Academic planning moves into new phase

By David Sonderman

Academic planning at the University level is something that has never been attempted before, according to Howard Gauthier, associate provost for academic affairs.

“The process is innovative and different — and to me, exciting — because of the level of involvement faculty and staff are experiencing in the planning process,” Gauthier says.

There is no model out there to follow, he adds.

“I have received calls from other universities and they are amazed at the level of faculty and staff participation we are providing,” he notes. “They want to know how we are doing it and what problems we are encountering.”

The innovativeness comes from a top-down and a bottom-up approach to planning, where faculty and staff, along with central administration, are involved from the outset. “It is imperative that the faculty and staff be an integral part of the process from beginning to end.”

This process began last month when President Gee addressed the University Senate on March 2 and began his “town meetings” with faculty, staff and students to discuss his ideas for the University.

“We have put together a discussion document based on those meetings and on written responses to the president’s address, including some responses from alumni and emeritus professors,” Gauthier says.

“This is a comprehensive document which will be used as a basis for a series of focus groups,” Gauthier says.

The focus groups, arranged by the University Senate Steering Committee for the faculty and by the University Staff Advisory Committee for the staff, are already being planned.

Gauthier says he expects between 30 and 35 focus groups for the faculty alone. Seventeen will come from the colleges.

The remaining ones will come from cross-college groups that will discuss issues such as undergraduate education and interdisciplinary activity.

“We need to keep the size of each group reasonable; 40 to 50 people will probably be the best number. It will largely depend on how many wish to be involved in each group,” says Gauthier.

Continued from page 1.

Details are being finalized on how participants can be nominated or self-nominated for the groups.

Gauthier adds that the focus groups are going to be highly structured. Each will have a set agenda on what is expected of them, access to “town meeting” materials, guidelines for discussion and at least one facilitator to monitor the discussions.

Gauthier says the effort is not to cover the same ground as the “town meetings” but to build upon the issues raised in them. “These focus groups will synthesize their recommendations and present them to the administration,” Gauthier says.

“College and cross-college focus groups will begin meeting early in May,” Gauthier says.

Staff focus groups will meet later in the quarter and probably continue into the summer.

Gauthier says he has spoken to some student leaders about student involvement, but no final plans have been made. In addition, there may be alumni focus groups that might meet in the summer.

“These focus groups are the key to everything that follows,” Gauthier says. “The next step will be a vision/mission statement and a set of goals for the University.”

“Our goal is to use and build upon the planning processes already in place and not to create a new bureaucracy for planning,” Gauthier notes.

“We need to use the groups we already have in place to build upon the planning processes we already have in place.”

Most colleges and departments already have strategic plans in operation, many of which include plans for faculty hiring, enrollment, curriculum development and resource management.

Gauthier has arranged an informal group of advisers from the faculty who have experience in long-term planning.

This “informal brain trust,” as Gauthier calls it, is composed of faculty from several colleges. Members of the University Senate and the Staff Advisory Committee are involved as well.

“These faculty have written research on long-term planning, taught on the subject and have been hired by other organizations for their expertise,” Gauthier notes.

“I wouldn’t be surprised if we get some research papers out of all this work,” he adds.
Focusing groups to look at University's values, desires

By David Sonderman

An in-depth evaluation of values and desires of the University community might sound like a psychology lab experiment, or a marketing research project. But it is exactly what Howard L. Gauthier has in mind for a series of focusing groups on academic planning.

Beginning this month, members of every area of the University community will be asked to identify, evaluate and discuss the impact of a number of principles. As well, they will develop their own as part of the focusing groups.

The groups are the third stage in the development of an academic plan and mission statement for the University. They follow President Gee's March 2 address to the University Senate and a series of town meetings Gee had with faculty, staff and students.

"Our goal is for each group to submit a report that addresses principles of planning in terms of importance and potential impact. Then we will synthesize the reports to develop a mission statement that reflects the attitudes and values of the University community," says Gauthier, associate provost for academic planning and acting vice president for international affairs.

It is not as easy as it sounds. Gauthier has worked for several months with an informal advisory group to evaluate alternatives and determine the most effective way to move forward.

"What we came up with is a careful identification and evaluation of alternatives."

The present strategy has been reviewed

Continued on page 2.
Focusing groups...

Continued from page 1.

and approved by the Academic Planning Council, made up of the vice presidents.

A three-part process has evolved.

First, the focusing groups will evaluate and prioritize principles underlying the themes set forth in Gee's speech to the Senate and at the town meetings.

Second, and most importantly, the groups will explore the paradoxes, tensions, questions and trade-offs these principles imply.

"What do we have to give up in order to get what we want? What will be the losses and gains of a given course of action?"

"This process of rigorous and careful questioning will help to clarify the values which must be considered in setting priorities for the University," Gauthier says.

Finally, the groups will develop additional principles that might need to be addressed and which were overlooked previously. These additional principles will then be subjected to the same rigorous process of questioning.

Gauthier believes the focusing group findings, along with town meeting discussions and Gee's themes, will offer the basis for a meaningful mission statement.

"We will not have a mission statement composed of empty platitudes.

We envision at least one group per college, but if a dean wishes more than one, we will proceed accordingly."

Ohio State also will attempt to discover how these values and principles stack up against the values and priorities of the external community by gauging responses to focusing groups for alumni around the state and for local business and community leaders around Columbus.

These groups will meet in the summer.

"We need a mission statement that offers accordance between internal and external perceptions of the University's future."

Within Ohio State, deans will determine the number of groups from each college.

"We are following the lead of the deans.

Focus points

The focusing groups will consider principles based on the themes presented by President Gee to faculty, staff and students.

He began the academic planning process March 2 with a speech to the University Senate, followed by a series of town meetings.

Gee urges Ohio State to become the best University it can be, better known for its academic strengths than its size.

Central to his vision are the following:

- Teaching and research recognized as part of the same endeavor.
- Ohio State as the university of choice for top students.
- A smaller undergraduate population.
- Greater rewards for interdisciplinary work.
- Emphasis on a moral and ethical University community.
- More reward for service done outside the University.
- An administrative structure that enhances scholarship.

Our mission statement must accurately express the values of the University community.

He notes that the details concerning nomination and logistics are being worked out by each college or academic support unit.

Upon recommendation of the Staff Advisory Committee, the college focusing groups will be composed of faculty and staff.

The Staff Advisory Committee will work within each college to nominate staff for the groups.

In a parallel role to the deans, vice presidents for administrative and support units will ask department heads to nominate staff to the groups. These nominations will be cleared by the Staff Advisory Committee to ensure a proper representation, Gauthier says.

Similarly, the student focus groups are being planned by students with the help of the Office of Student Affairs.

"What we do will be consistent with each administration, consistent with the goal of not creating a new bureaucracy.

"We are trying to make the project manageable without a staff or office; so we must do so within the existing offices and organizations that we have."

Other plans include:

- As many as 50 different focusing groups; including at least one from each of the 19 colleges, each administrative support unit, alumni groups around the state, students, business and community leaders and several cross-college groups.

- Between 15-20 participants in each group, although Gauthier is open to the recommendations of the deans and vice presidents.

- Two facilitators for each group, who will help discussions and submit the final report.

- One meeting each that will last between 2 and 2 hours.

- One University Senate member attending each session of each group.
Groups’ focus ‘right on schedule’

By David Sonderman

“Right on schedule” is the way Howard L. Gauthier describes the academic planning process under way since March.

Gauthier, associate provost for academic affairs, says that the focusing group sessions have covered all of the 19 colleges and are working with cross-college groups now. The groups began forming in May.

The groups are the third stage in the development of an academic plan, mission statement and ongoing planning process for the University. They follow President Gee’s March 2 address to the University Senate and a series of town meetings.

The intent of the focusing groups is to examine the goals, values and priorities for the University and to consider the problems and barriers those goals may imply.

“We are getting back from the focusing groups exactly what we were looking for: a clear indication of the priorities of the University,” Gauthier says.

So far, the three-hour sessions have been composed of faculty and both classified civil service and administrative and professional staff. Gauthier says the same format is being used for the cross college groups that are currently meeting.

Equitable representation will be important for all the groups, he says.

Other focusing groups are being scheduled for this summer, including those for administrative units, alumni groups, extended campuses, local and state community members, college deans and department chairpersons, and the Board of Trustees.

The focusing group participants are nominated or self nominated within their colleges or departments. The only restriction is that no one sits in on more than one group.
Focusing groups finish discussions

By David Sonderman

"I wish everyone at the University could sit in on one of these groups as an observer."

That is how George L. Smith Jr., chairperson and professor for industrial systems engineering, describes his experience as a facilitator for six focusing group sessions.

Over the past five months, 66 focusing group sessions have been held both on and off campus.

Focusing groups are the third and most lengthy step in developing an academic planning process. The effort is under the direction of the Office of Academic Affairs. It began with President Gee's address to the University Senate last March and was followed by 30 town meetings with faculty, staff and students last spring.

Smith is one of 19 faculty and staff members who served as facilitators for the focusing sessions. He has been working in similar focusing groups for 15 years; including ones for former Governor Richard Celeste's and former Columbus Mayor Tom Moody's cabinets.

"I found it edifying the degree to which the academic support staff and non-University people really care about the academic mission of Ohio State," says Smith. "People who you would think have a very parochial view didn't; interestingly the most parochial view was held by the faculty."

Astrid Merget, director of the School of Public Policy and Management, was also a facilitator for several focusing sessions.

"They all had opinions about the current condition of the University and about priorities and the directions they thought the University should be taking," she says.

However, she adds, those opinions differed greatly depending on the groups. People from areas on campus, such as faculty, staff and students, had different views than those from off-campus, such as local business leaders and alumni.

"The groups on campus were principally concerned with institutional support for academic initiatives," says Merget. "Also they were concerned with the consistency of policy initiatives Universitywide."

She says external groups were more concerned with the image of Ohio State, the reach of its reputation and its influence in the larger community. "Many of them — almost to a person — felt Ohio State was far better than the rest of the world knew."

Other concerns of the external groups were the prevalence of Ohio State’s athletic image, lack of recognition for its academic achievements, and the need to harness its academic talents to help solve problems outside the University.

