TO: Council on Academic Affairs

FROM: Faculty of the School of Public Policy and Management
Bert Rockman, Director of PPM
Deborah Merritt, Director of the John Glenn Institute
Don Stenta, Acting Director of the John Glenn Institute

RE: Strategic Plan for the Proposed John Glenn School of Public Affairs: AY 2006-AY 2010

The John Glenn School of Public Affairs will build on the achievements of the John Glenn Institute and the School of Public Policy and Management. The School will serve students and policymakers nationwide by providing excellent education for public service, offering ongoing training to policymakers, generating outstanding research on policy issues, and stimulating civic engagement through a wide variety of innovative programs. The School will further Ohio State's academic plan, enhancing the reputation of its public policy unit as well as the reputation of the University as a whole. The School will offer many opportunities for other academic units to partner with and build upon its programs. Joint appointments and interdisciplinary work will be a hallmark of the School.

If the John Glenn School of Public Affairs is created, one of its first tasks will be to hire a new director through a national search in AY 2006. We do not want to preempt the work of that director by developing a strategic plan that will narrowly confine the School. At the same time, we have strong traditions of faculty governance and collegial decisionmaking in both of our units. We also possess a deep knowledge of the assets currently held by PPM and JGI and the potential for a combined unit. We have created the attached plan, drawing upon that knowledge and with the belief that it is sufficiently flexible to adapt to changing conditions during the next five years.

The plan begins with a profile of the School as it would be on July 1, 2005, if formed by that time. After this profile, we offer an analysis of the new School's strengths and weaknesses. These form the basis of plans for each of the School's first five years.

The plan for each year notes specific priorities for that year, as well as the goals we hope to have attained by the end of that year.

A companion memo, outlining the School's financial plan for these five years, demonstrates how we will attain our strategic goals.

Please let us know if we can provide any further information.
**Faculty Size**

| Faculty Size | 7 (4 tenured associate professors, 1 untenured associate professor, 2 untenured assistant professors) |

**Faculty Degree Fields**

| Faculty Degree Fields | Public Policy (5), Political Science (2), Social Work, Agricultural and Resource Economics, Law² |

**Joint Appointments**

| Joint Appointments | None |

**Emeriti**

| Emeriti | 10, with 1 actively teaching and in residence full time |

**Adjuncts/Lecturers**

| Adjuncts/Lecturers | 11, 7 from the community and 4 from non-tenure-track administrative positions at OSU. Seven currently teach. |

**Affiliated Faculty**

| Affiliated Faculty | Approximately 200, from more than 50 different OSU departments |

**Scholars in Residence**

| Scholars in Residence | 2 faculty from Humanities and Education, funded by outside grants for research projects; 2 visiting scholars from Korea |

**Master's Student Enrollment (MPA and MA)**

| Master's Student Enrollment (MPA and MA) | 85 |

**Doctoral Student Enrollment**

| Doctoral Student Enrollment | 19 |

**Staff Support**

| Staff Support | Associate Director (1) Fiscal/Human Resources (1.5) Training Programs (4.3) Office Manager (.8) General Office Support (1) Information Technology (2) Kiplinger Program (1.25) Lectures and Public Relations (1) Student Non-Degree Programs (3) Recruiting, Admissions, Placement (1) Research Initiatives (1) Development (2)³ Archivists (2)⁴ Senator Glenn's Staff (2)⁵ Undergraduate student workers (8) Graduate student administrative assistants (6) |

**Centers/Research Initiatives**

| Centers/Research Initiatives | Second Amendment Research Center Service-Learning Scholars Initiative |

**Non-Degree Student Programs**

| Non-Degree Student Programs | High School Internship Program Washington Academic Internship Program |

---

¹ Tenure for one of these associate professors to be effective AY 2005-06.
² Some faculty hold more than one degree.
³ These staff members are paid by and report to Development, but they have been assigned to JGI and will be assigned to the John Glenn School.
⁴ These staff members are paid by and report to the Library, but they enhance the work of the Institute and will enhance that of the School.
⁵ These staff members are paid by and report to the President's Office, but they contribute significantly to the mission of JGI and will contribute similarly to that of the School.
### Analysis:

1. The School's greatest need is for added faculty. In addition to increasing faculty size, faculty are needed at senior ranks and with joint appointments. It will also be important to diversify the fields in which faculty hold degrees, do research, and teach. Given their small size, the current faculty cover an impressive range of fields (including regional and spatial economics; social policy, family, and crime; public administration; environmental policy; and operations research), but public policy encompasses increasingly diverse areas of expertise—including expertise falling outside the traditional social and behavioral sciences.

2. The School does not need additional staff; staff size is more than adequate to support the School and its programs. Some staff, however, need to be shifted to student recruiting, admissions, and placement. These functions will be crucial for the School to succeed.

3. The School could expand the number and diversity of its adjuncts from practice. Visiting scholars and professors from other top schools of public affairs would also...
be desirable, both to enrich faculty and student life and to inform visitors about the School.

- The School's training programs, non-degree programs for students, applied research initiative, lectures, conferences, and workshops are excellent. The number and breadth of these activities already match those at many top schools of public affairs. These activities are likely to grow due simply to their own excellence, but no special effort needs to be devoted to expanding them.

- Student enrollment has dropped considerably since the mid-1990s. Regaining previous enrollment levels is necessary to assure the School's financial stability and reputational growth. Growth should focus on the master's programs; the size of the doctoral program has remained steady and is appropriate.

- The School needs to develop financial support for its professional master's students. Only a small number of these students currently receive funding. To compete with other top schools, the Glenn School will need to offer fellowships to a higher percentage of master's students.

- The School has a very large number of affiliated faculty. This is a strength, particularly since they represent so many disciplines. Although it is not the highest priority, efforts should be made to engage these faculty and leverage their affiliations.

- The School has two interesting research centers/initiatives, so this is not an immediate concern. As faculty size grows, however, it would be appropriate to establish several other centers of excellence and specializations for the School. Focus areas will emerge as new faculty join the School.

- The School has a strong professional master's curriculum with a coherent set of required courses, internship opportunities, and capstone experiences. It has been respected as a leader among other schools of public affairs for its curriculum. Major curricular work will focus on expanding electives for master's students and developing new areas of distinction. The latter will emerge in tandem with faculty hiring.

- Similarly, the School has a well regarded doctoral program, with graduates teaching at top schools and winning national awards for their dissertations. A larger faculty will make this program even better by expanding the policy areas in which doctoral candidates can find strong mentors.

- International affairs are increasingly important in schools of public affairs, but the current faculty has modest expertise in that field. In addition to cultivating other areas of excellence, the School should recruit some faculty with an international focus to their work, draw upon other international expertise at Ohio State, and consider development of an international public policy master's program.

- The School has a decent endowment for an organization in its first year. These funds will help sustain the School and will be particularly important in supporting some faculty hires. With current rates of return on endowment, adding to endowment should not be a priority.

- Cash gifts are good for a School of this size and reputation. The School should aim to continue increasing these gifts steadily. With the addition of new faculty, it should be possible to compete for NSF grants and other funding sources that have been out of the School's reach in recent years.

- Alumni relations have suffered recently in PPM. The renamed School and range of programs/new constituencies offered by JGI should revitalize these relations. Connections among alumni, students, and policymakers are essential assets for schools of public affairs. Attention should be paid to revitalizing these connections.
• The John Glenn name and connections with the Glenn Archives offer unique opportunities for building the School's reputation, developing a strong ethic of public service, and creating innovative programs. These associations rank among the School's strongest assets.

• Page Hall offers outstanding facilities for the School. The building has been designed to serve both as a bridge between the University and the community and to facilitate thoughtful interactions. Excellent space exists to support faculty research, training programs, graduate classes, and public programs. The building's central location on the Oval facilitates interaction with other departments. It also offers ready access to pool classrooms and other facilities.
1. Hold a high-level, nationally prominent search for the School's first permanent director. In addition to securing an outstanding director, this search will enhance the School's visibility among other schools of public affairs.

2. Explore opportunities to hire visitors from other top schools for winter/spring quarters. Cash will be available for this purpose; securing a few visitors would enrich the curriculum and School life—and would also introduce visitors from top schools nationally to the Glenn School.

3. Hire at least one, and preferably two, faculty members for AY 2007. Place a high priority on making at least one joint appointment. Discuss the appropriate balance between hiring aggressively and retaining lines for arrival of the new director. One possible resolution is to restrict hiring during this first year to making 1-3 joint appointments with OSU faculty from other departments. Ohio State's strength in international relations offers opportunities to begin building that expertise through joint appointments. In general, joint appointments of existing OSU faculty would begin increasing faculty size and establish a pattern of joint appointments without preempting the new director's ability to lead external hiring.

4. Redefine staff duties to take advantage of efficiencies gained by combining the units and to provide additional staffing for student recruiting, admissions, placement, and alumni relations.

5. Develop a marketing strategy for the new School, create a new website, and create new materials for student recruiting.

6. Reconfigure the Glenn Institute's Board of Directors as a Board of Advisors for the School. Add new members, focusing on policymakers with national connections, leaders of other schools of public affairs, and alumni of the School in prominent public sector positions. Make special efforts to recruit members with national/international visibility and connections.

7. Create additional mechanisms for alumni and policymaker input, such as alumni councils or visiting committees. In addition to securing needed input, these will lay the foundation for future development efforts.

8. Reorganize mailing lists; increase communications with alumni; invite alumni to at least one event each quarter.

9. Invest in recruiting efforts to generate a total enrollment of at least 100 master's students in AY 2007. Consider using some of the School's cash reserves to offer modest fellowships to top applicants.

10. Seek prominent office holders and policy makers—including some from other states—to serve as adjuncts, distinguished visitors, or practitioners in residence.
These visitors will establish a tradition of “John Glenn Distinguished Visitors/Practitioners in Residence.”

By July 1, 2006, the School:

- Will have a nationally recognized permanent director
- Will have increased national visibility through the director search, appointment of visitors from other schools, appointment of new members to the Board of Advisors, and development of marketing strategy, new website, and new materials
- Will have increased its faculty size to 9 FTE, preferably by making selected joint appointments
- Will have reorganized staff to address critical needs in student recruiting, admissions, placement, and alumni relations
- Will have strengthened alumni and policymaker networks through appointments to the Board of Advisors, development of other mechanisms for alumni and policymaker involvement, communications with alumni, and invitations to events
- Will have increased master’s student enrollment for AY 2007 by at least one third over AY 2004 enrollments
- Will have increased connections to state, local, and national policymakers through appointments to the Board of Visitors, as well as invitations to serve as adjuncts, distinguished visitors, or practitioners in residence.

Notes

Priorities for year one do not include new development initiatives, public programs, or curricular innovations. These are all central to the School, but they are areas in which the John Glenn School already is very strong. Existing staff and faculty efforts will maintain quality in these areas. Indeed, some growth and innovation are likely without special focus.
Having organized the combined unit internally, hired a new director, and launched the new School in a variety of state and national contexts, the primary focus for Year Two is for the director, faculty, and other stakeholders to shape faculty hiring, research, and curriculum priorities for four years of aggressive hiring. The School will have the opportunity to make several senior appointments, as well as a significant number of joint appointments. These offer important opportunities to deepen the School’s expertise and define areas of excellence.

This is likely to be an iterative process, as new hires open new research and teaching avenues. But the director, faculty, and Board of Advisors most likely will want to begin the year with a series of in-depth discussions of their preferred areas of curriculum and research expansion.

As hiring occurs in this and succeeding years, the School will have the opportunity to consider the establishment of new master’s degrees or joint degree programs, as well as the creation of new research centers.

In addition to this focus on building faculty, Year Two will continue efforts to increase student enrollment, raise national visibility, deepen connections with alumni, and establish productive relationships with top policymakers and faculty from other schools.

Suggested goals for Year Two:

1. Discuss hiring, curriculum, and research priorities. Define initial plan.
2. Conduct search for a very senior hire—most likely the Wolf Chair.
3. Hire one other FTE, most likely composed of two joint appointments.
4. Continue improving student recruitment, advising, and placement.
5. Solidify relations with the Board of Advisors, other alumni and policymaker groups, and general alumni population by sharing goals for new School and seeking input.
6. Review training programs, nondegree student initiatives, lectures, and other outreach initiatives to identify opportunities for improvement and innovation.
7. Begin aggressive marketing of faculty research and expertise in academic and policy arenas—both statewide and nationally. These efforts should focus, not only on individual contributions but on developing a unique “John Glenn School” reputation for policy research.
8. Begin new development campaign for School programs. Faculty chairs and student fellowship support are likely to be top priorities.
9. Review the School's connections with the John Glenn Archives, seeking new ways to leverage those connections.

By July 1, 2007, the School:

- Will have 11 FTE faculty, including 2 very senior full professors and 4 joint appointments
- Will have a plan for the focus of additional faculty hiring
- Will have 125 master’s students enrolled
- Will have an actively engaged and enthusiastic Board of Advisors and other alumni groups
- Will have reviewed, and possibly enhanced, its nondegree student programs, training initiatives, and other outreach programs
- Will have expanded recognition of faculty research and policy contributions, establishing a unique "John Glenn School" reputation for policy research
- Will have established a new fundraising campaign with targets keyed to the School's evolving programs and top needs
- Will have leveraged its unique connection with the John Glenn Archives
This year is the transitional one in the five-year plan. It brings together the work of the first two years and uses that work to launch new initiatives for the following two. These initiatives are likely to include curricular innovations, new master's degree programs or certificates, research initiatives, and innovative forms of outreach to policymakers and younger citizens.

Suggested Goals for Year Three:

1. Review curriculum and degree offerings in light of new hires, projected hires, and student demand. Establish a master's degree in international public policy and/or graduate certificates in specialized fields.

2. Hire two more faculty FTE, including at least two joint appointments. These hires should complement the decisions made during the curriculum and degree review.

3. Develop at least one new research center, drawing upon areas of excellence developed in the preceding two years.

4. Continue developing opportunities to publicize faculty research and policy contributions, expanding the unique “John Glenn School” reputation for policy research.

5. Review the School's connections with affiliated faculty and other units campuswide, seeking new ways to involve these faculty and units in policy initiatives.

6. Recruit and enroll sufficient students to reach target of 143 master's students enrolled.

7. Begin aggressive expansion of training programs, building on centers of faculty excellence, market demand, and policy opportunities. Cultivate a reputation as leaders in this field. Seek ways to offer training nationally in addition to statewide.

