contacts
  - c. \$3K on various advancement/development activities, e.g., Advisory Council, DTA, attendance at receptions