Howard L. Gauthier and the team of facilitators will soon release a report to the president and the University community on just what they found in the sessions. The text of the executive report will be printed in onCampus after it is released later this quarter.

Gauthier, associate provost for academic affairs, has been the president's point man in the academic planning process. He says that more than 1,000 people have participated in the focusing groups to discuss their views on the University.

The executive report being prepared will "bring together everything we have learned from the 66 focusing sessions. It will lead to a mission statement for the University; a vision for its future; the identification of important goals, objectives, and challenges the University may face; and tactical actions the University should take," says Gauthier.

However, Smith adds, "the jury remains out on how we, the University, will respond."
Academic plan on the way, Gauthier says

By David Sonderman

A report on the findings of more than 60 University and community focusing sessions appears on pages 5-7.

A report on the findings of more than 60 University and community focusing sessions appears on pages 5-7.

last March 2, 1991, when President Gee called for faculty, staff and students to “draw together our disparate views of this University from the perspectives of our interests, our disciplines, our departments. It is time to reinvigorate our historical values...to adopt a new, brighter, more focused vision of what this University is and is becoming.”

Gee then held a series of town meetings on the Columbus and regional campuses. In late spring and summer, more than 60 groups comprising every facet of the University community met in focusing sessions to discuss a variety of issues.

At this April 4 Senate meeting, President Gee is scheduled to reveal the completed mission and vision for Ohio State.

The mission and vision “will guide us throughout the rest of the decade and into the beginning of the next century,” Gauthier said Feb. 29.

Failed academic plans of previous years may have tainted the idea of a planning process, but Gauthier assured the Senate that the latest efforts have concrete implications. “The proposed planning structure will have linkage to operational procedures for all programs — not just academic ones,” Gauthier said.

“The elements of an academic planning program should drive decisions that are made in related areas: budget, support units, facilities and personnel. In other words, whatever we do in the University will be driven by this process.”

Gauthier added that the process will be a perpetual one. The next steps include: applying the plan to budgets, programs and facilities; evaluating that implementation; then making adjustments based on the reassessment.

“(This) creates an ongoing loop, which is consistent with an ongoing planning process,” he said.

Those last steps are to begin later this year. After his Senate speech in April, Gee will begin another series of town meetings to talk with the University community about the academic plan.

According to Gauthier, fiscal year 1992, which begins July 1, will be a transitional year. “(We want) to bring into play implementation strategies. The goal is to have full implementation of the process in place by the following fiscal year.”
Academic Planning Report on the Focusing Sessions
Prepared by
Howard L. Gauthier
Associate Provost
February 1992

This report summarizes the observations, opinions and concerns of the more than 1,000 people participating in 64 focusing sessions.

This report presents no conclusions; rather it extends the dialogue. This compilation is submitted to President Gee and the University community as a preliminary to the development of a mission statement and for consideration in setting goals for the future.

Introduction
In his speech to the University Senate on March 2, 1991, President E. Gordon Gee called upon The Ohio State University to create an academic planning process by which it would establish priorities and translate a vision for the future. Following his speech, the senate held nearly 30 town meetings during March and April to initiate a dialogue on academic matters which would capture the areas of consensus and disagreement as well as the energy and expertise of all who participated.

Common Themes
A careful reading of these reports poses a challenge for anyone trying to summarize their findings, yet it is possible to recognize six broad themes encompassing the issues raised. These are: (1) the interrelationship of enrollment and research service, (2) Ohio State University and the public, (3) the student experience, (4) student achievement, (5) the university as a learning organization, and (6) the quality and standards of Ohio State University.

Enhancement of Education
The enhancement of the educational experience at The Ohio State University has been raised more frequently than any other. Many participants believed that although the student experience has improved in recent years, the quality of the student's educational experience has not improved. Many participants supported the concept of undergraduate education in the University's mission. Many believe that the University must broaden its mission to include undergraduate education. A common perception is that students have not been sufficiently involved in the development of educational goals and that students are not sufficiently informed about educational goals.

All focusing sessions were facilitated by faculty or staff members knowledgeable in Nominal Group Technique. Under the direction of the facilitators, participants explored a wide range of issues which they felt the University must address in the next decade. The following is a summary of the major issues raised and the recommendations made.

No summary report can do justice to the scope of the contributions made during the focusing sessions. Each session was a rich source of information in which many faculty members provided the depth and breadth of research needed to address these issues effectively. This diversity of viewpoints accounts for the richness of the individual contributions and the depth of the discussion.

While many problems and concerns were expressed, the tone of the focusing sessions was generally quite positive. Many participants stressed the importance of the students' role in the planning process and their opportunities to voice their views in this kind of forum.
There was overwhelming agreement that we need to improve financial support for graduate students. In many programs, salaries and research support are not competitive with other institutions. We also need to recognize the contributions made by graduate students to teaching and the long-term career potential that is not being realized by many graduates. The lack of opportunities for women and minorities was also a major concern. The University’s commitment to increasing diversity in all aspects of the campus is supported by many, but there is a need for greater efforts to recruit and retain minority students and faculty. The need for better communication and coordination among departments and graduate programs was also highlighted. Some departments felt that they were not well-represented in the decision-making process, and there was a desire for more transparency and accountability in the allocation of resources.

There is clearly a shared feeling that the University needs to improve its sensitivity to the personal needs of its employees.
Academic policy and procedures should be designed to strengthen rather than diminish the capacity of academic units to fulfill the University’s mission.

Budger Process During these times of fiscal constraint, it is not surprising that the budget allocation process was viewed as a source of concern. Many participants argued that administrators should define and openly communicate to the Ohio State community the criteria on which funding decisions are made. Many said that they have a poor understanding of how the budget process operates and who is responsible for making critical decisions. There was strong agreement that all budgetary processes should be reflective and supportive of academic reallocation as a zero-sum game in which a new program can be started only by eliminating an existing one. For this reason, strong objections were raised to reallocation only within colleges. Many were unclear as to whether reallocation had been made in the past across colleges and throughout the University and argued for such a pattern.

Concern about underfunding was not limited to academic units. Many participants from academic support units agreed that underfunding is a common problem for them. If these units are to serve faculty, staff and students, their funding must be considered in the context of their mission. Reallocation, reexamination of bureaucratic processes, and reduction in the size of the staff and administration were identified as necessary if the academic support units are to serve the University efficiently and cost effectively.

There was a reluctance recognition that current financial constraints may lead to the elimination or downsizing of some academic programs. Many participants expressed concern over who will make these decisions. There was general agreement that the decision-making process must be participatory and consistent with the University’s traditional commitment to shared governance.

The ‘sleeping research giant’ soon will wake

By Gemma McLaughlin

If Ed Hayes has anything to do with it, the sleeping research giant will awake with a roar. Hayes’s giant is Ohio State, in particular future growth in the quality and amount of research.

“From the first seven months of this fiscal year, Ohio State’s new grants and contracts are up 30 percent ahead of where they were last year at this time,” the vice president for research reported to the University Senate Feb. 29. “Also, externally funded research expenditures have increased by about 10 percent.”

Hayes added, “From my perspective, Ohio State has the greatest potential for research enhancement of any major university in the nation. As we deal with the problems and issues of the day, we must not lose sight of the long-term prospects for research and scholarship…”

He said the Senate’s new Research Committee is working on issues such as return of indirect costs, fringe benefits for postdoctoral fellows, research faculty, and others.

Hayes has an agenda for research, “based on my first impressions (in the eight months I have held the post as vice president) of what steps are most critical to enhancing research excellence.”

The elements include:

* Recruiting and retaining quality faculty, student and staff by working out issues such as faculty start-up packages, stipends and fringe benefits for graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, and the special problems of interdisciplinary centers.
* Creating a supportive research infrastructure by improving library resources, using information technology, improving computer resources, sharing instruments such as high-resolution nuclear magnetic resonance and mass spectrometer facilities, and providing central support for core activities such as laboratory animal facilities.
* Renovating and constructing research space, and investigating innovative solutions such as industry-supported space.
* Developing seed grant programs for interdisciplinary activities of small faculty groups and major research centers.
* Promoting faculty and graduate student participation in scholarly conferences, travel, and faculty publications.
* Developing a way to determine “research budget crosscuts,” which will give a comprehensive view of all internal and external funds throughout the University, regardless of sources, “to help us supply resources where they are most needed.”
* Establishing planning goals, priorities and directions for the Research Foundation.
* Communicating to audiences inside and outside Ohio State about faculty research, which would underscore its importance to the state of Ohio and its link to education.
* Developing external relations to make the case for research within the state, develop research relations with Ohio industry and with the state of Ohio, and strengthen ties with federal agencies, President George Bush’s administration and Congress.
* Moving more technology out of research laboratories into business and industry.

Hayes cautioned that “it is essential that we not lose sight of the ultimate goal of research: high quality work across all disciplines. He added, “It is the quality of research and not the total funding that makes or breaks the research reputation of a university.”

A copy of Hayes’s remarks is available from the Office of Research, 202-1582.
TRUSTEES DISCUSS ACADEMIC PLANNING AND BUDGET PRIORITIES

COLUMBUS -- The Academic Affairs Committee of The Ohio State University Board of Trustees heard reports Thursday (2/4) from Associate Provost Ed Ray and Vice President for Finance William Shkurti on the status of the academic planning process and its relationship to setting budget priorities.

Ray told the trustees that guidelines for developing the budget process will be given to vice presidents and college deans this spring and that their thoughts will be sought on reassessing budget commitments in light of the university mission. He stressed the need to continue openness and candor in academic and budget planning.

The goal is to more formally link the academic planning process with budget planning. This will be done by identifying budget themes and priorities in consultation with vice presidents, deans, the Senate Fiscal Committee, Student Advisory Committee, University Priorities Committee and other constituent groups.

According to Shkurti, the academic planning process will be an evolving, dynamic process that continues, rather than starting and stopping each year.
Shkurti reviewed the process for tying budget allocations to university priorities. In developing next year's budget, the overall theme will be to focus on the university's teaching and research mission.