8. Draw upon alumni, policymaker, and student networks, developed during the preceding two years, to enhance placement opportunities and internships for students. Feature these efforts in recruiting students.

9. Implement development campaign, with the first dollars going towards student support. This will enhance the quality of master's and doctoral students, as well as the School's national reach.

10. Develop a new program targeted at high school students or teachers nationally. This program may build on the School's previous service-learning work or adopt a new direction. It will pay particular tribute to Senator Glenn's concern for civic education.
By July 1, 2008, the School:

- Will have 13 FTE faculty, including 2 very senior full professors and at least 6 joint appointments
- Will have 143 master's students enrolled
- Will have established new directions for its curriculum, including a new master's degree program and/or certificate programs
- Will have established at least one new research center
- Will have enhanced its links with faculty and departments campuswide, finding new ways of collaboration
- Will have increased visibility for its faculty members' research and policy contributions, linking those contributions to the John Glenn brand
- Will have improved placement opportunities for students
- Will have increased student financial support through a new development campaign
- Will have established innovative programs in both public sector training and high school civic education—programs that will complement the School's existing reputation for leadership in these areas and further Senator Glenn's distinctive vision
The John Glenn School of Public Affairs
Priorities for Year Four (AY 2009)
The Homestretch Year

This year completes implementation of many priorities established during the preceding years. It allows refinement of those priorities and development of their most advanced components.

Suggested Goals for Year Four:

1. Hire 1.5 faculty, with sufficient joint hires to reach target of 9 joint appointments.

2. Implement curricular innovations for master's/doctoral students or new master's degree programs; consider additional innovations in these areas.

3. Identify new methods of publicizing faculty research to expand the John Glenn School's reputation as aggressively as possible nationally.

4. Review the School's overall marketing plan to assure that it has kept pace with evolving programs and priorities.

5. Seek input from alumni and policymakers on new initiatives or roles for those individuals.

6. Maintain student enrollment at 143 or more; new programs may draw even more students.

7. Continue development campaign, adding focus on securing funds for new faculty and research initiatives.

8. Implement new training and student initiatives (from Year Three) and review all nondegree programs to identify any that need to be revitalized or reformulated.

9. Review status of financial support for master's and doctoral students to determine whether it is adequate to continue drawing top students to the School and, if not, how it can be supplemented through further development work.

By July 1, 2009, the School:

- Will have 14.5 FTE faculty, with at least 4 full professors (2 very senior) and 9 joint appointments.
- Will have a student body of at least 143.
- Will have faculty and research programs that regularly receive recognition among national audiences.
- Will have a refreshed marketing campaign and well recognized reputation; the John Glenn School brand will enjoy widespread recognition.
- Will have loyal networks of alumni and other supporters.
• Will have a well established new development campaign, with contributions supporting both student scholarships and faculty positions
• Will have widely recognized training and public programs serving individuals from high school through retirement. These will be linked in ways that support a common John Glenn School reputation and vision.
The John Glenn School of Public Affairs  
Priorities for Year Five (AY 2010)  
The Year of Review and Renewal

During this year, the School's standing as an independent unit reporting to the Provost will be reviewed. This five-year mark also offers an appropriate opportunity for the School to take stock of its own position and create a new five-year plan.

**Suggested Goals for Year Five:**

1. Conduct a thorough review of the John Glenn School's progress and standing.

2. The faculty may not engage in any hiring this year, unless it needs to replace faculty lost through attrition. The overall review, however, will provide an excellent context for assessing curriculum development and degree programs—setting targets for faculty hiring during the next five years.

3. Building on the review, identify specific areas of improvement in all School programs.

4. Complete implementation of initiatives remaining from years three and four.

5. Continue development campaign, maintaining focus on both student support and the development of new faculty lines.

6. Prepare new five-year plan to take the School through 2015.

**By July 1, 2010, the School:**

- Will be well established, both nationally and at Ohio State
- Will have a faculty of at least 14.5 FTE, with several senior professors and at least 9 joint appointments
- Will have a master's student body of at least 143
- Most likely have at least one new master's program and/or graduate certificate programs
- Will be well known for its innovative training, public, and outreach programs
- Will have a reputation for scholarly excellence in several fields, with policymakers, journalists, and academics regularly referring to the School's work and recognizing a distinctive "John Glenn School" brand
- Will have a secure financial base, drawing upon new master's student revenues and a growing development campaign
- Will have a wide range of programs inspiring and informing public service in citizens of all ages, all connected by John Glenn's vision and legacy
- Will have an innovative 5-year plan for AY years 2011-15
We are pleased to respond to the Council’s request for further information regarding the financial plan for a John Glenn School of Public Affairs that would report to the Provost. As indicated in our earlier communications, this School would begin with the assets and income streams currently identified with the John Glenn Institute and the School of Public Policy and Management. We anticipate supporting the new School, including necessary growth, by using (1) Current assets and income streams; (2) Increased support from private donors and foundations; and (3) Increased revenue from enrollment of additional students in the professional master’s program. We do not anticipate investment of new annual rate from OAA or the creation of new undergraduate courses.

This memo lays out in more detail our financial assumptions and plan for the next five years. We focus here on the first and third categories mentioned above, omitting discussion of private support beyond what is already in hand. Although we believe that support will increase dramatically with establishment of the new School—and would allow growth beyond what is described here—we do not rely on that assumption in our projections. We base all projections on conservative assumptions.

I. The Starting Position

Both JGI and PPM fully support their current faculty, staff, and programs with their current budgets. In fact, our current projections suggest that JGI will carry a surplus of at least $216,601.48 into FY 06, while PPM will carry an even larger surplus of $686,577.90 into FY 06. This cash will be available to seed new faculty hiring, master’s student support, and other initiatives. It also serves as a substantial “contingency” buffer if any of our assumptions about future income prove erroneous.

A. Projected Revenue for FY 2006

The terms of the proposed merger provide that each unit will bring its current assets and income streams to the combined unit. Using that assumption, a conservative estimate for the unit’s revenue in FY 2006 is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carryforward from JGI</td>
<td>216,601.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryforward from PPM</td>
<td>686,577.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JGI PBA</td>
<td>609,096.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM PBA</td>
<td>1,302,424.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These estimates are conservative because in all but one case we use actual figures from FY05. The exceptions are for JGI and PPM "other income," where we use lower figures—eliminating payments in the current year that will not recur in FY06.2

Most of these income projections are quite secure. It is possible that the state budget crisis will force OAA to cut PSA to units but, in the end, we believe allocations will remain at least constant. In the case of PPM, enrollments have increased during the last year so there may be a modest increase to PBA.

JGI's training programs constitute an earnings unit designed so that, if revenues fall, expenses fall as well.3 A rise or fall in these revenues will not affect bottom line projections.

Our projection of cash gifts and grants to JGI is quite conservative. Because Development holds gifts for 6 months, we know that at least this amount is already "in the pipeline" for payment to JGI in FY 06.4

JGI's line item is the only portion of the income stream that is in any doubt. Because of the state budget crisis, it is possible that we will lose at least part of this line item. So far, however, the item is in the state budget (indeed, it has been listed for a slightly higher

---

1 Other income for both units includes state government payments on research contracts, sublease payments on the Institute's Washington office, the "tech" fee paid by PPM's graduate students, and miscellaneous transfers from other OSU units (e.g., contributions from Residence Life towards the Institute's Living Learning Program).

2 JGI's "other income" for FY05 totals more than $130,000, but that includes payments for Stillman Hall furniture purchased by other units, one-time revenue transfers from SBS in connection with our Washington Academic Internship Program, and other payments that will not be repeated. Similarly, PPM's "other income" in FY05 included payments to support operation of the Governance journal, which will move to another school next year. Both units might acquire new sources of "other income," but we have estimated conservatively by including only income that will repeat in FY06 and future years.

3 Over the next few years, we believe it is possible to generate some "profit" from these training programs, i.e., revenue that can be used to support overhead of the School. For purposes of these projections, however, we have taken a conservative position and omitted any reliance on such revenue. These programs, at the very least, break even.

4 In other words, we do not count gifts as revenue until those funds are released to JGI. Six months before that happens, Development has already deposited a check from the donor. Often, we have a signed commitment another month or two before that. At this point, we already have sufficient commitments and checks deposited with Development to know that we will have at least this amount of gift income in FY 06.
amount) and we have been successful in protecting this line item through previous budget crises. If the Institute does lose its line item, we have contingency plans for cutting program expenses in ways that would require no reduction in staff or serious compromise of program quality. We would make temporary reductions in certain expenditures while seeking private funds to support those expenses. For purposes of this discussion, we can assume that either the line item will be preserved or the Institute will cut marginal costs in ways that will not significantly affect growth of the School.

B. Available Resources for Growth in FY 2006

As noted above and in previous discussions, both JGI and PPM support their current faculty, staff, and programs with current revenues. Both units, moreover, have some reserved revenues that can be applied to new hiring. These include some interest from endowments within JGI and PPM, as well as a modest amount of PBA in PPM’s “reinvestment” account—i.e., PBA that it has not yet used for salary or benefits.

In addition to these reserves, the departures of both Deborah Merritt (JGI Director) and Bert Rockman (PPM Director) will free substantial PBA in both units.

In FY06, the new School will be able to support all faculty and staff remaining on the payroll after July 1 and all current programs. In addition, it will have the following PBA and endowment interest to support new hiring and raises for current faculty/staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PBA (released by Merritt/Rockman departures, plus available PBA in PPM)</th>
<th>454,103.09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPM endowment interest</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JGI endowment interest</td>
<td>45,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>619,103.09</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We anticipate needing no more than $45,000 to cover raises for existing faculty and staff. Any retirement payouts to Merritt and Rockman will be covered by the cash carryforward in the two units. This leaves at least $574,103 for new hiring.

In addition, if the proposed Glenn School is approved, we believe that Ambassador Wolf will designate the Wolf Chair (which is already fully funded and generating interest) to that School. Projected income from that endowment for FY 06 is at least $65,000.

Thus, available resources (PBA and endowment interest) for new hiring or programs will be at least $639,103 in the School’s very first year.

---

5 Part of our success lies with the fact that the Glenn Institute is paired with the Voinovich Center in the state budget. Republicans in the General Assembly do not want to offend Senator Voinovich by cutting funds for his Center at Ohio University. Democrats will not let them get away with that unless they also fund the Glenn Institute. We will see if the dynamic holds this year.

6 Some endowment interest in both units will be used for other purposes; these are the amounts available for new hiring.

7 This estimate excludes raises for staff associated with the JGI earnings unit, because those raises come from increased revenue rather than PBA or endowment interest.
II. Plan for Fiscal Years 06-08 (the first three years)

As noted in our accompanying memo, which outlines the strategic plan for the proposed School’s first five years, we do not anticipate hiring any new staff for the School. The combined unit will have substantial staff resources. Nor do we anticipate needing PBA or endowment interest to support nonpersonnel program costs; any necessary funds for increased costs will come from our cash carryforward. We will focus all available resources from PBA and endowment interest on faculty hiring.

The $639,103 available from PBA and endowment interest is sufficient to support a significant number of hires. Since the School will need a new director, as well as other senior hires and joint appointments, this is one possible hiring pattern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Benefits @ 27%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superstar hire (director or Wolf Chair)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior hire (director or Wolf Chair)</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>37,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four half-time associate professors (joint appointments with other departments) @ $40,000 apiece</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>43,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $635,000

This hiring strategy would increase the School’s size from 7 FTE/7 faculty (i.e., no joint appointments) on July 1, 2005, to 11 FTE/13 faculty (4 joint appointments). The strategy would also give significant added strength at the senior level and several joint appointments.

Realistically, almost none of these resources will be used in FY 06. The hiring season for that year is already over. Instead, the School will begin recruiting in FY 06 to fill at least some of these lines in FY 07. Some available cash from these lines in FY 06 may be used to pay an acting director for the School drawn from another OSU unit. As noted in the strategic plan, cash may also be used to hire visitors from other schools. A significant amount of cash, however, will also be available as carryforward, to continue seeding new hires and other investments—or to cushion any reversals in funding.

We anticipate that hiring for these positions will take at least two full years, especially since hiring during the first year must also focus on securing a permanent director through a national search. We would not want to fill all of these positions without that new director’s input. It is most likely, therefore, that the School will not reach the projected FTE of 11 (with 4 joint appointments for a total of 13 faculty) until at least FY 08. The financial resources, however, clearly are available to fill these positions as soon as possible.

---

* Adequate funds for moving, start-up packages, and faculty allowances, which are modest in a school of public affairs, are available from cash carryforward and cash funding streams.
III. Plan for Fiscal Years 09-10 (the second two years)

By the start of FY09, the School will have grown from 7 to at least 11 FTE by using existing resources. During the same period, it is essential for the School to rebuild enrollment of its professional master's students; those increased enrollments will support further expansion in FY 09 and FY 10.

PPM's student enrollments dropped dramatically while it reported to SBS. Enrollments were 143 in 1997, but only 74 in 2004—a decline of almost 50%.\(^9\) We believe it will be relatively easy to raise those enrollments at least to the 1997 level. We base that belief on the facts that:

- Enrollments at other schools of public affairs have been rising steadily
- There is an increased demand among workers of all types for professional master's degrees
- The drop in the School's enrollment has been due to lean staffing, making recruiting efforts and visibility building difficult
- Recruiting has also been hampered by the School's lack of visibility within the University; it has been hidden within SBS, a College that potential students do not perceive as supporting the mission of professional policy education
- The Glenn name will bring considerable visibility to the School
- The Glenn programs—both those for college students and those for public sector managers—offer important recruiting pools for professional master's students

Indeed, by working with the Glenn Institute during the last year and a half, the School has already started to increase its enrollments. Revenues from those increases will start flowing to the School in FY 06, at the same time that we continue our efforts to enhance enrollments further.

If the School can build enrollment back to 143 students per year,\(^10\) a very attainable goal, those additional credit hours will generate at least $402,675 in new revenue each year.

Here is how we calculate that figure:

First, each master's student generates $227.50 per credit hour, net of central tax and cost pools (using FY 05 figures):

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
345.82 & \text{Fee} \\
+ 195.94 & \text{Subsidy (MAS 2)} \\
541.76 & \text{Total} \\
\times .76 & \text{Central Tax} \\
411.74 & \text{Net after Tax} \\
\end{array}
\]

\(^9\) These figures include only MPA and MA students, who form the "heart" of the School. There is also room for growth in joint/dual degree master's students, but we omit that category here. We also omit doctoral students from these calculations. The number of those students has remained relatively steady (18-24). That is an appropriate size for this program.

\(^10\) All figures refer to the number of students enrolled in any one year, not the number of students accepted into a program in a particular class.
Second, we need to calculate the number of credit hours the 69 new students will generate. The School has two professional master's degree programs: the MPA program and the MA program. Based on historical trends, we anticipate that students will divide evenly between the two programs. We assume there will be 35 MPA students and 34 MA students.

The MPA students need at least 81 credit hours for their degree; those students usually complete their degrees in two years. The MA students need at least 56 credit hours to graduate; we estimate that on average they spread those credits over three years.

Students may take some courses outside PPM. The MPA students, however, must take at least 61 hours (required courses taught only by PPM) within the School. Similarly, the MA students must take at least 41 hours of required courses within the School. Even being conservative, we estimate that each MPA student takes at least 71 hours in the School, while each MA student takes at least 46 hours.

Putting this information together, we estimate that once the new enrollment level is reached, in any one year we will have:

- 35 new MPA students each taking at least 36 credits (half their total)
- 34 new MA students each taking at least 15 credits (one third their total)

Finally, multiplying new students x credits x net revenue for each year:

$$(35 \text{ MPA students} \times 36 \text{ credit hours} \times $227.50) + (34 \text{ MA students} \times 15 \text{ credit hours} \times $227.50) = $286,650 + $116,025 = $402,675.$$  

We consider this a conservative estimate: some students do not take any credits outside the School, and some exceed the minimum number of credits required for graduation. In addition, we expect that enrollments may rise above the level of 143 students.

The full amount of these revenues, of course, will not be available immediately. Enrollment must rise, and then revenues must flow to the School through the rolling two-year average in the budget process. This process, however, has already started and if the merger proceeds we will be able to recruit students aggressively during the next two years. We anticipate that a considerable portion of this new revenue will be available by FY 09 and that all of it will be available by FY 10.

All of this revenue will be devoted to additional faculty hires. One way to allocate those hires, again filling the School's need for senior hires and joint appointments would be:
Two half-time (joint appointment) full professors @ $55,000 apiece | Salary | Benefits @ 27%
---|---|---
110,000 | 29,700

Three half-time (joint appointment) associate professors @ $40,000 apiece | Salary | Benefits @ 27%
---|---|---
120,000 | 32,400

One full-time assistant professor | Salary | Benefits @ 27%
---|---|---
65,000 | 17,550

Total: $357,100

The remaining $45,575 might be used to fund a visiting professor for one or two quarters, courses from a few OSU faculty in other departments, and/or a supplement to attract a more senior/distinguished professor at one of these levels. This amount also offers a cushion if the full revenue from increased enrollment is not available by FY 10.

Using this pattern, the School would grow by FY 10 to 14.5 FTE and 19 faculty (9 joint appointments).

There are no "hidden costs" to this growth that the School would be unable to cover. The proposed School already has adequate office space in Page Hall for this expanded faculty. Modest payments for moving expenses, start up packages, and faculty accounts can be drawn from cash reserves and ongoing cash streams. The number of staff currently serving JGI and PPM will be sufficient to support both the expanded faculty size and the enlarged student body.

We are also confident that the growing faculty will be keep pace with curricular demands from the growing student body. In 1997, a faculty of 11 FTE readily supported a student body of 143 in PPM. Our plan anticipates 14.5 FTE supporting the same size student body. This permits both suitable class sizes and curricular growth.

IV. Will a Target of 14.5 FTE Faculty Adequately Secure the School?

We describe above a plan for growing the School's faculty from 7 FTE, with no full professors or joint appointments, to 14.5 FTE, with at least 4 full professors and 9 joint appointments. Clearly this would be a spectacular improvement over the School's current—and decidedly desperate—situation. SBS has offered no concrete plan for the School's revival—certainly not one that would support this level of growth.

A faculty of this size and breadth would better serve the School's students, the research community, and the citizens of Ohio. But would a School of this size be sufficient to begin regaining the reputation that the School lost while housed in SBS—and to develop real academic excellence? We discuss that briefly here.

There are some very large schools of public affairs, just as there are some very large law schools, medical schools, political science departments, and English departments. But, as the attached case studies of several top-ranking schools of public affairs show, excellence does not require expansive size.

11 We say "at least" 4 full professors because we also anticipate promotions among current and new associate professors.
Berkeley's Goldman School of Public Policy, for example, ranks fifth in the country with a faculty of just 14 FTE. Six of those faculty hold joint appointments, yielding a total faculty size of 17—just under what we project for the Glenn School. Student enrollments at Goldman are comparable to those we project for the Glenn School.

Similarly, the University of North Carolina's School of Government ranks 10th nationally with a faculty of 13.5 FTE. The University of Chicago's Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy ranks 17th with 17 FTE. Wisconsin's Robert M. LaFollette School of Public Affairs, tied with Chicago for 17th, has just 9.5 faculty FTE.

These schools, and others like them, differ from PPM in important ways: (1) They have reporting lines that support their mission as interdisciplinary professional schools; (2) They have a significant number of jointly appointed professors, including many appointments outside the disciplines housed at OSU within SBS; and (3) The degree fields and policy connections of their faculty are much richer than those that have developed within PPM while housed in SBS. Clearly it is possible to develop an excellent school of public affairs with a faculty of 14.5 FTE.

VI. Other Faculty Enhancements

We have focused in this memo on the financial strategy for permanent faculty hiring, because that will be the central task of the proposed School during its first five years. As our strategic planning memo indicates, however, there are other important mechanisms for strengthening the School's faculty and enhancing its reputation. During the next five years, the School will have cash resources in addition to the PBA and endowment interest discussed here. Indeed, most of the lines discussed in this memo will produce cash for at least one year before they are permanently filled. We anticipate using those funds to hire distinguished visitors from top public affairs faculties nationwide, support distinguished policymakers in residence, hire selected adjuncts who can enhance the School's prestige, and support the development of faculty research initiatives. All of these efforts will play important roles in establishing the national reputation of the John Glenn School of Public Affairs.

VII. Conclusion

Conservative calculations demonstrate that a centrally reporting John Glenn School of Public Affairs can readily grow from a faculty of 7 FTE (with no full professors or joint appointments) on July 1, 2005, to one of 14.5 FTE (with at least 4 full professors and 9 joint appointments) on July 1, 2010. At the same time, the School has the capacity to maintain all existing programs developed by PPM and JGI, to bring distinguished visitors to campus, and to enhance the academic life of Ohio State in myriad ways. Achieving

---

12 Three of these four schools, like most top schools of public affairs, report centrally. Wisconsin's school reports to a very large College of Arts and Sciences that is even more diverse than Ohio State's federation of arts and sciences colleges.

13 Other cash resources will be used to support fellowships for top master's students, to enhance recruiting, and to build other initiatives. Again, however, we have focused on expenses of faculty expansion in this memo because that is the School's greatest need and the largest demand on financial resources.
these goals requires only approval of the proposed merger while maintaining the Glenn Institute’s central reporting line. As CAA has suggested, that could be done on a provisional basis for 5 years, allowing time for the School to show that it can establish itself in the ways described in this memo.
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RE: Statement on Curriculum for the Proposed John Glenn School of Public Affairs

We are pleased to submit this statement on curriculum for the proposed John Glenn School of Public Affairs. This statement, requested by the Council, expands upon our earlier statements and complements the strategic and financial plans we recently submitted.
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I. Master's Programs

A. Current Programs

The School of Public Policy and Management has a particularly well developed curriculum for its professional master's students. Indeed, during its thirty-five year history the School has been considered a national leader in setting curriculum for these students. Current master's programs fall into three groups, discussed separately below.

1. The MPA. The School's core degree, an MPA, is a two-year program requiring 81 credit hours. Students first complete 52 credit hours of required courses divided into four "streams":

- Public Policy Stream
  - Public Policy Formulation and Administration
  - Legal Environment of Public Administration
  - Program Evaluation
- Public Management Stream
  - Strategic Management
  - Public Management and Human Relations
  - Strategic Leadership
- Public Sector Economics Stream
  - Economics of Public Policy and Management
  - Public Finance
  - Public Budgeting and Spending Decisions
- Decision Support Systems Stream
  - Research Methods in Public Administration
  - Governmental Information Systems Administration
  - Data Analysis in Public Administration
  - Governmental and Nonprofit Accounting

In addition to these 52 credits divided among four streams, students take a one-credit course, "Perspectives on Public Service," which orients them to career opportunities in public service, public service ethics, and other practical issues.

All MPA students complete a major policy paper during their final year in the program, earning another 8 hours of required credit in the two seminars supporting completion of that paper. Work in these seminars also tests the student's mastery of materials from the full MPA curriculum. Students who earn a B+ or better in PPM 809 (the second of the two seminars) may waive the Master's Comprehensive Exam. Students who do not meet that level of performance must pass the Comprehensive Exam.

In addition to this required coursework, MPA students complete a minimum of 20 hours of elective work in "policy labs" or other courses applying their public

---

1 Much of this material appears in the School's proposal dated August 29, 2004. See particularly pp. 5-6 (describing current master's degree programs) and pp. 16-19 (discussing possible additions to the master's program). At the Council's request, we have reproduced and expanded upon those curricular materials here.
administration knowledge to specific policy areas. Examples of these courses from the current academic year are:

- The Political Economy of Administrative Regulation and Deregulation
- Grants Policy and Administration
- Advanced Budgeting
- Benchmarking
- Wicked Environmental Problems
- Alternative Dispute Resolution
- Ethics in the Public Sector
- Rebuilding Failed and Weak States
- Climate Change and Public Policy
- Privatization of Public Services

Students are also free to elect a wide range of policy application courses offered by other departments.

Most MPA students, finally, complete an internship during the summer between their first and second years. Although an internship is not required to graduate, and carries no academic credit, the internship serves as the basis for most students’ policy papers. The policy paper must analyze a real policy problem of a public, quasi-public, or non-profit agency. The student conducts a comprehensive and systematic analysis of that problem, integrating coursework in the program’s four required curricular streams. Given the practical focus of the paper, most students find an internship indispensable in giving them the necessary grounding to identify and analyze a public sector problem. The School offers substantial assistance in helping students locate appropriate internships.

2. The In-Career MA. This degree program adapts the MPA for individuals who already have 3-5 years of post-college administrative or analyst work experience. MA candidates typically complete the program part-time while continuing their work experience. Students enroll in the same required courses, spanning the same four streams, that are required of MPA students. In-career MA students, however, complete 41 hours of these courses rather than the 52 hours required in the MPA program; they are excused from courses that are likely to duplicate material already learned in the workplace. In-service MA students also are excused from the one-credit “Perspectives on Public Service” course. Nor do they write a policy paper or register for the seminars supporting that paper. Instead, all in-career MA students take the Master’s Comprehensive Exam, testing their knowledge of all core courses.

In-career MA students, finally, take 15 credits of policy labs or other electives applying their public administration skills. They choose from the same array of courses offered the MPA students.

3. Joint and Dual Degrees. The School of Public Policy and Management currently operates dual degree programs in Law, Social Work, City and Regional Planning, Health Services Management and Policy, and Natural Resources. It also offers an MA in Arts Policy and Administration, hosted jointly with the College of Arts. We do not reproduce here all of the specific requirements for each of those programs. Each of the programs allows students to pursue studies in closely related fields, fulfilling
the core requirements of each field while receiving credit for appropriate work in the other field. Each has been quite successful in attracting talented students.

B. Plans for the John Glenn School

1. Current Programs. As noted above, the School of Public Policy and Management has very well developed master's programs. The programs have a well articulated core curriculum serving the needs of professional students planning a career in the public sector. Like other top schools of public affairs, the School has developed a version of the program that serves the needs of in-career public servants who seek the perspectives and advanced training that a master's degree can offer. The School has also developed an admirable range of joint and dual degree programs—indeed, it has a surprisingly diverse range of these programs given its small size.

The School has no plans to alter its master's programs significantly after formation of the John Glenn School. Instead, merger with the Institute and formation of the School will allow the School to enhance its current programs in the following ways:

- As detailed in the strategic and financial plans, the merger will allow the School to more than double its faculty size during the next five years. This growth is essential to offer students an appropriate range of electives. As the School's faculty size has declined, the diversity of complex policy issues has expanded. No School can offer students exposure to every policy issue—even through referrals to graduate courses in other departments—but it is essential for us to offer our students a greater array of policy electives.

- Enhanced faculty size is even more essential to offer appropriate supervision of the master's policy papers. Each MPA student writes a policy paper and receives individualized faculty input on that paper. To continue offering our students appropriate, graduate-level input on their papers—as well as a range of expertise related to those papers—the School desperately needs to expand its faculty size.

- Expanded faculty size is also essential to staff our core courses. Because these are graduate level courses, we try to offer our core courses in sections of no more than 40 students. Our MPA and MA students, moreover, have different needs in terms of when these courses are scheduled; MPA students prefer day-time schedules, while MA students need evening sections. Expanding faculty size is essential to supporting these students through multiple sections of core courses.

- The Glenn Institute's connections and existing programs will greatly facilitate internship placements for our MPA students. These internships play an integral role in developing our students' understanding of the public sector, their capstone policy papers, and their post-graduation employment opportunities.

- The Glenn Institute's staff similarly will enhance internship placements and advising for our master's students. Because of our School's small size and lean staffing, we have not been able to serve our MPA, MA, and joint/dual degree
students as well as we would like. The larger staff created through merger with JGI will expand these capabilities.

- The Institute's Washington office offers particular strengths for expanding the capacity of our master's students to secure internships and other career opportunities in the nation's capital.

Beyond these enhancements of our current program, we plan to examine the possibility of establishing an additional professional master's program and/or certificate programs. Our thoughts in this area are preliminary; our 5-year strategic plan purposely includes time to analyze these possibilities rather than plunge immediately into new programs. But we offer a few thoughts on these possibilities as they currently appear to us.

2. International Public Policy. Many schools of public affairs have created specialized master's degrees in international public policy. Several of the School's current faculty members are doing policy work with an international focus. Trevor Brown, for example, is deeply involved with the Parliamentary Development Project, a USAID funded organization providing technical assistance to the Ukrainian Parliament. In addition to publishing on issues of democratization in developing countries, Brown teaches a master's course on "Rebuilding Failed and Weak States." Similarly, one of Robert Greenbaum's most recent articles offers a "Comparative Evaluation of Spatially Targeted Economic Revitalization Programs in the US and the European Union." Mary Marvel has published on international development, including Honda's Ohio investments, and has been a visiting fellow at both Japanese and British Universities. Other faculty members are interested in examining the international implications of their work on environmental, social policy, and technology policy issues.