Priorities will include building up the General Education Curriculum, reducing the closed course problem, supporting academic computing, taking care of deferred maintenance, improving campus security, protecting the purchasing power of faculty and staff salaries, recruiting and retaining students, and supporting research.
Date: Mon, 22 Nov 1999 01:14:57 -0500
From: Office of the President <bhaerman.1@osu.edu>
To: ihnat.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu
Errors-to: uts.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu
X-Original-To: ihnat.1@postbox.acs.ohio-state.edu
Subject: Academic Plan

TO: All Faculty and Staff

FROM: William E. Kirwan, President
Edward J. Ray, Executive Vice President and Provost

DATE: November 22, 1999

RE: Draft Academic Plan

At the October meeting of the University Senate, we announced that a unified, coherent, comprehensive academic plan was in preparation and discussed its critical importance in helping to position Ohio State among the top ten public teaching and research universities. We are pleased to report that a draft of the plan is now complete and ready for review by the university community.

Your input will be extremely valuable as we work toward a final version. One of the major goals is to present the finalized plan to the Board of Trustees at the March 3, 2000, meeting. You may obtain a copy of the plan from your college or administrative office or access it on the Web at http://www.osu.edu/academicplan

We would prefer that you submit comments or recommendations through the leadership of your academic or administrative unit. Should you wish to send us input directly, however, please forward comments to academicplan@admin.ohio-state.edu. In developing your response, we ask that you consider the following questions:

* If successfully implemented, will this plan help us make significant strides toward recognition as one of the nation's top ten public teaching and research universities?
* Does the plan make it clear that academic excellence is Ohio State's top priority?
* Is the plan visionary enough?
* Is there support for the 20/10 goal? (While some may debate the efficacy of how departments or programs are ranked, many believe that the 20/10 goal is clear and sufficiently focuses effort and resources on all the right things.)
* Does the plan support our commitment to academic excellence?
* Assuming that we are successful in implementing the "student learning experience" section of the plan, are the stated objectives and program initiatives sufficient to reach our goal of providing all students with an intellectually rigorous and exciting learning experience at Ohio State?
* If successfully implemented, will the "diversity" section of this plan move us forward in creating an environment that enriches the university and clearly demonstrates that all students, faculty, and staff are valued members of the community regardless of nationality, race, gender, or sexual orientation?
* Do the program elements in the "outreach and engagement" section move the university in an effective, overt way toward meeting a land-grant mission relevant to the needs and requirements of the 21st century?
* Are the strategies for enhancing resources adequate to accomplish the plan's overarching goal to become a top ten public teaching and research university?
* Is the link between the plan and the leadership agenda clear and obvious?
* Are there any goals and/or initiatives that should be added to the plan?
* Are there any goals and/or initiatives that should be deleted?

We are excited about our plan and believe that it will go a long way toward helping us to better focus our energy on our activities and on those initiatives that will best enable us to achieve our desired
goals. Becoming a top ten public teaching and research university is, we believe, important to the education of students, who will go on to be significant contributors and leaders in the next millennium, and to the state of Ohio as it seeks to develop the high-tech sector of its economy.

We look forward to your input on our academic plan and to your support in providing leadership for Ohio State as we prepare to capitalize on the challenges and opportunities ahead.

Finally, you should be apprised that our much anticipated "diversity plan" has also been completed and is being circulated for review and comment. The diversity plan was developed by Vice President David Williams, II and Dean Carole Anderson. We welcome and look forward to your comments on this most important document as well. Specific directions for providing input will be communicated to you by Vice President Williams and Dean Anderson.
Academic plan seeks to boost competitiveness

By Elizabeth N. Smith
Lantern staff writer

As Ohio State strives to move itself up in the ranks among public universities as a leading research institution, the university administration has developed a plan that they hope will bring OSU from its 41st ranked position in support of state funding for higher education into the top 10 among all public universities in the United States.

This plan of action is known as the 2010 Plan. The 2010 Plan is a strategy in which 20 academic programs will be ranked in the top 20 and 10 programs will be ranked in the top 10 among all public universities by the year 2010. In this array of top-ranked research universities, OSU would be one of the nation's top 10.

The 2010 Plan, which was being discussed when President William "Brit" Kirwan was recruited to the university, was one of the driving forces that led him here.

"Quite frankly, the boldness of this plan was one of the major factors in my decision to come to Ohio State," said Kirwan. "I have embraced the plan and made its implementation a centerpiece of my administration's efforts."

The funding for this plan will come from a combination of state and university resources, research grants and private gifts. Most of the research at the university is currently funded by federal, state and industry grants.

One of the major initiatives for achieving the 2010 goal is a program called Selective Investment, which is headed by Vice President and Provost Edward J. Ray.

Every year for the past two years, four programs have been selected to receive an infusion of $1 million into their base budget. The programs are selected through a rigorous review process, which looks at their current quality and their potential to move into the ranks as a top academic program.

Ray appoints a blue-ribbon committee, which consists of a panel of faculty members who make recommendations on who they feel is best to receive the selective investment awards. Deans are also invited to submit proposals for awards, while department chairs and other faculty members develop proposals.

According to Ray, proposals sent forward by the colleges are required to match the funds they are seeking with internal funds of their own, so that there is a shared commitment to the success of funded initiatives from the departments, colleges and the university.

Programs selected thus far for these awards are physics, chemistry, neurosciences, history, psychology and political science. Kirwan said that the university would soon be announcing the winners of this year's competition.

"Incidentally, something like
half of these programs have also won the university’s distinguished departmental teaching award,” he said. “This shows that excellent research departments also tend to be excellent teaching departments.”

Kirwan also said that because these programs have already been distinguished as very good, these departments receive significant amounts of research grants and private gifts in addition to university funding. “This combination of resources should enable them to achieve the high aspirations we have set for them and they for themselves.”

Though these programs have been targeted for excellence, there are other means of supporting other departments in this plan in their drive for academic distinction through programs such as the Academic Enrichment Program. This program, also managed by Ray, has been in existence for six years and provides funds for innovative ideas for improvement in departmental teaching, research and service in diverse areas such as music, dance, international studies, nursing, law and honors programs.

Ray said that other initiatives will be developed over time. “Our goal is not to have a program for everybody, but to have a sufficient array of programs so that we can support excellent academic programs throughout the university,” he said. “We are committed to providing enough opportunities for programs to improve that no program should feel that it has no opportunity to compete for resources to improve itself.”

Kirwan said that generally speaking, Ohio is doing poorly in the technological sector of the economy and that the state has fallen to the bottom of the pack relative to other states. He also said that because the technological sector is the fastest growing sector of the economy and the one producing the most and the highest paying jobs, becoming a major research university by means of the 2010 Plan is a competitive advantage, not only to the university, but the state itself.

If this plan is implemented and Ohio State does, in fact, move itself up into the top 10, state funding for public support of higher education will increase. However, this funding will not directly decrease costs such as tuition and fees at the university.

Kirwan said that he would like to say that this funding would decrease tuition and fees, but that both were tied directly to the university’s drive for excellence.

Whatever the outcome of the plan, university administration is optimistic that through a combination of internal strategies and external funding, they will be able to achieve the 2010 goal.
University plans major investment in strategic plan

Officials set agenda to transform Ohio State into one of the world’s great universities

COLUMBUS – The Ohio State University is poised to spend up to $750 million over the next five years to enhance its academic standing nationally and increase the benefits the university provides to the people of Ohio.

University leaders today released an Academic Plan, a strategy designed to transform Ohio State, already a powerful educational presence nationally, into one of the world’s truly great universities.

“In an information age, Ohioans need and deserve a top-tier university that will be a center of excellence in areas of critical importance to the state. We are determined that Ohio State will be such a university,” said President William E. Kirwan. “A truly great teaching and research university will advance the well-being of the people of Ohio by creating and disseminating knowledge, fostering a rich flow of ideas and innovation, producing superbly trained graduates and stoking the state’s economic growth in the new Information Age economy.

“By putting this academic blueprint into action, and more thoughtfully and strategically allocating our resources, we will transform Ohio State into a 21st-century land-grant university recognized worldwide for the excellence and impact of its research, dedication to teaching, commitment to diversity and richness of student experience.”

New and redirected funding will be used to support the Academic Plan’s 14 sweeping initiatives, Kirwan said, including recruiting and retaining world-class faculty, enhancing the quality of the teaching and learning environment and creating a more diverse university community, to move Ohio State toward academic excellence.

Executive Vice President and Provost Edward J. Ray said the university in recent years has focused more intently on aligning its resources with an ambitious academic agenda, and thereby laying the groundwork for such a plan, through four core elements:

- Pursuit of national leadership in the quality of its academic programs;
- Creation of a learning environment for students on a par with the nation’s best universities;

- more -
Universal recognition for the quality of the student learning experience;
Creation of an environment that values and is enriched by diversity; and
Expansion of the land-grant mission to address society's most compelling needs.

"This Academic Plan, which reflects the input of Ohio State's faculty, administrators, staff and students, sets even more specific academic goals and defines the methods we will use to meet our aspirations," Ray said. "We see this as a smart way to best serve the people of Ohio in this competitive academic environment, and expect that after making this collective effort to develop a plan, we will see results."

Kirwan said funding for the Academic Plan will be derived from four sources: Additional state support as outlined in the Ohio Board of Regents recent budget proposal, funds redirected from university resources, private fund-raising and increased tuition. The Regents' proposal also includes a recommendation that Ohio State be granted relief from the state-mandated 6 percent cap on annual tuition increases. Kirwan said any tuition increase above the cap would go directly back to the students in the form of improvements to their educational experience, better academic support and increased need-based financial aid.

In addition to obtaining increased state support to successfully implement the university's ambitious agenda, Kirwan said the university also must improve the organization and delivery of instruction, increase organizational flexibility and improve the faculty work environment.

The Academic Plan first was released to the campus and community late last autumn, and went through a substantial review process among all constituency groups. The current plan, which incorporates much of the feedback received, has been streamlined and prioritized to focus on strategies determined most critical to Ohio State's success.