Designation of the Ambassador Milton A. and Roslyn Z. Wolf Chair for the John Glenn School will allow the School to hire a very senior full professor with expertise in international policy. In addition, we anticipate that several of the School's other hires will have expertise in international policy. This hiring, combined with the natural tendency of all public policy to embrace international elements in the current policy climate, will provide a core group of advisors to oversee a master's degree program in International Public Policy.

In addition to these assets, Senator Glenn's reputation and interest in international affairs will lend prominence to any master's program in International Public Policy developed by the John Glenn School. During his Senate career, Glenn introduced six major pieces of legislation on nuclear nonproliferation, laws that remain a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy. He also served on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate Armed Services Committee, and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. This service, combined with his military and astronaut careers, makes Glenn an emblem of international public policy. His extensive collection of papers, deposited at Ohio State, also offers a unique resource for master's and doctoral students writing in these areas.

---

2 The financial plan allocates sufficient resources to this hire so that the endowment interest will supplement the salary and benefits of a customary full professor hire, allowing a truly superstar hire.
The Glenn School's expertise in international affairs, moreover, constitutes just a fraction of the expertise that Ohio State can offer in this field. It is Ohio State's tremendous campuswide breadth in international studies that offers the ideal opportunity to establish a master's program in International Public Policy. Just as the School's popular master's degree in Arts Policy and Administration represents a partnership with the College of Arts, a master's degree in International Public Policy might represent a partnership among the School and one or more departments campuswide. The Colleges of Humanities; Food, Agriculture, and Environmental Sciences; Business; Law; Arts; Social and Behavioral Sciences; and Social Work, as well as the School of Public Health, all would contribute essential elements to a professional master's program in International Public Policy.

Ohio State has long struggled with ways to leverage its strength in international studies; a professional master's program involving the John Glenn School of Public Affairs and several other units on campus provides one important avenue to capitalize on these strengths.

3. Homeland Security. Ohio State's strength in international studies, combined with its technological expertise, the work of the Mershon Center, and the University's growing connections with Battelle, offer the opportunity to establish a specialized master's degree or certificate in Public Administration and Homeland Security. The Glenn Institute already has established significant contacts with Battelle, including the establishment of both a high-profile lecture series and a series of national policy papers that will premier in AY 2005-06. Those lectures and policy papers will focus on homeland security and technology/privacy issues.

Battelle's leadership has indicated its enthusiasm for development of a professional master's program focusing on homeland security issues and its willingness to offer various kinds of support for such a program. Numerous faculty from departments around campus have also expressed interest in homeland security issues. State and local leaders likewise support specialized master's training in this area, since much of the homeland security burden will fall on those government units. The uneven progress of our national Department of Homeland Security underscores the need for professional master's training to develop a cadre of skilled public servants in this area.

Very few schools of public affairs have yet created programs in homeland security, making this field an area of possible distinction for Ohio State and the Glenn School. As with the possible master's degree in International Public Policy, we contemplate exploring the possibility of a master's degree or certificate program in Homeland Security in partnership with other units on campus. Although the School can provide necessary leadership in developing professional master's programs related to public sector employment, as well as certain core courses in this area, a first-rate program in Homeland Security would draw upon Ohio State's campuswide excellence in fields related to this area. Ohio State has particular promise in developing a homeland security program because of its excellence in the many fields essential to homeland security: natural sciences, engineering, medicine, public health, law, the arts, cultural studies, and social sciences. Other universities might focus on one of these disciplinary areas; Ohio State has the potential to draw upon them all.

Rob Greenbaum, from the PPM faculty, has been working on several papers related to terrorism and economic development.
Senator Glenn’s name once again would provide special distinction to a program in Homeland Security. As with international public policy, his name is firmly and positively linked with issues of homeland security. A specialized master’s degree or certificate program in homeland security, backed by the public sector expertise of the School; the campuswide expertise of Ohio State; and the name of an individual who earned distinction in World War II and the Korean Conflict, secured a Cold War victory by reclaiming America’s place in the Space Race, and focused on security issues during his 24 years in the Senate, would quickly secure national prominence.

4. **Nonprofit Management.** Nonprofits play an increasingly important role in the American public sector. Careers with nonprofit agencies likewise attract many of our top college graduates. Building on these trends, several schools of public affairs have begun successful programs focused on nonprofit management.

The John Glenn School could draw upon several assets to develop a specialized master’s degree or certificate program in nonprofit management. Trevor Brown, an assistant professor in PPM, has expertise and interest in this area. Mary Marvel, one of the School’s more senior faculty, has extensive expertise in program evaluation—an essential element of nonprofit management. The Glenn Institute has numerous assets to contribute to a program in nonprofit management. Its partnerships with the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Ohio Grantmakers Forum, and other foundations have already involved some discussion of nonprofit management and the development of programs in this area. The Institute’s Community Research Partners, an applied research organization operated in partnership with the City of Columbus and United Way of Central Ohio, focuses on program evaluation and research for nonprofit agencies. These state, local, and national connections would prove invaluable in developing a high-profile program in nonprofit management.

As a first step in exploring such a program, the Institute established and funded three research fellowships for PPM master’s students this year: One with the Ohio Grantmakers Forum and two with Community Research Partners. All three fellowships have allowed master’s students to explore essential aspects of nonprofit management. Because of the Institute’s and School’s connections in this area, a specialized program in nonprofit management at the proposed John Glenn School could include both high-quality coursework (contributed by the School) and funded research assistantships or internships (developed by the Institute).

As with the other program areas under consideration, a specialized program in nonprofit management likely would involve other units at Ohio State. The College of Social Work has expertise in this area. The College of Human Ecology has particularly strong expertise in program evaluation and other aspects of nonprofit management. The College of Business has considerable management expertise to contribute. And the College of Law has a newly hired faculty member with both research and teaching interests in nonprofit management. These assets suggest the possibility of a new master’s program jointly developed by the John Glenn School and these other units.

5. **Technology or Science Policy.** Ohio State’s expertise in technology, engineering, and the basic sciences offers the possibility of a successful master’s degree or certificate program in technology or science policy. Such a program might
focus broadly on science and technology policy or might focus on one or two areas (such as climate control) in which Ohio State has achieved international distinction.

The School's faculty already includes several individuals with a focus on science or technology policy: David Landsbergen is well known for his work on information technology, while Andrew Keeler is an expert on a variety of environmental policy issues. To build a specialized program in this field, the School would complement their work with new hires or joint appointments in the science and technology policy area. It would also work with other departments to tap their expertise, creating a technology/science policy program that would benefit graduate students in both public policy and science/technology fields.

At least in the short term, the technology/science policy area might lend itself to a certificate program or graduate minor rather than a specialized master's degree. Ohio State has remarkable science/technology expertise but, unfortunately, it has not built upon that expertise during the last decade to assemble a parallel group of faculty specialized in science/technology policy. Other universities and schools of public affairs are far ahead of us in developing science/technology policy programs. We should build towards a professional master's degree program in this field—and might have some hope of achieving one during the next five years—but a certificate program or graduate minor is a more realistic goal. A dual degree program, allowing interested students to obtain an MPA with a master's degree in one of the sciences, is also an attractive possibility.

A certificate program, graduate minor, or dual degree in science/technology policy would serve two very different groups of graduate students: (1) master's students in public policy with an interest in the science/technology field; and (2) students in a wide variety of science/technology departments who want an introduction to public policy analysis. Both PPM and JGI have been approached repeatedly by students in the latter category during the last five years. There appears to be an unfilled need among graduate students in the sciences for some instruction—most likely at the certificate or graduate minor level—related to public administration and public policy. Similarly, there is strong demand among public policy students (and public sector employers) for expertise in science/technology policy.

We believe that the John Glenn School, working again with a large number of departments campuswide, could develop an outstanding certificate program, graduate minor, or dual degree in science/technology policy studies. This program would address unmet needs among graduate students and add to both the School's reputation and that of other participating departments. John Glenn's name, once again, would give special prominence to such a program. Glenn is widely known for his interest in and impact on science/technology policy. His work in this field includes leadership of a national commission on K-12 math/science education, ongoing involvement with NASA, his military and astronaut careers, and 24 years of Senate leadership on highly technical

---

4 The program might also establish connections with the College of Education, given the clear national need for improved instruction in math and science. That College has already developed a highly regarded master's program for teachers interested in math/science instruction. Some links between that program and a graduate certificate or minor in science/technology policy would be highly beneficial.
issues involving science and technology policy. A John Glenn certificate, minor, or dual degree in science/technology policy would attract clear interest.\(^5\)

In addition to the pedagogic benefits of a master's program in science/technology policy, such a program would serve as a focus for faculty from many departments with an interest in this field. This focus, in turn, would support increased interdisciplinary research in the area and improve Ohio State's competitive stance in seeking NSF grants in a wide range of science/technology fields. Those grants increasingly require a strong policy component of any program; Ohio State's strong science/technology departments have been handicapped by the absence of established, recognized science/technology policy programs on campus. Developing such a campuswide program would produce strong benefits for the University as a whole.

6. **Mechanics.** As noted above, the School plans to explore any new master's programs in collaboration with many other units on campus. Strong programs in any of the four areas identified above will require extensive cross-disciplinary collaboration. Partnerships on these programs offer "win win" opportunities for all units involved. These programs can (1) increase revenue by establishing new professional master's programs; (2) attract students to existing graduate programs; (3) increase departmental reputation by developing new specializations; and (4) enhance the University's status in competing for major research grants that require a policy component.

Notably, all of these potential master's programs—which represent both the growth areas in schools of public affairs nationwide and particular opportunities for the John Glenn School—involve significant collaboration with units falling outside the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. The social sciences would play a role in each of these potential programs, but other disciplines (ranging from the Humanities and Arts to Engineering, the Biological Sciences, Public Health, Social Work, and Law) would play a more central role. A strong master's program in international public policy, homeland security, nonprofit management, and/or science/technology policy— one that reflects the full strengths of Ohio State—is more likely to emerge from a School of Public Affairs that reports centrally than from one reporting to SBS or any other single college.\(^6\)

7. **Role of the Graduate School.** As noted in our proposal of August 29, graduate students enrolled in the John Glenn School of Public Affairs would remain part of Ohio State's Graduate School. Students will be admitted through the Graduate School and degrees will be awarded consistent with Graduate School guidelines. Any changes in the current master's curricula or proposals for new master's programs (such as those outlined above) will be vetted through the Graduate School and approved by that School:

\(^5\) Glenn's name is so highly regarded in the science/technology field that the Institute has been approached by departments at other universities seeking to partner with us on NSF proposals simply to obtain access to the Glenn name in submitting those proposals.

\(^6\) Recent confirmation of this prediction appears in the undergraduate public policy minor currently being developed by SBS. The minor focuses heavily on SBS disciplines and courses; faculty within the College refer to it as an "SBS Centered" public policy minor. A minor developed outside the confines of that College (or any other), we predict, would more accurately reflect the full breadth of academic research and teaching related to public policy.
Graduate students enrolled in the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, like those enrolled in the School of Public Policy and Management, will remain part of Ohio State's Graduate School. Students for both master's and doctoral programs will be admitted through the Graduate School, and degrees will be awarded in accordance with Graduate School rules. The Graduate School will approve any curricular changes or new graduate degree programs for the merged School. The School’s graduate programs thus will maintain their current high standards.\(^7\)

II. **Doctoral Program**\(^8\)

A. **Current Program**

PPM’s doctoral program, like its master’s programs, enjoys a strong national reputation. The program is designed to prepare students both for university positions as teachers and researchers and to prepare them for senior-level research positions in government, nonprofit, and other institutional settings. The program has succeeded admirably in both goals, placing graduates in tenured positions at schools ranked above PPM (a distinction that is difficult to achieve in any academic field) and in high-level government positions.\(^9\) Despite its many difficulties while housed in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, the School has maintained the curriculum and distinction of its PhD program. In 2002, one of the School’s doctoral candidates shared first place in a national competition for the year’s best doctoral dissertation.

The School’s doctoral candidates complete at least 135 graduate credit hours. Candidates who have already earned a master’s degree must complete at least 90 graduate credit hours beyond the master’s degree. All doctoral students take three foundation courses:

- History of Public Administration Thought and Current Directions
- Logic of Inquiry for Policy and Management Science
- Doctoral Research Colloquium

In addition, doctoral students take core courses from four knowledge streams. Although these streams are similar to those established for master’s students, there are some important differences\(^10\) and the coursework is more advanced:

- Policy Analysis
  - Public Policy Formulation and Administration
  - Seminar in Public Policy
- Public Sector Economics

---

\(^7\) Proposal of August 29, 2004, at p. 17.

\(^8\) These materials, like those related to the master’s programs, draw upon our proposal of August 29, 2004.

\(^9\) The School, for example, has doctoral alumni holding tenured positions at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs (ranked first nationally) and the University of Georgia’s School of Public and International Affairs (ranked third nationally). Another PhD holder served as Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

\(^10\) For example, advanced work in quantitative methods and analysis replaces the master’s students’ more general work in Decision Support Systems.
In some cases, doctoral students have completed courses related to these core courses in their master’s program; in others, a student may prefer to take a more advanced course related to his/her specialization. All doctoral students, however, master the material represented by courses in these four core streams.

In addition to mastering these four core areas, each doctoral student works with his or her advisor to develop a program of advanced study in a field of specialization. A large number of these specialized courses currently are drawn from departments outside the School of Public Policy and Management. For lists of sample courses related to different specializations, see:

www.ppm.ohio-state.edu/handbook/handbook_phd.htm#curriculum.

Finally, in addition to the above coursework, each doctoral student must successfully complete a Candidacy Examination, a doctoral dissertation, and a Final Oral Examination.

B. The John Glenn School

We contemplate few, if any, changes in our doctoral program with formation of the John Glenn School of Public Affairs. The program has a well structured curriculum and has been quite successful in producing both first-rate academics and outstanding senior researchers for the public sector. Merger with JGI will, as outlined in our strategic and financial plan, allow us to double our faculty size within the next five years. This expansion, especially when combined with joint appointments and enhancement of the degree fields represented by our faculty, will allow us to offer doctoral students a wider range of specialized seminars and to advise them on a greater breadth of dissertations. Expansion in all of these regards is essential to maintain a top doctoral program.