The plan includes the following strategies and initiatives:

**Strategy: Build a World-Class Faculty**

- Over the next three to five years, recruit at least 12 faculty who have or are expected to attain the highest honors in their disciplines.
- Implement a faculty recruitment, retention and development plan that includes a competitive compensation structure that is in line with our peer institutions.

**Strategy: Develop Academic Programs that Define Ohio State as the Nation's Leading Public Land-Grant University**

- Continue the Strategic Investment approach by competitively funding initiatives that build programmatic strength and open new fields, with special emphasis on Ohio where appropriate.
- Significantly increase space dedicated to funded research beyond what is currently planned.

- more -
Strategy: Enhance the Quality of the Teaching and Learning Environment

- Transform the Main Library into a 21st century Information Age center within five to 10 years, upgrade classroom space quality and provide the latest technology tools to faculty, staff and students.
- Upgrade the quality of classroom pool space and enhance the appearance of the campus facilities and grounds.
- Provide faculty, staff and students with the latest technology tools for leadership in teaching, research and career development within the next five years.

Strategy: Enhance and Better Serve the Student Body

- Make admissions to Ohio State selective throughout the year for new freshmen and transfer students; increase course accessibility, reduce class size, establish at least 10 Scholars programs that expand opportunities for students to live with those who share common interests, and provide ample merit-and need-based financial aid to undergraduates.

Strategy: Create a Diverse University Community

- Hire at least five to 10 women and five to 10 minority faculty at a senior level each year for five years through the Faculty Hiring Assistance Program, and similarly recruit, retain and graduate more academically able minority students.

Strategy: Help Build Ohio’s Future

- Strengthen the scope and effectiveness of Ohio State’s commitment to preschool-12th grade public education, and become a catalyst for developing Ohio’s technology-based economy.

Kirwan will focus on the Academic Plan during his State of the University Address to the University Senate. The meeting is at 9 a.m. Saturday (10/7) in 1000 McPherson Laboratory, 140 W. 18th Ave. The plan is available on the web at www.osu.edu/academic_plan/.

###
Kirwan clarifies new academic plan for students

By Shannon Ratzer
Lantern staff writer

With long lasting implications at the core of the newly revised Academic Plan, Ohio State President William "Bill" Kirwan is making an effort to address concerns and answer student questions.

"The Academic Plan is probably the most important thing I will bring before campus during my tenure as president," Kirwan said.

During a visit to The Lantern yesterday, one of the points which Kirwan stressed was that the Academic Plan's various initiatives will take time and planning to implement.

Some of the plan's goals are already drawn out. Depending on possible tuition increases, undergraduate financial aid could be increased by as much as $10 million or may not be affected at all. Other portions of the plan will be put into effect the first year that they affect.

A dramatic change suggested in the plan is the switch from a quarter system to a semester system. Kirwan said the university will consider this measure carefully.

"I talked to the Senate leadership and I will be sending a formal letter asking them to study this and bring their recommendations back to (Provost) Ed (Ray) and me by the end of the year," Kirwan said.

The plan also addresses the ways in which OSU could improve its diversity. In terms of improving faculty diversity, the plan sets a goal of hiring 25 to 30 women faculty members and 25 to 30 minority senior faculty members in the next five years. The plan's explanation of this initiative is that the university will seek to hire five to 10 minority and female faculty members each year for the next five years.

"We make an effort to hire diverse faculty anyway, with this initiative we're talking about making senior hires in areas where there is an applicant pool problem," said Ed Ray, executive vice president of Academic Affairs and provost.

The scope of the plan's diversity goals also extend to the student population. Ray offered some possible explanations as to how OSU might "recruit, support, and retain to graduation larger numbers of academically able minority students."

Ray suggested possibly increasing the resources for the Minority Scholars Program and adding to the number of transfer students accepted, since there tends to be a disproportionate number of those students who are minorities.

Kirwan also suggested some additional recruiting strategies.

"When we visit schools we could target major cities like Chicago and Atlanta where there are large minority populations and strong schools," Kirwan said.

To retain students, Ray said the university will make efforts to offer more financial aid to junior and senior minority students. According to Ray, the university has good first-year minority retention, but improvements are needed to keep them through graduation.
Ohio State is measuring up to the competition
*Trustees hear progress report on university’s performance*

COLUMBUS -- The Ohio State University is showing recent gains in research productivity and improvements to the student experience as part of its ongoing self-assessment in relation to the nation’s top public comprehensive research institutions.

The university also reports that student and faculty satisfaction levels match national standards, especially concerning academic expectations, and that 11 advanced-degree programs rank among the nation’s top 25. Those results and others are part of an updated document that provides quantitative and qualitative measures of Ohio State’s performance in several areas.

The newest statistics were reported to the university’s Board of Trustees Friday (2/2) in a presentation on strategic indicators that demonstrate the progress Ohio State is making in a national context and what the university must do to enhance its value to the people of Ohio and become one of the world’s truly great universities.

Ultimately, said William J. Shkurti, senior vice president for business and finance, Ohio State will use the ongoing strategic indicators assessment as a guide in institutional decision-making.

“Ohio State is not required to conduct this assessment,” he said. “But because Ohio State is an institution that takes its academic and access mission seriously, we consider this kind of ongoing analysis a factor in being good stewards of public resources. We also measure our performance against the best because it’s the right thing to do.”

Assessments center around the university’s recently released Academic Plan’s six broad strategies: build a world-class faculty; define Ohio State as a leading land-grant university; enhance the quality of the teaching and learning environment; enhance and better serve the student body; create a diverse university community; and help build Ohio’s future. Such an
"academic report card" to monitor progress was built into the Academic Plan, and builds upon similar analyses conducted by the university for the past several years.

A report summary indicates Ohio State has made progress in service to the student body and steady improvements in becoming a leading land-grant institution, with mixed results in measures concerning the other four initiatives, said Alice C. Stewart, director of the university's Office of Strategic Analysis and Planning.

The Academic Plan reflects the university's focus in recent years on more closely aligning its resources with an ambitious academic agenda that includes pursuit of national leadership in the quality of its academic programs; creation of a learning environment for students on a par with the nation's best universities; creation of an environment that values and is enriched by diversity; and expansion of the land-grant mission to address society's most compelling needs. The university's numerous initiatives, ranging from selective investment in the most promising academic departments to establishment of a Council on Diversity, demonstrate Ohio State's commitment to excellence and address many of the statistics cited in the strategic indicators report.

"This ongoing analysis, which is based on a huge variety of data sources, shows the results of our investment of time and resources, and areas in which the university might want to invest even more," said Stewart, also an assistant professor of management and human resources. "Identifying these outcomes is about capturing an institutional picture of what's going on here and where we stand in relation to some of our stiffest national competition for high-achieving students and high-caliber faculty."

Stewart cautioned that it could take years to demonstrate significant changes in performance because of both the intensity of the competition and the long-term nature of most of the performance indicators being measured. "We need to watch the direction of the trend, not just year-to-year changes," she said.

Strategic indicators are based on comparisons with nine identified benchmark institutions that are similar to Ohio State in organization and size, but are generally regarded in the top tier of public universities: Pennsylvania State University and the universities of Minnesota, Washington, Texas, Michigan, Illinois, Arizona, Wisconsin and California, Los Angeles. The full report is available on the Web at www.rpia.ohio-
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state.edu/strategic_analysis/Strategic_indicators/2001_strategic_indicators.htm. Highlights include:

**World-class faculty**

- The impact of Ohio State’s research has improved over the past five years, with the market share of citations increasing .06 percent during the most recent three-year period measured.
- In 1999, Ohio State increased its market share of federal research dollars by .022 percent, or $35 million, while three benchmark universities received a smaller share of federal funding than in 1998. Still, total federal research dollars awarded to Ohio State remain much lower than funding awarded overall to benchmark schools.
- After doubling the number of national merit-based faculty awards from 1998 to 1999 (nine to 18), the number decreased to 13 in 2000. At the same time, the benchmark mean barely changed, from 16.6 awards in 1998 to 17.5 in 1999 and 16.4 in 2000.

**Land-grant institution**

- Seven of Ohio State’s professional graduate programs rank among the top 25 as rated by *U.S. News & World Report*, which exceeds or matches the number of ranked programs at six top public universities.
- Four of OSU’s academic doctoral programs rank among the top 25, exceeding only two benchmark institutions’ total doctoral programs in the top 25.

**Teaching and learning environment**

- In surveys of faculty and students, most (71.7 percent of faculty; 80 percent of undergraduates; 64.4 percent of graduate students) reported satisfaction regarding their overall experience at Ohio State, consistent with national norms.

**Serving the student body**

- In 1999, 61 percent of Ohio State’s incoming freshman class ranked in the top 25 percent of their high school class, compared with 47 percent in 1994. Though the percentage remains below the 81 percent benchmark mean, Ohio State has made steady gains while the mean has remained relatively constant.
- In 1999, Ohio State reached an all-time high 81 percent freshman retention rate, and projections for 2000 indicate improvement will continue.

- more -
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- Perception of student safety on campus increased in every year surveyed (82.2 percent perceived it safe in 1998-99); perception of safety off campus, however, is lower (61.1 percent perceiving it safe in 1999-2000).

Diverse community

- The percentage of minority full-time faculty (4.99 percent) at Ohio State exceeds that of four benchmark universities, but is lower than the range of 5.58 percent to 7.98 percent reported by five other benchmark schools.

- The six-year graduation rate of African-American students is lower than that of non-minority students, and is lower than the average African-American graduation rate at benchmark universities. The university has initiatives in place to address these statistics. For example, Ohio State is creating a more effective model of transferring students into the university that will include scholarships for transfer students, and is devoting additional funding to merit-based scholarships for minority freshmen. Ohio State also has enhanced retention efforts, which include an intensive First Year Experience that integrates orientation, Welcome Week and survey course activities, and bolstered support systems for all at-risk students. The Term One transition program for first-year students also has been enhanced.

Ohio’s future

- Invention disclosures at Ohio State increased substantially in 1999, from 75 to 100. Though the benchmark universities increased, as well, the gap between those universities and OSU narrowed.

- The average licensing income at benchmark universities is much higher than licensing income at Ohio State. The University has intensified its efforts to generate partnerships between researchers and business that could result in technology-based start-up companies (see http://techpartners.osu.edu).

###

- more -
OSU capital projects driven by academic mission
Board hears annual presentation on infrastructure needs

COLUMBUS -- The Ohio State University Board of Trustees heard the annual presentation on capital projects Friday (2/2), focusing on the major issues the university faces in the next five years and beyond, and the need to advance Ohio State’s efforts to become one of the nation’s top public universities.

“Our facilities must enable the academic enterprise to achieve the goal of teaching and research excellence,” Vice President for Business and Administration Janet Ashe said. “Therefore, a ‘life-cycle’ approach to our capital projects is required. This includes planning, design and construction, and operation and maintenance.”

The report, “Life Cycle Facility Planning and the Academic Plan,” also outlined an intense construction schedule and accompanying problems in the near future; a call for legislation that could make building more cost-efficient; and a deferred maintenance dilemma that will require renovation or replacement of 51 major buildings in the next 20 years.

University Architect Jill Morelli said the Academic Plan provides fundamental guidance for the physical planning process, particularly in the setting of priorities and the narrowing of options. Master and district planning, state capital requests and feasibility studies help weigh the critical needs of the academic units of the university with the little unencumbered space available, she said.

Morelli told trustees that significant campus construction congestion is just ahead, with 17 major projects in the central campus region alone (including roadway projects) anticipated for the years 2002 to 2004. Morelli said strategic plans for each project and for the campus should be developed to deal with the anticipated congestion.
Morelli also said that planning the most efficient and cost-effective way to build structures is not always possible. Legislative requirements imposed on public institutions -- some currently under review by the governor’s office -- add significant time and cost to capital projects, she said.

She said design and construction is a balance between budget, quality and on-time delivery, and said planners must focus on the university’s long-term investment strategy. “We must build our buildings to last decades, but they also must be easy to maintain in the 20-year life of the systems that support the programs within.”

Briefing trustees on building operations and maintenance, Associate Vice President for Physical Facilities Jim Stevens said building commissioning is a new tool the university is carefully evaluating to insure that buildings work as intended. Commissioning allows Physical Facilities to work with building tenants and designers to discuss operational and maintenance issues before they commit to a final design, thus greatly reducing the chances of system malfunctions in new buildings.

While commissioning occurs at the launching point, Stevens said the other end of the spectrum in a building’s life is deferred maintenance -- a result of constant aging, continued growth and limited budgets. He said building condition audits conducted for all the university’s major buildings on a five-year cycle identified $103 million in urgent maintenance projects. Additionally, the current combined deferred maintenance for both the systems repair projects and the overdue whole-building renewal is $240 million. Stevens estimates that 51 major buildings will require whole-building renovations or replacement in the next 20 years.

“The challenge the University faces is finding additional funds to meet our biennial need. We are running $12 million short each biennium,” Stevens said.

Stevens said that, working within the state capital budget, the university has the capability to renew the 12 deferred buildings scheduled over the next decade. However, he said the decade after that will be more challenging, with 30 buildings requiring renovation or replacement at a price of $428 million.

He said it is important that new buildings added to the campus come from funding sources outside the state capital process, and suggested establishing a separate endowment for system repair and eventual renewal.

- more -
Internal audit, mid-year budget

Trustees received an update from William J. Shkurti, senior vice president for business and finance, on the Department of Internal Audit work plan. The mid-year report is in response to a request by the fiscal committee to periodically review work plans and other activities involving internal audit functions.

Shkurti announced the appointment of Kevin Patton as interim director. Patton will replace Aletha Shipley, the current director, who is moving to Florida.

Trustees also heard a routine mid-year budget report. Reporting on general fund resources, Shkurti said that finances are stable for FY 2001. Enrollment and medical center figures continue to be monitored, as are the Department of Athletics and the Schottenstein Center, and benefit costs for faculty and staff. Shkurti said that while it appears there will be no cuts in higher education, the legislative outcome is more uncertain than in previous years.

Other business

In other business, the board

- Authorized entering into joint use agreements as necessary for the Ohio State Gateway Parking Garage; the Nicklaus Center, Phase II; Natural Habitat Research Site Improvements, Phase IV; and the Cleveland Botanical Gardens.

- Accepted the quarterly report on waivers of competitive bidding requirements for October through December 2000. During that period, the vice president for business and finance granted 39 waivers for annual purchases totaling more than $9 million; the vice president for health services granted 21 waivers for annual hospital purchased totaling more than $7 million. Waivers are granted in the event of an emergency, when a sufficient economic reason exists or when the goods or services can be purchased only from a single source.

- Authorized the university to proceed with a list of small capital improvement projects, each estimated at $1 million or less, to be undertaken in 2001.

- Approved the proposal to establish the Heart and Lung Research Institute in the College of Medicine and Public Health, effective immediately. The institute will promote and coordinate interdisciplinary and molecular research in the field of heart and lung disease; organize and provide training for individuals in the field of molecular research for heart and lung disease; and serve as a catalyst for discovery.

- more -
• Approved the renaming of the Department of Aerospace Engineering, Applied Mechanics and Aviation to the Department of Aerospace Engineering and Aviation and the renaming of the Department of Marketing to the Department of Marketing and Logistics.

• Approved the naming of the Food Industries Center, located in Howlett Hall of the College of Food, Agricultural and Environment Sciences in honor of Wilbur A. Gould, former director of the center, who served on Ohio State’s food processing and technology faculty for nearly 40 years.

• Approved the administrative renaming of the Floriculture Research and Biocontainment Facility, 670 Tharp St., as the Ornamental Plant Germplasm Center.

Trustees also approved the following construction-related items:

• Selection of qualified architectural/engineering firms for Phase II of the Doan and Rhodes Halls Material Handling System, Sisson Hall Complete Shelled Space, and Wexner Center for the Arts building renovations.

• Selection of qualified construction managers to assist with the design of a new heart hospital to house an integrated cardiothoracic surgery and cardiology program.

• Request for construction bids for the Doan and Rhodes Halls Material Handling System.

• Request for construction bids for graduate and professional student housing, Knowlton School of Architecture and Sisson Hall Complete Shelled Space.

• Award of contract for a central chilled water plant at the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center in Wooster. Engineer of record is Bacik, Karpinski & Associates of Cleveland; general contractor is Ben Imhoff Construction of Wooster. Total project cost is $7 million.

###
JUNE 2002

Eighteen months ago the Board of Trustees approved our Academic Plan, a document that defines six strategies and 14 initiatives that we deem necessary to become a truly great teaching and research university. This report highlights our progress thus far.

It is important to reiterate why we are pursuing such an ambitious goal. Top-tier universities are essential in today’s knowledge economy to ensure economic growth and social progress for the people and regions that they serve. Ohio lacks such a top-tier institution, and we believe that The Ohio State University is poised to fill that role.

It is also important to remember that we have begun to implement this plan during a period of severe fiscal constraint brought about by reductions in state funding. While these constraints greatly impeded our progress, we have still made encouraging strides in our march toward academic excellence. That so much was accomplished during this difficult period is a tribute to the talent and hard work of the women and men on our faculty and staff.

While this report covers progress on all Plan strategies and initiatives, it highlights four priorities that we identified last year in recognition of our resource limitations and the resulting need to focus on relatively few items. These priorities were chosen based upon their broadly beneficial effects, the wide contributions they would make across the university and our ability to fund them—whether by reallocating existing resources, improving efficiency or raising external revenues. These initiatives will enable the university to:

- Retain and attract outstanding faculty and staff by bringing salaries up to the level of our benchmark peers;
- Strengthen significantly the quality of the academic experience for undergraduates;
- Establish Ohio State as a leader in biomedical research; and
- Create a state and national resource for understanding and resolving the issues of race and ethnicity that continue to divide us as a nation.
Academic Highlights

☑ Profile of incoming freshman class has improved dramatically over six years:
   • Average ACT score has risen from 22.8 to 25.2
   • Percentage of entrants ranking in top 10 percent of high school class has risen from 21 to 32
   • One entrant in five is a minority.

☑ Freshman retention has risen from 77.7 percent in 1995 to 86 percent last fall.

☑ Research grants have increased by 34 percent (to $329M) over the past two years.

☑ Ohio State ranks among U.S. News & World Report's Top 25 Public Universities in America and is number one in Ohio.

☑ From 1994 to 2002, Ohio State doubled its number of National Academy members from eight to 16. Currently, there are five members of the National Academy of Sciences, eight members of the National Academy of Engineering and three members of the Institute of Medicine.

☑ This year, there are a record-breaking 366 scholar-athletes, up from 263 just six years ago. Almost 40 percent of all student athletes have a GPA of 3.0 or higher.

☑ U.S. News ranks many graduate/professional programs tops in the nation.

☑ Ohio State ranks 20th in the nation in the number of national merit scholars, ahead of Vanderbilt, Duke and UCLA.

☑ The Council for Advancement and Support of Education ranks Ohio State 10th in fund raising among nation's public universities.

☑ Students have been recipients of such prestigious recognition as: British Marshall Scholars, College Bowl, Fulbright Fellows, Goldwater Scholars, Mellon Fellowships, NSF Graduate Fellowships, Truman Scholars and Finalists and Udall Scholars.

☑ The successful Affirm Thy Friendship campaign created 79 new endowed chairs and added more than $105 million to the university's scholarship fund.
Areas of Current Focus

**RESTORE COMPENSATION TO COMPETITIVE LEVELS**

To attract and retain a top-flight faculty supported by a first-class staff necessitates compensation levels that compete favorably with those at peer institutions. Due to inadequate state support, our average salaries have fallen behind our benchmark peers, and today our faculty salaries rank 8th out of 10 peer institutions while staff salaries are below market overall and in some cases significantly so. One year ago, the President announced that correcting this inequity was our highest priority and that we would increase compensation to benchmark mean levels over the next three or four years. The first payment on that promise will be made July 1, 2002, when average compensation will rise by approximately 4.5 percent, 1 percent above the estimated increase in our external market. We have also included Graduate Associates in our benchmarking and multi-year compensation initiative while also increasing their minimum stipend and beginning to phase in a health care subsidy.