At the same time, we anticipate that our doctoral students will continue to draw upon advanced course offerings from Ohio State departments campuswide. These opportunities are what make doctoral education at Ohio State so rich and rewarding.

Expanding funding for doctoral students is a major priority for the School; this is essential to attracting top candidates. We anticipate that merger with the Institute will

11 Both this course and the one on Applied Economic Models and Forecasting are offered through the Economics Department. Students with interests in particular areas may substitute graduate level quantitative method courses in Psychology or Sociology for one of these Economics courses.
expand our funding opportunities and allow better support of our students, particularly through the research initiatives (e.g., the Second Amendment Research Center, the Sports and Citizenship Center) that the Institute has established.

As with our master's programs, and as stated in our proposal of August 29, 2004, doctoral students in the John Glenn School will remain part of Ohio State's Graduate School. They will be admitted through the Graduate School and fulfill Graduate School requirements for their degrees. Any new courses, new doctoral programs, or changes to the existing program will be approved by the Graduate School.12

III. Undergraduate Programs13

A. Current Programs

PPM, like most graduate schools of public affairs, has focused its teaching almost exclusively on professional master's students, doctoral students, and individuals currently employed by the public sector. JGI has created several co-curricular programs for undergraduates but, like PPM, has not focused on credit-bearing courses for undergraduates.

Our proposal of August 29, 2004, offers a detailed listing of the co-curricular undergraduate opportunities currently offered by PPM and JGI;14 we do not repeat that listing here. As noted in that proposal, PPM and JGI also operate a small number of undergraduate courses. These are:

- PPM 522, "Introduction to Public Policy Analysis," offered occasionally by PPM
- PPM 594, "Rebuilding Failed and Weak States," offered for the first time this Spring by PPM in collaboration with International Studies
- PS 589G, PS 678G, and PS 679G, three courses listed through Political Science that together comprise the Institute's Washington Academic Internship Program
- PPM 594, "Exploring Public Service and Public Policy," two-credit seminars offered exclusively to students enrolled in JGI's Living Learning Program (but not required for those students)
- PPM 594, "Introduction to Public Policy," a course offered through the Ohio Academy to high school seniors enrolled in the Institute's High School Internship Program

All of these courses enroll a small number of students and have expenses that exceed the revenues they generate. Although they do not financially benefit PPM or JGI, they offer high school students and a small number of undergraduates specialized public policy perspectives that are not otherwise available at Ohio State. They also allow

---

12 See also Proposal of August 29, 2004, at p. 17.
13 For an extensive discussion of undergraduate programs within the proposed John Glenn School of Public Affairs, please see pp. 19-22 of the School's Proposal of August 29, 2004. We reproduce and elaborate upon that information here for the Council's convenience.
14 See particularly Appendix A to that proposal.
PPM's doctoral students to build their academic careers by obtaining modest teaching experience.\textsuperscript{15}

B. The John Glenn School

JGI and PPM plan to maintain the innovative co-curricular programs that they have created for undergraduates. These programs attract students to Ohio State,\textsuperscript{16} enhance the campus experience of existing students,\textsuperscript{17} and draw national attention to the University's undergraduate programs.\textsuperscript{18} We plan to continue these co-curricular programs under the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, along with the small number of undergraduate courses that the two units currently teach. We also hope to build upon these initiatives by developing career advising services with a public service focus that would be available to any student at Ohio State.

As stated in numerous documents submitted to CAA, however, the faculty, staff, and others associated with the proposed John Glenn School have no plans to establish a significant undergraduate program or extensive new courses for undergraduates. For several years, the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences urged PPM to create a wide array of undergraduate offerings.\textsuperscript{19} PPM resisted this pressure because large undergraduate programs would not further either its reputational or financial interests. Nor are PPM or JGI interested in creating such expansive undergraduate programs as part of the John Glenn School of Public Affairs.

Schools of public affairs rest their academic and public reputations on their graduate programs. The field was created to serve professional master's students, and the alumni of these schools seek interaction with the sophisticated offerings that graduate programs maintain. Similarly, top doctoral students and alumni look to a School's doctoral offerings, not to its undergraduate programs, for reputational excellence. The appropriateness of undergraduate policy minors and majors is controversial among faculty members at schools of public affairs nationwide. Even

\textsuperscript{15} This experience would not otherwise be available to PPM students since doctoral students may not teach master's students (most of PPM's enrollees) and Ohio State's budgeting system discourages other departments from hiring doctoral instructors outside their own departments.

\textsuperscript{16} The Institute's High School Internship Program, for example, has persuaded a number of participants to attend Ohio State rather than other colleges. Students have also cited the Institute's Living Learning Program and its Washington Academic Internship Program as factors influencing their decision to enroll at Ohio State.

\textsuperscript{17} Selected programs enhancing the campus experience are JGI's Living Learning Program, its Washington Academic Internship Program, its NEW Leadership Program, and its Speech and Debate Team. Undergraduates also benefit from JGI's partnership with the First Year Experience Program, mentoring offered by the Kiplinger Program journalists housed in JGI, and public lectures and conferences offered by JGI.

\textsuperscript{18} The national and international essay competition cosponsored by JGI and PPM has attracted winners from the University of Pennsylvania, the University of California at Berkeley, and other top schools nationwide. Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government has recognized JGI for its outstanding co-curricular programs and has included the Institute among a small group of schools advising it on innovative programs related to public service.

\textsuperscript{19} During the last year, after PPM proposed moving outside the College, SBS shifted its emphasis and began pressing the School to expand its master's enrollment rather than create new undergraduate programs.
schools that have created undergraduate programs rarely, if ever, have relied upon these programs to enhance their reputation in the public affairs field.

Nor, under Ohio State’s current budgeting formula, are undergraduate programs financially attractive to a school of public affairs. Instead, expanding offerings to professional master’s students is much more financially attractive.

We keep getting questions about developing undergraduate programs, so it seems appropriate to spell out this financial comparison. As explained in our Financial Plan, professional master’s students enrolled in the School generate $227.50 per student credit hour. This is similar to the revenue generated by master’s and doctoral students in other departments. Professional master’s programs, however, differ from doctoral programs in two key ways: (1) Class sizes are much larger than in the typical doctoral seminar, reaching 40-50 students for some classes and 20 in others. (2) Adjuncts are appropriate instructors for some professional master’s courses. Indeed, for courses on some subjects (such as applied budgeting and applied ethics) they may be more appropriate than full-time faculty.

A single five-credit course enrolling 40 professional master’s students generates $45,500 in revenue under the University’s budgeting system (net of all taxes and cost pools). This is sufficient to support more than half an assistant professor’s salary and benefits in PPM, forty-five percent of an associate professor’s salary and benefits in the School, or forty percent of a full professor’s salary and benefits. Since most faculty in PPM teach four courses each year, there is ample opportunity for them to support their salaries and benefits through a mixture of these courses and smaller offerings targeted at advanced master’s students and doctoral candidates.

Whenever the School offers one of these master’s courses through adjuncts, moreover, it receives a revenue windfall that further subsidizes faculty growth. PPM currently attracts high quality adjuncts with payments of just $3500 per course, regardless of class size. Schools of public affairs should employ adjuncts judiciously, but there are circumstances in which they can offer ideal training to professional master’s students.

The key to this revenue stream based on professional master’s students, which SBS appears to have had difficulty realizing in its dealings with PPM or in its responses to this merger proposal (which repeatedly raise the specter of PPM “competing” with other units through new undergraduate programs), is that professional master’s students generate as much revenue as master’s students enrolled in doctoral programs, but at far lower cost. Doctoral students necessitate very small classes and seminars, and the use of adjuncts is rare with these students. These two differences spell a very different financial picture for professional master’s programs than more traditional doctoral ones.

Undergraduates, in contrast, currently generate $147.82 per student credit hour in the kind of courses that a Glenn School might offer. For FY 05, the net effective fee rate for undergraduates is $171.17; the BAC 1 net effective subsidy rate is $77.32. Combining these figures yields $248.49 gross revenue. Subtracting the 24% central tax leaves $188.85. Further subtracting Cost Pool One (Undergraduate) of $39.42 and Cost Pool Five (All Students) of $1.61 yields $147.82.
five-credit course taught to undergraduates, the John Glenn School would have to enroll 62 students in that course. Why would its faculty, who have taught almost exclusively master's courses up until this point, want to develop new undergraduate courses that would require larger class sizes to be financially viable?

The financial picture for undergraduate classes taught by a School of Public Affairs becomes even bleaker when one realizes that (1) Adjuncts are much less suitable instructors for undergraduate classes than for professional master's ones; and (2) competition at Ohio State is much stronger for undergraduate enrollments than for professional master's ones.

As noted above, public sector leaders can enhance a professional master's curriculum in important ways by providing instruction as adjuncts. Most schools of public affairs rely upon a number of distinguished adjuncts to complement their full-time faculty in this manner. The case for adjunct instruction in the undergraduate arts and sciences curriculum, however, is much more shaky. We can see the value of professionals as class visitors or one-time speakers, but would be reluctant to support extensive adjunct instruction of undergraduates in public policy. This pedagogic concern greatly reduces the financial attractiveness of undergraduate courses.

Competition for undergraduate enrollments at Ohio State, moreover, has become almost pathological. In fact, we sense that competition for those enrollments underlies much of the concern voiced about creation of the proposed John Glenn School—as well as the request for this memo. Given the strong demand for professional master's courses in public affairs, the virtually open-ended possibility of growing our master's enrollment, our expertise in master's programs, and the much larger financial return to master's programs than undergraduate ones, it would be foolhardy for us to waste time competing with so many other campus units for a static (or slightly declining) number of undergraduates.

For many departments, participation in this competition for undergraduate enrollments makes financial sense because of a final point distinguishing their programs from ours: large doctoral enrollments. Undergraduate enrollments provide poor support for faculty salaries, but they provide adequate support for doctoral students—especially when a department has a large number of doctoral students it is already obliged to support. PPM, however, has a small doctoral program (fewer than 60 degrees awarded in its 35-year history) and anticipates modest, if any, growth in enrollment of those students. Doctoral enrollments in PPM or the proposed Glenn School thus do not provide the incentive that exists in many other units for the creation of new undergraduate courses.

PPM and JGI do support the University's commitment to providing high-quality undergraduate education. For that reason, we have supplemented the courses offered by other departments with a particularly rich array of co-curricular programs targeted at undergraduates interested in public service and public policy. We make special efforts to include undergraduates in our lectures and other public events. We are also

---

21 Annual doctoral enrollments have fluctuated between 19 and 24 students during the last eight years. Enrollments at the top of that range—or slightly above it—are more healthy than at the bottom of the range, but this size seems to be in the appropriate "ballpark" for a healthy school of public affairs.
interested in expanding career counseling services for undergraduates interested in public service careers.\textsuperscript{22}

As explained in our Proposal of August 29, 2004,\textsuperscript{23} however, we contemplate participating in the creation of new undergraduate courses or academic programs under only two conditions:

(1) If other units are interested in creating an undergraduate minor or major in public policy. If that interest arises, we believe that the John Glenn School—drawing upon the combined expertise of PPM and JGI—could provide essential insights to developing such a program. We assume that other units would welcome our participation in design of a high-quality undergraduate policy program. We have intimate knowledge of the public policy world, as well as of the distinctive academic discipline known as public affairs. As an interdisciplinary unit reporting to the Provost, we could also help assure that such new programs draw upon all of Ohio State’s public policy expertise—rather than being confined narrowly to a single College.

Although we would be happy to work with other units contemplating development of an undergraduate major or minor in public policy, it is not at all clear that we would contribute new courses of our own to any such program. As noted above, our faculty specialize in professional master’s education, and both our reputational and financial interests lie in expanding those master’s programs. Whether or not the Glenn School is formed, we assume that our existing course PPM 522, “Introduction to Public Policy Analysis,” would play a foundation role in any undergraduate major or minor focused on public policy. Beyond that course and others currently taught by the School and Institute, however, it is unlikely that we would develop significant new courses related to an undergraduate program.

(2) If we identify needs for advanced courses in public policy analysis, particularly courses with strong research and writing opportunities, that are not being addressed by other departments. As with other initiatives, we would be most likely to develop courses addressing these needs in partnership with other campus units. Given the reputational and financial interests outlined above, we contemplate creation of courses under this heading to be minimal. We note this possibility primarily because we have heard from students that there is a need for additional writing/research seminars for advanced undergraduates interested in public policy, and we believe that the campus should respond to that need.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{22} One option for expanding that counseling lies with the Partnership for Public Service. That national organization is organizing—and supporting—pilot programs at a handful of universities to advise undergraduates on public service career options. The Partnership very much wanted the John Glenn Institute to participate in the first year (AY 2005-06) of its pilot project, bringing those counseling benefits to Ohio State undergraduates. We had to decline that invitation given the ongoing uncertainty surrounding this merger proposal and the amount of faculty/staff time required to attend to the merger process.

\textsuperscript{23} See pp. 21-22.

\textsuperscript{24} Development of a 3/2 program, sometimes suggested by other units, lies at the intersection of these two possibilities. By definition, a 3/2 program requires interest and cooperation from existing undergraduate units; those units would have to grant college credit for graduate work in public affairs at the same time that the School would grant graduate credit for advanced college work. The justification for such a program, if jointly desired by the School and other units, would
C. Mechanics

PPM, JGI, and the proposed John Glenn School have no current plans to develop new undergraduate courses or programs. Nor do new academic initiatives for undergraduates play a role in our strategic or financial plans, previously submitted to the Council. Those plans are quite comprehensive; engaging in significant work at the undergraduate level would distract us from the goals laid out in those plans.

If the School engaged in the creation of any new undergraduate courses or programs, it would do so in partnership with other campus units—most likely at the request and instigation of those units. In this sense, our approach to policy education is quite different from that of SBS. SBS currently is developing a proposal for an undergraduate policy minor that it calls an "SBS Centered" minor. From what we have seen, the minor does focus heavily on SBS departments and courses; it does not include the kind of cross-college collaboration we would favor. Nor does this proposal embody significant input from PPM—the SBS unit specializing in public policy. Despite our expertise in this area, our offers to advise on public policy programs, and our current location within SBS, no PPM faculty were invited to serve on the committee developing this proposed public policy minor. Although we do not contemplate the John Glenn School developing significant undergraduate courses on its own, we do think that the campus's policy experts should be more extensively consulted in the development of academic policy programs by other units. And, as consultants, a centrally reporting John Glenn School would be much more insistent than SBS seems to be on the inclusion of policy expertise from all colleges on campus.

Finally, if the John Glenn School does create any new undergraduate credit-bearing programs or courses, we plan to rely upon the curriculum process of the Arts and Sciences Colleges for review. As indicated in our Proposal of August 29, 2004, the John Glenn School:

would submit all proposals for any new undergraduate offerings (whether individual courses or programs like a policy minor) to the Arts and Sciences Colleges Committee on Curriculum and Instruction, and would work with members of that committee—as well as other faculty—to develop offerings that appropriately enhance the education of Ohio State's undergraduates.25

We reaffirm that intent here, as we have throughout the documents submitted and discussions held this academic year.

---

25 Proposal of August 29, 2004, at p. 22. That proposal further notes: "Consultation with Interim Executive Dean [now Executive Dean] Royster of the Arts and Sciences Colleges, as well as Associate Dean Adelson, suggests that any proposals from the Glenn School would be referred to Subcommittee A of the Arts and Sciences Committee on Curriculum and Instruction. That Subcommittee reviews interdisciplinary proposals before referring them to the full Committee for approval."
Appendix A

Case Studies

This appendix presents four brief case studies of public affairs schools currently ranking among the top 20 schools nationally. These case studies show that schools with faculty sizes ranging from 9.5 to 17 FTE can—and do—achieve national recognition. The schools also provide interesting models to inform development of a new John Glenn School.

Faculty counts included in these case studies exclude emeriti, nontenure-track administrators, and adjuncts or lecturers. Administrators (such as the dean or director) who hold faculty rank are included.

Although some schools of public affairs have very large numbers of adjuncts and other nontenure-track teaching faculty, none of these schools do. Nor do they have a particularly large number of emeriti. Teaching at these schools rests largely on the faculty enumerated here—just as the Glenn School would rely primarily on its tenure-track faculty for classroom teaching.
Richard and Rhoda Goldman School of Public Policy  
University of California-Berkeley

Founded: 1969  
Current National Rank: 5  
Reporting Line: To the Provost

Faculty Strength and Breadth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Primary Degree Field/Department of Joint Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Full Time Faculty**                | 11     | Architecture  
Business  
Law (2)  
Economics (3)  
Engineering  
Psychology  
Public Policy |
| **Joint Appointments**               | 6      | Physics  
Business  
Political Science  
Public Health  
Economics  
Law |

Faculty FTE: 14, assuming that joint appointments average 50%

Degrees Offered: MPP (Master in Public Policy)  
Joint Degrees with several graduate programs  
PhD

Student Enrollment: 150-55

Comments:

The Goldman School offers a striking example for the proposed John Glenn School. The size of its doctoral program is comparable to that of PPM, while the size of its master's program is similar to PPM's pre-SBS enrollments—and to its targeted size for the next five years.

The School has achieved a very high national reputation with a faculty of modest size. The breadth of degree fields and joint appointments is particularly striking. 10 different fields are represented. Just under half the faculty members (eight) have joint appointments or primary degrees in SBS fields (Political Science, Economics, and Psychology). Other represented fields fall primarily in professional schools (Law, Business, Architecture, Engineering, Public Health) although the appointment of a faculty member with a Physics doctorate is noteworthy.
School of Government  
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill  

Founded: 2001  
Current National Rank: 10  
Reporting Line: To the Provost  

Faculty Strength and Breadth:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Primary Degree Field/Department of Joint Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Full Time Faculty    | 13     | Law (4)  
|                      |        | Regional Planning  
|                      |        | Public Administration (4)  
|                      |        | Finance  
|                      |        | Political Science |
| Joint Appointments   | 1      | Political Science |

Faculty FTE: 13.5 maximum for the degree-granting program. It is unclear whether some of the faculty counted above are tenure-track. See below for information on additional faculty members in this unusual school.

Degrees Offered: MPA  
Joint degrees with several graduate departments

Student Enrollment: Up to 55

Comments: This School has an unusual structure. The faculty counted above are those who teach in the School's master's degree program. The School has another 25 faculty members (for a total count of 39) who teach nondegree classes for state and local officials, provide research on state and local issues, and engage in policy consulting. Thirty-one of these 39 faculty members are tenured or tenure-track, although a substantial number of them do not perform traditional tenure-track teaching.

The School offers an interesting model because its MPA program ranks among the top 10 nationally, despite a relatively small faculty devoted to that program. This strong reputation derives partly from the teaching and research the School does for state/local government officials—work that apparently enhances the status of the MPA program even though these faculty members do not directly work with that program.

The John Glenn School probably would not emulate this model directly. The UNC example, however, suggests that a School can attain a top ranking with a relatively small faculty devoted to its degree granting program, and that training programs (like the one JGI currently maintains) can enhance the reputation of the degree-granting School. The model also suggests that it might be possible to support some additional faculty by expanding JGI's training programs (which, like UNC's, generate revenue) and using selected faculty to teach in them. UNC shows that faculty do not need to teach traditional degree-granting courses to enhance a School's national reputation and other contributions.

1 Information about degree fields unavailable for some full-time faculty from this school.
Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy
University of Chicago

Founded: 1988
Current National Rank: 17
Reporting Line: To the Provost

Faculty Size and Breadth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Primary Degree Field/Department of Joint Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Time Faculty</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Political Science (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public and International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economics (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Appointments</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economics (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Health (Medicine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>History of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty FTE: 17, assuming that joint appointments average 50%

Degrees Offered:
- Master of Public Policy
- Master of Science in Environmental Science and Policy
- Master of Arts (one year program for graduate students from Other departments)
- Joint degrees with several graduate departments
- PhD

Student Enrollment: More than 250

Comments:

The Harris School, like other departments at the University of Chicago, is strongly influenced by economists. Eleven of the 22 faculty members have primary degrees or joint appointments in that field. Other appointments, however, are relatively diverse. Faculty size is quite modest for such a large student body; annual enrollments approach double those we project for the Glenn School with only 2.5 additional FTE. This suggests that the projected FTE for the Glenn School could support an even larger student body.
Robert M. LaFollette School of Public Affairs  
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Founded: 1984  
Current National Rank: 17  
Reporting Line: To a College of “Letters and Sciences” which includes all arts and sciences departments as well as six professional schools

Faculty Size and Breadth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Primary Degree Field/Department of Joint Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Appointments</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economics (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural &amp; Applied Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Population Health Sciences (Medical School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty FTE: 9.5, assuming that joint appointments average 50%

Degrees Offered:  
Master of Public Affairs  
Master of International Public Affairs  
Joint degrees with several graduate departments

Student Enrollment: About 100

Comments:

The LaFollette School has a smaller faculty and student body than those we have targeted for the John Glenn School. One key to its success lies in the large number of joint appointments. These expand reputation despite the low FTE. The diversity of joint appointments and degree fields is particularly striking. One of the two full-time appointments is a professor with a degree in electrical engineering. More than a third of the joint appointments are with departments outside those housed in SBS. PPM has not even begun to match this breadth under its current reporting line—and would seem unlikely to do so if it remains in SBS.

If a LaFollette School at the University of Wisconsin ranks 17th nationally with a faculty FTE of 9.5 and student body of 100, we think that a John Glenn School at The Ohio State University with a faculty FTE of 14.5 and a student body of 143 can recapture its previous rank of 15th.
May 16, 2005

TO: Council on Academic Affairs

FROM: Faculty of the School of Public Policy and Management
Bert Rockman, Director of SPPM
Anand Desai, Acting Director of SPPM
Deborah Merritt, Director of the John Glenn Institute
Don Stenta, Acting Director of the John Glenn Institute


The John Glenn School of Public Affairs will merge the degree granting authority of the School of Public Policy and Management and its portfolio of academic research and service to the academic and public policy and management communities with the John Glenn Institute's innovative public service training, outreach and research support programs. The active participation of the Institute's affiliated members is evidence of how individuals across campus see the tremendous potential for their own research and other interests being enhanced by the existence of a centrally located School. With the creation of the integrated School, we will be able to build upon these individual partnerships and begin to offer many opportunities for academic units to partner with and build upon the School's programs. In this document, we provide some criteria and indicators for judging progress towards the stated goals of the merged School.

The first indicator of progress will be our ability to attract a broad slate of highly accomplished scholars and administrators and to select a director from among them. In spite of the fact that the University has successfully mounted a number of high profile searches, this search is complicated by the fact that it cannot begin until there is clarity regarding the merger. Hence, if aspects of this evaluation plan seem tentative, that reflects an attempt to provide some leeway for the new director in crafting a vision for the School. However, in a more general sense, there is little mystery regarding what must be achieved over the next five years for the new School to thrive.

Documents previously distributed to CAA have provided a profile of the School, as it would be on July 1, 2005, if formed by that time. The new School's strengths and weaknesses have also been described in earlier documents. These documents describe the plans for each of the School's first five years, identifying specific priorities for each year, as well as the goals we hope to have attained by the end of that year.

While we have specified landmarks we would like to strive towards each year, it is our expectation that we will be evaluated in the fifth year of the existence of the School. Please let us know if we can provide any further information.
The John Glenn School of Public Affairs
Evaluation Criteria and Indicators

*This evaluation plan assumes the creation of the School by July 1, 2005.*

**Year One (AY 2006): Reorganization and Launch**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By July 1, 2006, the School will have completed the following tasks:</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hired a nationally recognized individual to serve as permanent director</td>
<td>Name and qualifications of Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created a Board of Advisors</td>
<td>Names and qualifications of members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed at least one visiting professor from another prominent school or research institution</td>
<td>Name and qualifications of Visiting Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Developed a strategy to promote the School supported by the creation of a new website and materials | 1. Website  
2. Brochures  
3. Other materials, e.g. promotional CD |
| Increased master's student enrollment | Number of students |
| Reorganized staff to address critical needs in student recruiting, admissions, placement, and alumni relations | 1. Organization Chart  
2. Recruitment strategy  
3. Placement Strategy |
| Celebrated the 35th year of the existence of SPPM by inviting a prominent researcher/public servant to give a talk to alumni and policymakers and the University community | 1. Description of event  
2. Name of Speaker  
3. Press reports  
4. Feedback from attendees |

Having organized the combined unit internally, hired a new director, and launched the new School in a variety of state and national contexts, the primary focus for Year Two is for the director, faculty, and other stakeholders to shape faculty hiring, research, and curriculum priorities for the next four years.
Year Two (AY 2007): Faculty Growth and Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By July 1, 2007, the School will have completed the following tasks:</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed a blueprint for carving out a distinctive research and teaching profile of the John Glenn School. To that end we will have</td>
<td>Blueprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted a review of the School’s degree and non-degree programs and teaching and internship activities</td>
<td>Review documents and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begun the development of a plan for additional faculty hires based on curricular needs and research opportunities identified in the review</td>
<td>Plan and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begun substantive discussions with other units on campus regarding profiles of individuals who could be offered joint appointments in the School and the other unit</td>
<td>Report on meetings and potential commitments from different units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified areas, based on faculty interests and strategic opportunities, which will be the hallmark of policy research conducted at the John Glenn School.</td>
<td>Plan and recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Increased its faculty size and diversity (including race, gender, academic field, and focus of research/teaching) | 1. Number of faculty FTE  
2. Diversity indicators |
| Consolidated recruitment and admissions of masters students | Trends In  
1. Number of applications  
2. Number of students  
3. Quality indicators  
4. Diversity indicators |
| Begun development campaign for faculty chairs and student fellowships | Development activity report |
| Identified an individual to occupy the Enarson Chair as a visiting practitioner-in-residence (one year appointment) | Name and qualifications of individual |
| Enhanced existing Institute Programs | Trends in the number and profile of applicants for the  
Kiplinger program  
Washington Academic Internship Program  
Other student programs  
Other training programs |
| Integrated faculty, staff, and students from both units. | Survey of faculty, staff, and student satisfaction |
Year Three (AY 2008): Synthesis and Setting New Directions

By July 1, 2008, the School will have completed the following tasks:

| Established priorities and developed implementation plans based on the research and teaching blueprint. | Priorities and implementation plan |
| Established priorities and developed implementation plans for the School's degree and non-degree programs and teaching and internship activities | Progress report on implementation |
| Established priorities and developed implementation plans for additional faculty hires | Progress report on implementation |
| Begun implementation of joint appointments with other units on campus | Memoranda of Understanding with other units regarding joint hires |
| Developed plans for a research center (either new or building on existing initiatives) | Detailed plans including funding sources, research focus and scope. |
| Identified an individual to occupy the Enarson Chair as a visiting practitioner-in-residence | Name and qualifications of individual |
| Named senior faculty appointments | 1. Number, diversity, and other qualifications of faculty FTE 
2. Names, diversity, and other qualifications of senior faculty members |
| Increased the number, diversity and quality of students enrolling in the School's masters and doctoral programs | Trends in 
1. Number of applications 
2. Number of students 
3. Quality indicators 
4. Diversity indicators |
| Established funding support for students | 1. Funding dollars for masters students 
2. Funding dollars for doctoral students |
| Enhanced existing Institute Programs | Trends in the number and profile of applicants for the Kiplinger program Washington Academic Internship Program Other student programs Other training programs |
### Year Four (AY 2009): Homestretch Year

**By July 1, 2009, the School will have completed the following tasks:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed one year of implementation of the School's degree and non-degree programs and teaching and internship activities</td>
<td>Evaluation report on implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed one year of implementation of joint appointments with other units on campus</td>
<td>Evaluation report on implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established a research center</td>
<td>Progress report on implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified an individual to occupy the Enarson Chair as a visiting practitioner-in-residence</td>
<td>Name and qualifications of individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Completed initial growth in faculty size through joint and other appointments | 1. Number, diversity, and other qualifications of faculty FTE  
2. Names, diversity, and other qualifications of senior faculty members |
| Consolidated the number and quality of students enrolling in the School's programs | Trends in  
1. Number of applications  
2. Number of students  
3. Quality indicators  
4. Diversity indicators |
| Consolidated funding support for students                             | 1. Funding dollars for masters students  
2. Funding dollars for doctoral students                                |
| Consolidated existing Institute Programs                              | Trends in the number and quality of applicants for the  
Kiplinger program  
Washington Academic Internship Program  
Other student programs  
Other training programs                                               |

This year completes implementation of many priorities established during the preceding years. It allows refinement of those priorities and development of their most advanced components.
Year Five (AY 2010): Review and Renewal

By July 1, 2010, The School will have completed a review of its operations, its financial status and standing within the University, the policy-making and public service communities and among Schools of Public Policy/Affairs/Administration/Management.