Given that over the past year state support has eroded further, it was necessary to generate much of the funding for this competitive, merit-based plan internally. We did so through a combination of increased non-state revenues and budget reallocations. Specifically, we increased tuition, private fund raising and grants; reduced centrally funded initiatives by 10 percent; asked academic support units to re-program up to seven percent of next year's budget; and asked our colleges to re-program up to five percent of next year's budget. As a result, approximately 600 positions are being eliminated, approximately 120 of which involve layoffs.

**STRENGTHEN THE UNDERGRADUATE EXPERIENCE**

Ohio State has made great progress in attracting better-prepared students and enhancing their experience once they arrive. We now seek to shift our emphasis from retention to more advanced academic achievement and accelerated graduation timetables. To help sustain this progress, the Offices of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs have strengthened existing initiatives and created new initiatives. Examples include:

- Smaller classes, more openings in high-demand courses and curricular enhancements that respond to student needs, e.g., a new minor in Business and a proposed general Health Sciences major. Under review are ways to better integrate the General Education Curriculum into overall student programs and to more effectively integrate courses within the Colleges of Arts and Sciences.
- A new First Year Experience program that offers small seminar courses and other programs to ease the transition of first-year freshmen and transfer students into the University community.
- More and better academic and career advising for students.
- More and better classroom teaching development programs for faculty and graduate associates.

(continued)
Areas of Current Focus, cont'd

- More living-learning and other such special academic interest-based activities. Today, there are 41 living-learning communities of which nine are Scholar programs. Four in five incoming freshmen participate in such programs. (Living-learning Programs allow students who share academic and other interests to live together and participate in service learning, workshops and other enrichment activities.)
- New student housing for upper division undergraduate, graduate and professional students.
- Increased opportunities for undergraduates to incorporate research experiences into their learning.
- Recommendations to enhance the contribution of regional campuses to the mission of the University by better integrating them into the University and enhancing their role as a portal to the Columbus campus.

These and other enhancements were made possible through a combination of earmarked tuition revenues (with the impact for economically disadvantaged students softened and all students getting more for their money), improved management efficiencies and reorganizations and greater accountability.

MAKE OHIO STATE A LEADER IN BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH

Biomedical research is growing in importance as a national priority with technological advancements and successes brought about by the sequencing of the human genome. Ohio State has made a major commitment to become a leading player in this national arena, a commitment that is facilitated by the University's existing strengths. These strengths include interdisciplinary programs; broad research interests that range from cancer and heart disease to agriculture, biological sciences and pharmacy; and facilities such as the world's only 8 tesla MRI human magnet. A Biomedical Research Plan was developed to facilitate and leverage discovery across different types of research areas. That plan links researchers in seven different areas: Mechanisms of Health and Disease, Biomedical Informatics, Technology, Risk Factors, Assessment, Intervention and Health Outcomes. The goals of the plan are to create synergies across disciplines, link basic science researchers with clinicians and apply new technology and information to medical problems.

Groups of faculty, clustered in the seven focused areas of expertise, have been preparing inventories of existing strengths, identifying key assets and opportunities and recommending strategies for progress and collaboration. In addition to tapping into the vast expertise of current faculty, several new faculty members are playing key roles in the development of the Biomedical Research Plan, including: Joel Saltz, Medicine, who was recruited from Johns Hopkins and is leading the Biomedical Informatics component; Wolfgang Sadee, Pharmacology, who was recruited from the University of California-San Francisco and is playing a critical role in the area of Disease Intervention; and Avner Friedman, Mathematics, who was recruited from the University of Minnesota and will link his current efforts in mathematical

(continued)
biosciences, where he is working with the National Science Foundation, with Biomedical Informatics.

To facilitate the expansion of biomedical research, the University is planning to construct a state-of-the-art Biomedical Research Tower. This building is projected to open by late 2006 and will nearly double the assignable square footage devoted to biomedical research. It will be funded by the University Medical Center through the sale of capital bonds, repaid from private fund raising and increased grant awards, and by investments from the President’s Strategic Investment Fund. The initiative is consistent with the high level of growth in the NIH research budget and could perhaps receive funds from the State of Ohio’s tobacco settlement fund and the Governor’s Third Frontier Project. Apart from its major contributions to medicine and health, the biomedical research initiative will become the focus of new faculty hires, thus creating intellectual capital, stimulating the commercialization of discovery and benefiting the Ohio economy. In addition, the Biomedical Research Plan and Tower will contribute substantially to all six Academic Plan strategies.

CREATE AN INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF RACE AND ETHNICITY IN THE AMERICAS

Many consider race to be our nation’s greatest domestic problem, a pivotal issue that in turn affects many other societal challenges such as housing, public health, education, labor supply and social justice. Given that universities exist to create knowledge and to prepare students for the world that awaits them, an institute to study race — and the related subject of ethnicity — provides a meaningful opportunity for discovery and scholarship, teaching and service. It will also contribute to intellectual life on campus and foster a University environment that will attract and retain faculty and students of color.

Founded by the Colleges of Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences and Law, the Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity in the Americas offers several unique features. These include its focus on ethnicity as well as race, its emphasis on the Americas and the fact that it begins with more than $1 million in annual institutional investment — funds that were set aside prior to the budget cuts and which are expected to stimulate considerable grant activity. The presence of this initiative on campus will not only prepare students for a more diverse life, it will provide useful information and policy guidance for the community. This spring, following a national search, the University recruited John Powell, a nationally known scholar now serving as executive director of the Institute on Race and Poverty at the University of Minnesota, as the Institute’s director. He will assume this position during the upcoming academic year.
Overall Academic Plan Progress

The following information highlights major areas of progress on the Academic Plan’s six strategies and 14 initiatives.

**BUILD A WORLD-CLASS FACULTY**

1. Over the next three to five years, recruit at least 12 faculty members who have attained or have the potential to attain the highest honors in their disciplines, concentrating these appointments in areas of strategic focus.

   - In July of 2001, the Ohio Board of Regents awarded Ohio State four of the state’s seven new Eminent Scholar positions, providing up to $750,000 per position in endowment support to be matched by new University fund raising. Work is under way to identify candidates for these positions and to raise the necessary funds.

   - In winter quarter 2001, a faculty committee recommended pursuing proposals for nine distinguished faculty hires, four of whom have already accepted offers and are actively engaged in teaching and scholarship. Discussions are under way with three other eminent faculty while two declined our offers.

   - Among the outstanding individuals recruited to play prominent roles in the success of the Academic Plan and not otherwise cited in this report are: Martha Chamallas, Robert J. Lynn Chair in Law; Ann Hamilton, Art; Chris Hammel, Physics; Winston Ho, Engineering, Center for Materials Research; Alastair Minnis, English; and Jay Zweier, Davis Heart and Lung Research Institute.

2. Implement a faculty recruitment, retention, and development plan— including a competitive, merit-based compensation structure that is in line with peer institutions.

   - The “competitive, merit-based compensation structure that is in line with peer institutions” is discussed above. That plan was developed by a Competitive Compensation Oversight Group appointed by the President to advise the Provost and Senior Vice President for Business and Finance. All faculty and staff are eligible for the resulting increases and merit is the primary determinant of specific levels of increase. In addition, Colleges/Units are encouraged to make additional one-time cash payments to a limited number of faculty and staff to reinforce outstanding performance, retain individuals whose salaries are behind market or aid the lowest paid individuals to help offset fee increases.

   - The Offices of Academic Affairs and Research joined with a wide variety of Colleges in funding two dozen successful counteroffers to retain valuable Ohio State faculty.
3. Continue the Strategic Investment approach by competitively funding initiatives that build programmatic strength and open new fields. Build on existing capabilities and capture opportunities specific to Ohio State and to Ohio. Maintain ongoing multidisciplinary initiatives where appropriate and develop new initiatives that draw on University-wide strengths to attack major problems of the next quarter century. Create multidisciplinary centers that can attract additional faculty in key areas, helping reduce student-faculty ratios in high demand fields.

- The Office of Academic Affairs continued to support the 13 Selective Investment programs, Academic Enrichment commitments and other targeted central initiatives, acknowledging our desire to build excellence despite budget difficulties. We also began to realign base budgets consistent with each college’s financial performance and needs of the Academic Plan, completing 16 percent of the re-basing process during FY02 and anticipating continued progress in FY03. In all, almost $5.2 million in continuing funds were distributed to colleges for targeted purposes this year. The extent to which funds have been used for focused purposes is reflected in the fact that five of the 18 colleges received 73 percent of strategic investment funding.

- The Office of Research made significant multi-year commitments to a number of large-scale initiatives that show great potential to enhance the level and quality of research activities at Ohio State. Major commitments have been made to the Bioinformatics and Drug Delivery initiatives in the College of Medicine and Public Health and to the Math-Biosciences initiative in the College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences. Another significant commitment is marshalling a University-wide research response to counter terrorist activities and enhanced homeland security.

- Two major interdisciplinary initiatives – the University Medical Center’s Biomedical Research Plan and the Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity in the Americas – are discussed above.

4. Significantly increase space dedicated to funded research beyond what is currently planned. Include a multidisciplinary building devoted to high quality research space as well as to office and meeting space.

- As already noted, the new Biomedical Research Tower will nearly double the assignable square footage devoted to biomedical research in the Medical Center. Plans call for a 422,000 square-foot building with 10 stories and state-of-the-art facilities, including an animal-imaging center. The $120 million facility will be financed largely with bonds, repaid with grant growth from increased faculty productivity.

- The Office of Research has developed a plan to convert a renovated Smith Laboratory to a multidisciplinary research facility that could accommodate faculty from a variety of colleges focused on a central research theme.

- In partnership with the Office of Facilities Planning and Development, the Office of Research has commissioned a benchmark analysis of the campus’ long-term research space needs.

- Significant private funding contributed to many new research facilities, including the Davis Heart and Lung Research Institute, Ross Heart Hospital, Parker Food Science Building and Wildemuth Optometric Research Center as well as research facilities in Veterinary Medicine, Neuroscience and wetlands.

(continued)
5. Transform the library into a 21st century Information Age center within the next five to 10 years.