The School will have prepared

- a report on a satisfaction survey of students, staff, faculty, alumni and other stakeholders;

- a report on the alumni of the John Glenn School to highlight the progress of these individuals beyond their training at the School;

- a self-study report for accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA);

- a five-year plan for continued progress towards excellence and recognition among its various constituencies.
May 18, 2005

TO: Vice Provost Randy Smith

FROM: Karen Ahijevych, Steve Fink, Kay Halasek, Peg McMahon, Barb Pletz, and George Valco, appointed as an ad hoc committee of CAA

RE: Proposal to Alter the Reporting Line of the School of Public Policy and Management and Consolidate that School with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy

Recommendation
The ad hoc committee recommends approval of the consolidation of the two units, creating the John Glenn School of Public Affairs (JGSPA). If the consolidation is approved, the ad hoc committee further recommends approval of the reporting line of the John Glenn School of Public Affairs to OAA with the stipulations defined below.

Stipulations
- The JGSPA reporting line to OAA be approved for a probationary period of five years
- JGSPA provide annually to CAA a report that outlines its progress toward the goals articulated in its 15 April 2005 strategic and financial plans and 24 April 2005 statement on curriculum
- At the end of the probationary period that CAA determine through rigorous evaluation and review whether the reporting line be maintained; at that time, CAA may either (1) confirm that the reporting line be maintained, (2) extend the probationary period, or (3) determine that the reporting line not be maintained

The ad hoc committee recognizes that approval, should it be forthcoming, constitutes an exception to 3335-3-34 (D) (4) of The Bylaws of the Board of Trustees, which states that “A school, with the exception of the graduate school, shall be responsible to a college for administrative purposes.”

Purpose and Rationale for the Proposal

---

1 As required by 3335-5-37 (C) (3), CAA appointed an ad hoc committee to review the proposal. The ad hoc committee consisted of five regular faculty (Professors Ahijevych, Fink, Halasek, McMahon, and Valco) and one graduate student (Pletz). Membership of the ad hoc committee was agreed upon by the council on academic affairs and senate leadership.
The proposal articulates several arguments for the consolidation and new reporting line, noting that a consolidated unit reporting to OAA will

- Improve efficiency by eliminating duplicative administrative functions
- Shift resources from a nonacademic unit [JGI] to an academic one [SPPM]
- Maximize use of the new facilities . . . in Page Hall
- Improve educational opportunities for undergraduate, graduate, and executive education students
- Integrate complementary programs offered by the two units
- Enhance interaction with policy matters locally, nationally, and globally
- Create a focus for policy research, teaching, and service campuswide
- Increase the unit's ability to attract external funds
- Establish a platform for further integration of Ohio State's public affairs activities

Background Information
In reviewing the proposal to alter the reporting line of the School of Public Policy and Management and consolidate that School with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy, the ad hoc committee followed the procedure outlined in 3335-3-37 (C) of The Bylaws of the Board of Trustees. Said "procedure for the alteration or abolition of colleges" sets out the terms and processes for such a review. Detailed below are statements regarding the ad hoc committee's review and activities as they pertain to each portion of 3335-3-37 (C):

3335-3-37 (C) (1) The council on academic affairs, the executive vice president and provost, the dean, or faculty from the affected unit may initiate a proposal to alter or abolish a college.

- The proposal was initiated in early 2004 by the faculty of the School of Public Policy and Management (SPPM)
- In mid-2004 it was developed further and revised by that same body
- In August 2004, the proposal was forwarded to CAA by the faculty of SPPM
- SBS faculty reviewed and commented on the proposal at a November 4, 2004, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences open meeting for faculty
- On November 11, 2004, a subsequent vote of that faculty was taken: 114 faculty voted in favor of the consolidation, 18 against, 2 abstentions; 22 faculty voted in favor of the new reporting line, 110 opposed; 2 abstentions

3335-3-37 (C) (2) A proposal for alteration or abolition of a college must include an analysis with all of the elements outlined in paragraph (B)(2) of this rule. It shall be the responsibility of the party making the proposal to provide this analysis.

- The ad hoc committee has determined that the proposal, with supplemental materials provided by the initiators at the request of the ad hoc committee, meets the terms set out in 3335-3-37 (B) (2) (a-l) and 3335-3-37 (C) (4). The ad hoc committee includes in the attached documentation the proposal and appendices
(August 2004); letters of support from faculty, students, external deans, directors, and faculty; five-year strategic and financial plans; and a statement on curriculum.

3335-3-37 (C) (4) The ad hoc committee shall evaluate the proposal, which will include extensive consultation with affected faculty, students, and staff, and relevant parties external to the university.

- The ad hoc committee received the proposal on October 1, 2004 and began review of the document on October 27, 2004
- The ad hoc committee met to discuss the proposal on November 10, 2004; December 8, 2004; January 11, 2005; February 8, 2005; April 27, 2005; May 4, 2005; and May 11, 2005
- During those meetings, the ad hoc committee met with Provost Barbara Snyder; Vice Provosts Carol Anderson, Mike Sherman, and Randy Smith; Dean Paul Beck of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences; JGI Director Deborah Merritt; SPPM Director Bert Rockman, CAA chair David Stetson; and Professor Mary Marvel (representing the faculty of SPPM)
- The Council on Academic Affairs discussed the proposal at its January 5, 2005, meeting and was joined by Professors Rockman and Merritt and Dean Beck; discussion centered on the benefit of the consolidation for JGI, the question of the size of the faculty in the proposed unit, the need for a central reporting line to OAA, and potential for growth for the new school
- On February 3, 2005, the proposal was brought before Faculty Council; discussion centered on the proposed reporting line to OAA and the small size of the proposed school's faculty; the possibility of a compromise was suggested
- To gather additional information regarding program growth, the fiscal and curricular plans for the proposed school, and methods of evaluating its success, the ad hoc committee requested a strategic and fiscal five-year plan on March 24, 2005
- On March 28, 2005, faculty of SPPM reiterated (in letters to CAA) their unanimous support for the proposed consolidation and new reporting line
- In April 2005, the initiators forwarded five-year financial and strategic plans and a statement on curriculum
- On April 29, 2005, the ad hoc committee attended an open forum for JGI and SPPM faculty, staff, students, and alumni. That meeting was attended by 50 people: 22 MA and PhD students, 13 staff, 7 faculty, 1 alumnus, 1 affiliated faculty, and 5 ad hoc committee members. During the one-hour meeting, those attending voiced their support for both the consolidation and new reporting line. The meeting ended with a unanimous vote (of faculty, staff, and students affiliated with JGI and SPPM) in favor of the proposal.
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0. Context

This strategic plan is being written under a set of unusual circumstances. The School currently faces two temporary uncertainties that affect this strategic plan. In particular,

- over the next few months, the University will decide upon a proposed merger of the School with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy to form the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, and
- the School does not have a permanent director.

While the fundamental goals of the School's research and teaching mission will not change regardless of the outcome of the merger proposal, the ability of the School to achieve these goals will be different under the two scenarios. If the merger is approved, the School will be in a superior position relative to its current position. As a result, the School will be able to achieve more of its goals, and achieve these goals faster, than if the merger is not approved. Through this Strategic Plan, we highlight the different projected achievements and rates of achievement if the School merges with the John Glenn Institute and if it does not.

A new permanent director's influence will be most noticeable on the margins, which form the core of the strategic plan. In the absence of a permanent director, the School may not hire additional faculty. Our inability to hire has immediate consequences for our teaching, research and service productivity. Hence, the resolution of the merger proposal and the hire of a new director would be the appropriate start date to begin the implementation of this plan.

1. History and Program Assessment

In 1969, the School of Public Policy and Management began as the Division of Public Administration in the College of Administrative Sciences “to prepare students for public service at all levels.” Its mission is to create a dynamic interdisciplinary environment that enhances excellence in research, teaching, and service that further the public interest.

The last (AY 2000-04) strategic plan laid out four overall goals:

1. Improve the School’s research productivity and its national standing.
2. Improve the School’s graduate program by enhancing the quality of instruction, competing for and recruiting the best students and making strong placements.
3. Improve faculty, staff and student diversity.

Instrumental to achieving these goals was the proposed increase in the then faculty size of 10 FTE. We have clearly not made progress towards that goal. The size of our current faculty is 6.5 FTE. With respect to the other goals:

1. The School has recently improved its research productivity, but that is not yet reflected in its national standing as indicated by the US News and World Report. Since 2000, the School’s rank has dropped from 30th to 42nd out of 248 schools.
2. The School continues to maintain a high quality of instruction and has made strong placements, but has not made much progress in recruiting the best students.
3. There has been little change in student (Appendix A), faculty, or staff diversity.

4. The Public Management Programs are no longer a part of the School.

The size of our incoming classes is smaller today than in 2000. In brief, the School has not fared well with respect to size or those goals. In spite of the drastic reduction in size, and the uncertainty surrounding the School, it remains a vital and vibrant unit. Faculty research productivity is higher today than it was a few years ago, the teaching portfolio and its delivery remain strong, School graduates are in demand, and the School is poised to improve its visibility and standing in the academic and practitioner public policy analysis and public management communities.

Table 1 provides a summary profile of the School.

### Table 1
School of Public Policy and Management Profile for FY 2006

| Faculty Size | 7 (6.5 FTE) (4 tenured associate professors,¹ 1 untenured associate professor², 2 untenured assistant professors) |
| Faculty Degree Fields | Public Policy (5), Political Science (1), Agricultural and Resource Economics (1), Law (1)³ |
| Joint Appointments | 1 |
| Emeriti | 10, with 1 actively teaching |
| Adjuncts/Lecturers | 11, 7 from the community and 4 from non-tenure-track administrative positions at OSU. Seven currently teach. |
| Courtesy Appointments | 13 |
| Masters Student Enrollment (MPA and MA) | 85 |
| Doctoral Student Enrollment | 19 |
| Staff Support | Assistant Director for Academic Studies (1) Fiscal/Human Resources (1) Information Technology (1) Part-time GAA (1) and part-time undergraduate student worker (1) |
| Revenue Available for Current Year | $1,367,391.77 |
| Endowment Principal | $1,410,539.37 |
| Facilities | Page Hall, which is centrally located on the Oval and offers faculty offices, student and public meeting spaces, a dedicated computer lab and distance learning studio, conference and training rooms, and ready access to pool classrooms. |
| National Rank | 42 out of 248 |

¹ Tenure for one of these associate professors to be effective October 1, 2005.
² Currently under review for tenure.
³ Some faculty members hold more than one degree.
The School is now co-located with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy in the recently renovated Page Hall. The School's faculty and staff, its computer laboratory and most of its classes are now located under one roof.

Program Description

Masters Programs

The School of Public Policy and Management has a particularly well-developed curriculum for its professional masters students. During its thirty-five year history the School has been considered a national leader in developing a comprehensive curriculum for preparing these students. Current masters programs fall into three groups:

1. MPA. The School's main degree, an MPA, is a two-year program requiring 81 credit hours with a summer internship between the two years. The curriculum is developed around a core of the following four "streams":

   - Public Policy
   - Public Management
   - Public Sector Economics
   - Decision Support Systems

All MPA students complete a major policy paper during their final year in the program. In addition to this required coursework, MPA students complete a minimum of 20 hours of elective work in "policy labs" or other courses applying their public administration knowledge to specific policy areas.

2. In-Career MA. This degree program adapts the MPA for individuals who already have 3-5 years of relevant post-baccalaureate administrative or analyst work experience. MA candidates typically complete the program part-time while continuing their work experience. Students enroll in most of the core courses, spanning the same four streams that are required of MPA students.

3. Joint and Dual Degrees. The School of Public Policy and Management currently operates dual degree programs in City and Regional Planning, Health Services Management and Policy, Law, Natural Resources, and Social Work. It also offers an MA in Arts Policy and Administration, hosted jointly with the College of the Arts. Each of the programs allows students to pursue studies in closely related fields, fulfilling the core requirements of each field, while receiving credit for appropriate work in the other field. Each has been quite successful in attracting talented students.

Doctoral Programs

The School's doctoral program, like its masters programs, enjoys a strong national reputation. The program is designed to prepare students both for university positions as teachers and researchers and to prepare them for senior-level research positions in government, nonprofit, and other institutional settings. The program has succeeded

---

4 See remarks about the School's masters program in recent NASPAA site visit reports. Recent graduates of the School have gone on to Fudan University (ranked 2nd in China), RAND and the GAO.
admirably in both goals, placing graduates in tenured positions at schools ranked above the School and in high-level government positions.  

Faculty Research Description

Individual faculty members have begun to establish strong research links within the profession and across campus. Having established a solid research record studying the adoption and effectiveness of spatially targeted economic development incentives, Rob Greenbaum, who begins this year as a tenured associate professor, has recently begun to make a mark among the community of scholars investigating the relationships among crime, business location decisions, and residential choice. He has developed mutually beneficial ties with multi-disciplinary centers such as Center for Urban and Regional Analysis (CURA) and Criminal Justice Research Center (CJRC), which should help enhance the visibility and reputations of both the School and these centers.

Trevor Brown’s work on public management, more specifically on the capacity to manage contracted service provision, has led to highly visible publications and membership on the editorial board of the flagship public policy journal. In the last three years, four of his articles have appeared in top tier journals and two more articles are forthcoming in top tier journals in 2006. His involvements in international research activities continue with his collaborative work on emerging democracies in states of the former Soviet Union.

Tess Heintze’s research on social policy, which has begun to appear in demography and policy journals, has broad appeal across campus. In the year she has been on campus, her work, which has a strong methodological component, has established links with IPR.

Andy Keeler’s work on the environment and natural resource economics is aligned with the work of the Environmental Policy Initiative and the Clusters of Interdisciplinary Research on International Themes (Climate Change). His research and invitations to disseminate it (for instance, in a recent keynote address on international climate policy) offer an opportunity for the School to have a presence in a new area that is increasingly important in public policy.

David Landsbergen and Anand Desai are collaborating on enhancing the public policy and evaluation component of the research on information systems and technology being conducted in the College of Engineering. Individually, David Landsbergen’s research on legal and policy issues related to information technologies is also of practical interest to communities attempting to navigate in the increasingly complex world of e-government and information systems. All three of his most recent publications are in top tier journals.

Anand Desai was recently invited to serve as a guest editor for a special issue of a highly regarded computer science journal.