فكر

An architectural feasibility study to identify programmatic needs, architectural options and costs to renovate the Main Library has been completed, and planning continues on an option that will cost $98 million – roughly the mid-point of four options. The project is expected to be financed with 70 percent state funds and 30 percent from private fund raising. A detailed fund-raising plan is now being developed by the Director of Libraries in consultation with the Office of Development.

6. Upgrade the quality of our classroom pool space and enhance the appearance of the campus facilities and grounds.

فكر

Several projects to renovate large lecture halls with state funding are in the planning stages while the renovation of second-floor classrooms in Denney Hall have already been completed. In addition, many classroom projects are included in large capital projects now under way, including a new physics building, renovation of Hagerty Hall as the location of the new World Culture and Media Center, renovations for Page Hall as the home to the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy and the construction of the signature facility for the Knowlton School of Architecture. These facilities will be flexible and appropriate in size and design for their specific use and will include state-of-the-art equipment as well as gathering spaces that encourage out-of-the-classroom learning experiences among students.

فكر

Construction began in February for the first new student housing since the late 1960s, a facility at Nell and 10th that will house about 500 graduate and professional students as well as honors/scholars undergraduates.

فكر

Ground will be broken in November 2002 for the first phase of a $140 million, 634,000 square-foot recreation and physical activity center. This Larkins Hall renovation is a joint project of Student Affairs, the School of Physical Activity and Educational Services and the Department of Athletics.

فكر

Campus Partners began demolition this spring along North High Street to make way for construction of a University Gateway Center. The Center will be a dynamic blend of entertainment, retail, office space, rental housing and parking that is likely to cost more than $100 million. It will better serve Ohio State students and other area residents and will become a catalyst for renewal of the entire High Street corridor.

7. Provide faculty, staff, and students with the latest technology tools for leadership in teaching, research, and career development within the next five years.

فكر

A distance-education committee recently recommended ways for Ohio State to proceed more strategically and effectively with distributed learning and distance-education initiatives. Susan Metros, a nationally recognized leader in this field, was hired as deputy CIO for Educational Technology and Distributed Learning to provide the needed vision, leadership and expertise.
To improve the technology infrastructure for teaching and learning, 13 new central classrooms were technology-enabled for a total of 76; 13 existing technology-enabled central classrooms were upgraded; and 228 computers were upgraded in student labs. A new classroom support web site was developed to provide faculty with access to comprehensive information on each room’s technology resources.

A Pew Foundation grant will support the redesign of Statistics 135, a chronically-closed GEC course that enrolls 3,250 students annually. The methodology developed potentially can help redesign other large courses.

**ENHANCE AND BETTER SERVE THE STUDENT BODY**

8. Within the next three years, make admission to Ohio State selective throughout the year for new freshmen and for all transfer students.

Thanks to competitive admissions in the fall quarter, the University continues to recruit an increasingly better-prepared freshman class. This is already leading to increased retention rates, with positive implications for the budget and for improved graduation rates. Extending competitive admissions to winter and spring quarters is the next step that needs to be taken so that our entire student body enters the University well prepared.

9. Create a rich educational environment for undergraduates. Increase course accessibility, reduce class sizes, and establish at least 10 Scholars Programs within five years – expanding opportunities for students to live with those who share common interests and enhancing students’ academic success and sense of community. Provide academic programming, advising, and career counseling within these communities.

In addition to our current focus to strengthen the undergraduate experience (described above), we have completed the transition to direct enrollment, developed a computerized course monitoring program and created a program to prepare students for post-baccalaureate fellowships.

Today, we have nine scholars programs.

Student Affairs has developed an array of late-night alternative programming, taken measures to enhance safety in the East-of-High area and conducted educational programs to discourage dangerous behavior. In addition, the Jesse Owens recreation facility has been enhanced.

A new Multicultural Center opened in 2001 to promote intellectual and cultural enrichment, programs, services and facilities for students, faculty, staff and community.

10. Provide ample need-based and merit-based aid for undergraduates and a competitive financial aid and fellowship support package for graduate and professional students to improve Ohio State’s graduate and professional matriculation rate.

The University has maintained its tradition of softening the impact of tuition increases for needy students. Over the past two academic years, approximately 20 percent of such new fee revenue was earmarked for additional undergraduate student financial aid percent. As a result, Ohio State provided more need-based aid than other Ohio public colleges and universities.

Graduate student stipends were increased beginning in August 2001. And as noted above, GAs are now included in benchmarking and the

(continued)
competitive compensation initiative. In addition, the University is phasing in the subsidization of health care insurance costs for graduate students.

The Research Commission Report advocated increasing the number and value of fellowships to recruit outstanding graduate students to Ohio State and for funds to support interdisciplinary programs. The G-QUE recommendations included various ways to increase support for graduate students. The current financial climate is limiting our ability to implement these recommendations.

CREATE A DIVERSE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

11. Hire at least five to ten women and five to 10 minority faculty at a senior level each year for five years through the Faculty Hiring Assistance Program (FHAP) and other initiatives.

Sixteen women and five minorities, one of whom was female, were recruited into senior-level faculty positions and arrived on campus for the 2001-2002 academic year. Two of these individuals received some funding through the Faculty Hiring Assistance Program or FHAP.

More broadly, we continue to progress in meeting the goals of the Diversity Action Plan. The President and Provost have repeatedly articulated the importance of our diversity initiative. Accountability measures are in place. Each college was required to develop its own diversity plan and to report annually on its progress, which is reviewed by the Diversity Council.

The President's and Provost’s Diversity Lecture series has brought 12 well-known diversity scholars to campus for stimulating discussions of diversity issues.

Critical to future success will be effective retention strategies since we have done better in hiring women and minorities than in retaining them.

12. Recruit, support and retain to graduation larger numbers of academically able minority students.

Admission data show that we have continued to increase the racial and ethnic diversity and enhance the overall academic preparation of our entering freshman class last fall. Approximately one freshman in five from that entering class was a member of a minority group.

The Office of Minority Affairs instituted a program focused on the retention of African-American male students.

The Office of Student Affairs has a very active commitment to diversity programming, encompassing hundreds of events, activities and organizations designed to support minority students, educate the campus community and create a welcoming environment for all students. Students of color are well represented in such University-wide activities as Welcome Week, Homecoming and student government as well as in activities targeted to minorities. A 2001 Campus Climate for Diversity study provides valuable data for developing programs and services that respond to student diversity issues.
13. Become the catalyst for the development of Ohio's technology-based economy. Increase collaborations with the private sector to enhance research, successfully transfer University technology and provide experiential learning and career opportunities for students.

- Scitech, the University-affiliated research and technology campus, completed Science Village Phase 1, including the Ohio MicroMD Laboratory. This multi-user, academic and industrial BioMems R&D Center will help bring Ohio State and Central Ohio into worldwide prominence in utilizing nanotechnology to improve health care. Phase 1 also includes space for Honda R&D Americas, iMEDD, the Columbus Technology Leadership Council and Battelle Technology Fund.

- The Business Technology Center (BTC) incubator now houses 16 companies. It started and/or invested in seven companies and developed space for Leadscope, a bioinformatics company.

- The pieces are coming together for an effective pipeline that connects the University to the commercial world. Besides Scitech and the BTC, it includes the Technology Commercialization Corporation, which helps new companies get started.

- Industry-sponsored research continues to grow, and a host of University research centers contribute to economic growth, examples being the Center for Advanced Polymer and Composite Engineering, the Center for Excellence in Manufacturing Management and the Food Industries Center. Other academic-industry partnerships help prepare students for industrial jobs. Now in its second year, the Pre-Kindergarten through 12th grade Project has created the Learning Bridge, a neighborhood schools initiative that includes the Columbus Public Schools, Columbus Education Association, and agency and community representatives.

14. Significantly strengthen the scope and effectiveness of our commitment to P-12 public education, with a special focus on the education of underserved children and youth. In so doing, work with the State of Ohio and selected local school districts. This initiative will be a University-wide partnership with the College of Education in the lead college role.

- Working with the Service Learning initiative and Student Affairs, the P-12 Project has created the Community Connection, a web-based volunteer matching and training system that will be available to the University and the community next autumn.

- It also created the Ohio Collaborative – Research and Policy for Schools, Children, and Families, a statewide research and policy center to coalesce higher education faculty throughout Ohio to provide research and policy support for the Ohio General Assembly, Governor's Office, Ohio Board of Regents, and the Ohio Department of Education. The Ohio Collaborative is already assisting the Governor’s Commission on Teaching Success, the Ohio Families and Children First initiative and the Columbus Public Schools.

- In addition, the P-12 Project helped support the formation of the University Teacher Education Council, a structure comprised of equal numbers of education and arts and sciences faculty to strengthen the initial preparation of education professionals.
## The Academic Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Indicator</th>
<th>Ohio State</th>
<th>Benchmark Universities</th>
<th>OSU Change from previous reported year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build a World Class Faculty</td>
<td>1. Academic Honors and Awards (2000)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Market Share of Publications (1998-2000)</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Market Share of Citations (1990-2000)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Market Share of Federal Research Dollars (2000)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Average Faculty Compensation (FY2001)</td>
<td>73,929</td>
<td>76,406</td>
<td>$303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define Ohio State as Leading Public Land Grant</td>
<td>Benchmark Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. US News Academic Reputation Score (2001)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. US News Academic PhD programs among the Top 25 (2002)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. NRC Academic PhD programs among the top 25% (1992)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the Quality of the Teaching &amp; Learning Environment</td>
<td>National Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. % of Faculty Satisfied Overall (1999)*</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. % of Students Satisfied with Instruction and Courses (2001)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. % of Students Satisfied with Campus Facilities (2001)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance and Better Serve the Student Body</td>
<td>Benchmark Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. % of Freshmen in the Top 25% of H.S. Class (2000)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Freshmen Retention Rate (2000)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Four-year Graduation Rate (2000)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Average GMAT score for MBA students (2000)</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>653.7</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Average LSAT range for Law students (2001)</td>
<td>155-161</td>
<td>155-164</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Average GRE verbal score for graduate students (2000)</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Average GRE quantitative score for graduate students (2000)</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Average GRE analytical score for graduate students (2000)</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. % of Students Satisfied with Student Support Services (2001)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a Diverse University Community</td>
<td>Benchmark Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. % of Women Faculty (2000)</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. % of African American, Hispanic, and Native American Faculty (2000)</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. % of Minority Staff (2000)</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. % of African-American &amp; Hispanic Students (2000)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. African-American Freshmen Retention Rate (2000)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Hispanic Freshmen Retention Rate (2000)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. African American 6-Year Graduation Rate (2000)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Build Ohio's Future</td>
<td>Benchmark Avc.1998</td>
<td>OSU 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13.1 mil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Number of Invention Disclosures (OSU-2001; Bchmks-1999)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Number of Patents Awarded (OSU-2001; Bchmks-1999)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Number of License/Options Executed (OSU-2001; Bchmks-1999)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Revenue from Income Generating Licenses (OSU-2001; Bchmks-1999)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Impact of P-12 Initiatives</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Impact of Principal's Academy</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Benchmark institutions are large, comprehensive, Research I universities, many of which currently outrank Ohio State in various reputational surveys.

NC: No Change from Previous Reporting Period
NI: No Information about Earlier Reporting Period
* Faculty Satisfaction will be measured again in 2002.
**Data was available for 5 of the 9 benchmarks.

For more information about The Ohio State University Academic Plan, visit www.osu.edu/academicplan
The Ohio State University aspires to be among the world's truly great universities—advancing the well-being of the people of Ohio and the global community through the creation and dissemination of knowledge. Ohio needs a great teaching and research university for a rich flow of ideas, innovation, and graduates from a wide variety of disciplines. Ohio also needs a great university to be what The New York Times has called a "reviving economic engine" that spurs strategic growth in the new Information Age economy.

Any review of the comparative data makes it clear that our focus must be on building academic excellence. For while the University needs to continuously improve in many areas, we will never be a great university without dramatically enhancing the reality and perception of our teaching and learning as well as our research and scholarship - and without enhancing the service activities that flow from our excellence in these endeavors.

Over recent years, we have focused on four core elements: Becoming a national leader in the quality of our academic programs; being universally recognized for the quality of the learning experience we offer our students; creating an environment that truly values and is enriched by diversity; and expanding the land-grant mission to address our society's most compelling needs.

These core elements are reflected in the six strategies and 14 supporting initiatives that follow. While the University will undertake many more initiatives over the next five years, these are considered the most transformational.

Strategy: Build a World-Class Faculty
1. Over the next three to five years, recruit at least 12 faculty members who have attained or have the potential to attain the highest honors in their disciplines, concentrating these appointments in areas of strategic focus.
2. Implement a faculty recruitment, retention, and development plan - including a competitive, merit-based compensation structure - that is in line with our peer institutions.

Strategy: Develop Academic Programs that Define Ohio State as the Nation's Leading Public Land-Grant University.
3. Continue the Strategic Investment approach by competitive funding initiatives that build programmatic strength and open new fields. Build on existing capabilities and capture opportunities specific to Ohio State and to Ohio. Maintain ongoing multidisciplinary initiatives where appropriate and develop new initiatives that draw on University-wide strengths to address major problems of the next quarter century. Create multidisciplinary centers that can attract additional faculty in key areas, helping reduce student-faculty ratios in high-demand fields.
4. Significantly increase space dedicated to funded research beyond what is currently planned. Include a multidisciplinary building devoted to high-quality research space as well as to office and meeting space.

Strategy: Enhance the Quality of the Teaching and Learning Environment.
5. Transform the Library into a 21st century Information Age center within the next five to ten years.
6. Upgrade the quality of our classroom pool space and enhance the appearance of the campus facilities and grounds.
7. Provide faculty, staff, and students with the latest technology tools for leadership in teaching, research, and career development within the next five years.

Strategy: Enhance and Better Serve the Student Body.
8. Within the next three years, make admissions to Ohio State selective throughout the year for new freshmen and for all transfer students.
9. Create a rich educational environment for undergraduates. Increase course accessibility, reduce class sizes, and establish at least ten scholars programs within five years - expanding opportunities for students to live with those who share common interests and enhancing students' academic success and sense of community. Provide academic programming, advising, and career counseling within these communities.
10. Provide ample need-based and merit-based aid for undergraduates and a competitive financial aid and fellowship support package for graduate and professional students to improve Ohio State's graduate and professional matriculation rate.

Strategy: Create a Diverse University Community.
11. Hire at least five to ten women and five to ten minority faculty at a senior level each year for five years through the Faculty Hiring Assistance Program (FHAP) and other initiatives.
12. Recruit, support, and retain to graduation larger numbers of academically able minority students.

Strategy: Help Build Ohio's Future.
13. Significantly strengthen the scope and effectiveness of our commitment to P-12 public education, with a special focus on the education of underserved children and youth. In so doing, work with the State of Ohio and selected local school districts. This initiative will be a University-wide partnership, with the College of Education in the lead college role.
14. Become the catalyst for the development of Ohio's technology-based economy. Increase collaborations with the private sector to enhance research, successfully transfer University technology, and provide experiential learning and career opportunities for students.

To successfully implement this ambitious agenda, the University must take four Facilitating Actions: Obtain increased state support, improve the organization and delivery of instruction, increase organizational flexibility, and improve the faculty work environment. The Plan identifies specific steps to meet these needs.

Over the next five years, the University expects to invest in the range of $750 million in new and reallocated resources to implement this Plan, with spending scaled up or down depending upon actual funding. The Plan identifies potential sources for the needed revenues. A set of strategic indicators will help measure our progress.
Ohio State seeks ways to increase revenues, cut costs
Efforts needed to continue advancing Academic Plan

COLUMBUS – Leaders of The Ohio State University are preparing strategies to help the university address its long-term financial resource needs to implement the Academic Plan in the face of ongoing uncertain state support for higher education. The plan focuses on savings, cost avoidance and seeking additional resources in development and research funding.

Executive Vice President and Provost Edward J. Ray and Senior Vice President for Business and Finance William J. Shkurti told the university’s Board of Trustees today (2/7) that Ohio State must find new ways to increase revenues and reduce costs, so that more revenues do not come from tuition increases and state support alone. The goal is to identify at least $20 million to $25 million in savings and cost avoidance over the next five years.

“Ohio State has established a good track record in managing its costs, but past achievements are not sufficient to meet our future needs,” Ray said. “At a time when growth in state support is small or decreasing, it is important to identify revenue resources and cost reductions to meet academic goals without an over-reliance on tuition increases.”

During the last fiscal year, Ohio State absorbed a $28 million loss in state funding that resulted in a reduction of nearly 600 positions. Now, with the state’s tax revenues continuing to falter and a slow recovery mirroring that of the nation, Ohio State cannot rely on state support as the only method to finance the improvements called for in the Academic Plan, the university’s blueprint for becoming one of the world’s top public research institutions.

On the other hand, the university cannot and will not lay the burden solely on the shoulders of its students through exorbitant tuition hikes, Ray said. Published reports that the university is planning a mid-year tuition increase are inaccurate, he added.

Shkurti said the Academic Plan calls for administrative cost reductions of $3 million to $5 million and revenue increases of $65 million to $85 million in one-time funds through fiscal
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year 2006. “These goals will be met or exceeded in this time period, but this still is not likely to be sufficient to meet our needs in the years ahead.”

Among the plan’s priorities are recruiting and retaining outstanding faculty and staff, funding for scholarships, and continued improvement of the student experience—through greater course availability, increased access to faculty, better academic and career advising, improved access to informational technology, and additional opportunities for learning outside the classroom, including the creative work and research of the faculty that will enrich the future for the entire university.

“This is not a continuation of business as usual, but a significant commitment to make our undergraduates some of the best prepared in the world,” Shkurti said. “These are the kinds of steps we want and need to make to better prepare Ohio’s future teachers, entrepreneurs, engineers and public servants.”

Ray laid out for trustees a one-year plan to raise additional revenues by implementing a stronger and more aggressive agenda to win federal research funds, increasing extramural sponsorship of research and cost-recovery rates on sponsored research, expanding opportunities for private giving, and selectively expanding programs, such as distance learning, as well as entrepreneurial partnerships.

At the same time, Shkurti said the university will continue to cut costs by taking advantage of lower interest rates to reduce borrowing costs, using changes in energy markets to lower utility costs, and reviewing core administrative processes on capital projects and purchasing, for instance.

“Our size and diversity give us a comparative advantage to formulate unique sources of additional income and cost reduction,” Shkurti said. “As we go through this process, we need to remember that achieving cost savings is a long-term, continuous process and not a one-time big splash.”

But as the university begins this long-term process, it is also facing significant short-term budget issues with the state, Shkurti said.

To address a $720 million current-year budget deficit, Gov. Bob Taft last month ordered a 2.5 percent budget cut, which means that nearly $3 million in university line items are on the chopping block, but he exempted the state share of instruction, which is the source of most of the university's state support. Taft also made clear that if his plan for balancing this year’s budget is

- more -
not approved by the General Assembly by the end of February – a plan which includes not only the 2.5 percent cuts but also the approval of so-called “sin taxes” on cigarettes and alcohol as well as a package of various new sales taxes – higher education’s state share of instruction and other primary and secondary school funding would be reduced by $175 million yet this fiscal year.

For Ohio State, such a cut would mean the loss of an additional $7.6 million in state subsidies by the end of the academic year. The instructional subsidy makes up the lion’s share of state support to the university and a cut of $7.6 million is significant, Shkurti told trustees.

Illustrative of the size of the cuts, he said $7.7 million is the equivalent of 153 positions paying $50,000 in average salaries and benefits; or 1,697 class sections at 45 seats per class; or 1,407 full-ride undergraduate tuition scholarships for Ohio residents. “We would never create revenue by making cuts in any one key area like that, but it does help show the magnitude of what we are facing,” Shkurti said.

Ray agreed. “Although more resources do not guarantee results, success in acquiring resources is critical to the success of the Academic Plan. Success doesn’t come easily or without time and commitment. It still will require a strong base of tuition and state support.”

###