Mary Marvel is continuing her collaborative research on contracting out of public services. She recently completed a survey of government agencies exploring the relative monitoring costs of providing services in-house versus contracting out.

---

1 The School, for example, has doctoral alumni holding tenured positions at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs (ranked first nationally) and the University of Georgia’s School of Public and International Affairs (ranked third nationally). Another holder of the Ph.D, recently served as Director of the Congressional Budget Office.
In summary, over the past four years, there has been a notable increase in research productivity and faculty members have increased the School's visibility in other ways. In the last year SPPM faculty members have been named to the editorial board of the profession's flagship journal, given conference keynote addresses, and have been invited to participate in specialized conferences organized through NSF funding or by the professional organization.

All PPM faculty members, save one, are on the program at this year's annual Association of Public Policy Analysis and Management meeting, as are two doctoral students. This year three of the School's doctoral students will have received outside funding to present their work in health care, housing, and economic development at research conferences.

Table 2 summarizes the publication record of the current faculty. These numbers exclude faculty members (see appendix B) who have recently left the School. Including their research and professional service contributions would have further increased the various totals in this table. These numbers are driven, to a substantial degree by the research productivity of the faculty joining the School over the last half dozen years. Activity seeking outside research funding has shown a similar increase, as indicated in Table 3. The bulk of this activity reflects collaborative, multi-disciplinary activity on the part of the more senior members of the faculty.

Tables 2 and 3 are to be interpreted in a context where teaching and service loads are shared by a handful of faculty members, where the field's norms are that the average annual rate of publication in refereed journals is approximately one per faculty member, and where research dollars are hard to come by.

Table 2
Publications in Refereed Journals & Members of Editorial Boards
Counts include only Current (6.5FTE) Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FTE*</th>
<th>Refereed Articles</th>
<th>Articles in top ranked journals**</th>
<th>Articles under review or R&amp;R</th>
<th>Editorial Boards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Dec 2002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Dec 2003</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Dec 2004</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Dec 2005</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forthcoming</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3
Research Funding Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Funding Applied For</th>
<th></th>
<th>Funding Received</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Total $ '000</td>
<td>PPM Share $ '000</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Dec 2002</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$179</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Dec 2003</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,934</td>
<td>$869</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Dec 2004</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Dec 2005</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$952</td>
<td>$89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Resources and Needs

The School staff is currently 3 FTE, consisting of the Assistant Director for Academic Studies, a Fiscal/HR Officer and a Systems Specialist for information technology (IT). The Office Associate position (1 FTE) is currently vacant.

For approximately eight months in 2005, including the crucial time-period around the move from Fisher to Page Hall, the School was without a permanent IT Systems Specialist. This lack imposed considerable strain on the School’s internal functions, student, faculty, and staff IT support as well as on external communications with prospective students and alumni. The School has recently hired a Systems Specialist.

In addition to the Systems Specialist, the School has two other permanent staff members. The School’s Fiscal/HR Officer is responsible for all the financial and human resources related functions generally associated with the smooth functioning of an academic unit. Over the last several years, the School has been involved in various decisions regarding the layout of facilities in the renovated Page Hall; in planning for the move; implementing the move and since the move, in attending to the usual teething pains associated with a new facility. Our Fiscal/HR Officer has been the main School representative and oftentimes the sole person attending to these matters on the School’s behalf. Consequently, she has been severely over-extended.

The School’s Assistant Director for Academic Studies is responsible for the processing of student admissions, advising of potential and actual applicants to the School, student advising, coordination of dual and joint degree programs with other departments and schools, and overseeing graduate associates. The Assistant Director is also responsible for overseeing faculty support for the delivery of the School’s three degree programs. This oversight entails, among other duties, scheduling of classrooms, ordering textbooks, scheduling and managing comprehensive examinations, and auditing students records. The Assistant Director also
assists the students when they must drop or add classes, and helps with navigating the maze of requirements pertaining to a student’s progress from admission to graduation.

For the past several years, the position of Office Associate has been vacant. In the absence of an Office Associate, student workers have staffed the School’s front desk, on an irregular basis. Hence, normal traffic and inquiries generally addressed at the front desk become a source of frequent interruptions for the Assistant Director or the Fiscal/HR Officer.

In summary, current staff support in the School is precariously inadequate.

2. School Goals and Priorities

The School’s goals remain:

- Improve the School’s research productivity and its national standing;
- Improve the School’s graduate program by enhancing the quality of instruction, competing for and recruiting the best students and making strong placements;
- Improve faculty, staff, and student diversity.

The first indicator of progress will be our ability to attract a broad slate of highly accomplished scholars and administrators and to select a director from among them. In spite of the fact that the University has successfully mounted a number of high profile searches, this search is complicated by the fact that it cannot begin until there is clarity regarding the merger. Hence, if aspects of this strategic plan seem tentative, that reflects an attempt to provide some leeway for the new director to craft a strategic direction for the School. However, in a more general sense, there is little mystery regarding what must be achieved over the next five years for the School to thrive.

Goal 1

Faculty Hires

The School has been extremely successful in hiring highly productive assistant professors. The School however, needs to populate its ranks of full professors through internal promotion, joint appointments across the University, and outside hires.

In the *US News and World Report* rankings, the top ranked public affairs schools also have the highest ranking in the areas of Public Management and/or Public Finance. Among the sub-fields, the School’s highest ranking is 8th in information technology. The School has traditionally had a strong reputation in public finance, however, through retirements and lack of a critical mass, this capacity no longer exists.

In public management, Trevor Brown is quickly establishing himself as a highly productive and talented scholar. A hire in this area, either in the form of the new director or an assistant professor who complements Brown, would be an effective approach to signaling the strength of public management research at the School.

Historically, the director of the National Regulatory Research Institute (NRRI) has had strong ties with the School. Its permanent directors have either been tenured or have had an adjunct
appointment in the School. The search, just getting underway for the director of the NRRI, offers another opportunity to enhance the size of the School faculty and its research visibility.

The cost of a senior hire/director will be $180,000 and the cost of a junior hire would be $85,000.

**Research Collaborations**

Policy research at Ohio State occurs in various departments across campus. The School offers foundational public policy and management training and its faculty members are familiar with and conduct research on fundamental public policy and management issues. The foundational capability that resides within the School has tremendous potential for developing into collaborative research initiatives across campus without encroaching upon the area specific research that occurs within other departments and colleges.

A growing interest and demand for understanding the organizational and financial management needs of non-profit organizations offers the potential for joint hires with health policy and arts policy.

Similarly, there is interest and need for a strong research program in educational finance, which also offers the potential for innovative arrangements with the College of Education to develop additional capacity though joint appointments.

The School’s faculty members enjoy productive collaborative research relationships with individual faculty members in engineering, environmental science, natural resources, city and regional planning, agriculture and with multi-disciplinary research centers. Formal ties between the School and these departments in the form of joint hires have been largely unexplored. The University’s budget model does not lend itself to the easy development of such relationships, however, with the appropriate strategic support and cooperation, such collaboration should be feasible.

Initial explorations regarding joint hires have been positive, but progress is unlikely until the resolution of the uncertainty surrounding the School. A merged school with its wider range of activities offers innovative and attractive possibilities for collaboration.

Each joint appointment between the School and other departments and colleges would cost between $45,000 and $90,000 depending upon rank.

**Visibility**

With the arrival of Rob Greenbaum, Trevor Brown, Tess Heintze and Andy Keeler, the School’s presence at various research conferences has shown a marked increase. We will have to maintain and enhance our presence not only at the public policy and management conference but also at other conferences in faculty research subfields. Our goal is to maintain high enough research visibility to help move the current ranking of 42nd to among the top 30. A named school will provide an immediate positive boost in visibility among our peer institutions.

The flagship public policy journal, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, is currently housed at the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University. The editorial home for this journal is reviewed every five years. It has just completed one year at Indiana. We will encourage faculty members towards greater involvement in service to professional organizations. It is our goal to become viable contenders when the journal is seeking a new home in the near future.
ACTION:
Immediately upon the resolution of the uncertainty regarding the School’s status, we will

- begin the process to hire a new director and an assistant professor and to create a board of advisors;
- explore joint hires with other units on campus;
- encourage faculty involvement in service activities in professional organizations;
- create a hub for multi-disciplinary policy oriented research where School faculty members and students can bring public policy and management expertise and credibility to joint proposals;
- continue to target highly ranked journals for potential publication and maintain high visibility at research conferences and in professional organizations.

Goal 2
Quality of Instruction and Curricular Innovation
The School has always prided itself for its high quality of classroom instruction, student access to faculty and a practice-oriented curriculum based on a solid conceptual foundation. As stated earlier, the School’s curriculum was unique when first designed. Since then, it has been much copied and is no longer at the forefront of the curricula at comprehensive schools of public policy and management. Upon the resolution of the current uncertainties, the potential for relative stability and growth in the size of the faculty affords a good opportunity to review the teaching portfolio of the School.

The move to Page Hall and the campus-wide efforts to make information technology more readily available in the classroom is another aspect of this opportunity to review both the content and delivery of our courses.

Our objective, over the next five years, is to review our curriculum for both the masters and doctoral programs and to modify them as necessary to regain our presence at the innovative edge of training graduate students for public policy analysis, public management, public service, and research.

Graduate minors: The School plans to offer a public policy minor for graduate students enrolled in other OSU graduate programs. The purpose of the minor is to provide students with the analytical tools to understand governmental decision processes. We believe that an understanding of the causes and consequences of public policy is a critical element of success in a wide range of disciplines and professions. Consequently, we think that a public policy minor would be attractive for many graduate students.

The School also plans to offer a public management minor for graduate students enrolled in other OSU graduate programs. The purpose of the minor is to provide students with concrete professional skills needed for management of public and nonprofit organizations. An understanding of strategic management, leadership, human resources, financial and

---

*Mary Marvel is the School’s most recent recipient of the University Alumni Distinguished Teaching Award.*
information systems management is relevant for a wide-range of disciplines and professions. Consequently, we think that a public management minor would be attractive for many graduate students. These minors can be developed with our existing courses and will not require the development of additional courses.

We need to strengthen our ties with our dual and joint degree partners and to explore developing new dual degrees. Based on initial discussions, we can develop such dual degrees with Education, Engineering and Slavic and East European studies.

Undergraduate Courses: Historically, the School has had a sporadic and minimal presence in undergraduate education. It will continue this minimal presence, except for the opportunity to participate in the proposal to offer a public policy minor that has been recently developed within the College. Offering undergraduate courses should, at the outset, be neutral in terms of effect on the budget, and has the potential to modestly enhance the School’s revenue stream if the new minors are successful.

This level of presence in the undergraduate program is in accord with our basic belief that public policy and management education should build upon a solid undergraduate foundation. In addition to expanding the choices available at the undergraduate level, the policy minor proposal is attractive in that it provides the School access to a group of potential graduate students with an interest in public policy and public management.

Student recruitment and placement

Being involved only in graduate education, the School does not have ready access to undergraduates and teaching opportunities for advanced doctoral students. Offering some courses at the undergraduate level will not only expose undergraduates to potential graduate opportunities in the School, but also offer a potential avenue for our doctoral students to gain teaching experience.

Hence, this access to undergraduates will enhance our doctoral training and thereby improve our ability to place students in good academic positions. The ability to fund doctoral students, initially as teaching assistants and later as instructors in these undergraduate classes will also enhance our recruitment. If the merger is successful, doctoral students will enjoy the opportunity to teach co-curricular courses currently offered through the John Glenn Institute.

Public Policy Internship: We will also establish a long-term relationship with state agencies and local governments to offer internships to our students during the academic year. Our initial thinking on these internships is that the agency will pay a stipend and the School will cover their fees. The possibility of funding coupled with the opportunity to gain work experience in a government agency will be an attractive recruitment tool. (Cost of in-state fees for 10 students: $90,000).

Our goal is to increase both the quality and number of students in the programs to achieve a steady state of 140 - 150 students in the three degree programs.

ACTION:

Review our teaching portfolio, scan the curricula at other schools and reinvigorate the curriculum for our programs in congruence with the opportunities available at Ohio State.
Develop a recruitment plan to improve the quality and number of students enrolled in the School’s programs. To that end we will also

- develop graduate minors in public policy and public management;
- collaborate on developing undergraduate offerings in public policy and public management;
- develop core courses for undergraduate minors in public policy and public management;
- negotiate internships for incoming students in state and local governments; and
- nurture current dual and joint degrees and develop other dual degrees, potentially with Education, Engineering and Slavic and East European Languages.

**Goal 3**

**Staff and Faculty Diversity**

Two women and one man make up the School’s full time staff. This is a change from the beginning of the summer when all three full time staff members were women. Of the seven faculty members, two are women and five men, one of whom is Asian. In brief, there is diversity in gender, but little ethnic or racial diversity among the faculty or staff.

The need to increase the number of staff members and the size of the faculty provides an opportunity to change the ethnic and racial make-up of the faculty and staff.

**Student Diversity**

The School has made minimal recruitment efforts in the recent past. Over the next five years, the School will revisit its recruitment strategy, which until recently, used to include recruitment visits to historically Black colleges.

We will also further engage our alumni in the recruitment effort. Central Ohio has over 1,500 alumni with over 500 alumni distributed across the country. Our alumni base is a loyal, but essentially untapped resource.

**ACTION:**

Explore the possibility of using the School’s cash reserves to help improve the diversity of the School’s faculty in the short-term and develop a long-term strategy.

Hire a staff member dedicated to recruitment and alumni relations. The School has cash resources to immediately hire such an individual with the expectation that the person will become self-supporting through increases in enrollment. (Cost $50,000)

**3. Strategic Plan Implementation**

On the following pages, we present in tabular form how this strategic plan will unfold over the next five years. In column 1, we list some of the main tasks that must be undertaken to make progress in implementing this plan. In column 2, we have included indicators of the plan’s progress. In column 3, we report projected effect of the implementation of the plan if the merger is not approved. In column 4, we report projected effect of the implementation of the plan if the merger is approved. The merged School will have the advantage of the joint resources of the School and the Institute, including being a named school.
**Table 4**

**Year One: AY 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By July 1, 2006, the School intends to complete the following tasks:</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hired a nationally recognized individual to serve as permanent director*</td>
<td>Name and qualifications of Director</td>
<td>The School offers an excellent opportunity for the right individual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created a Board of Advisors*</td>
<td>Names and qualifications of members</td>
<td>Prominent alumni and state level public officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed a visiting professor or an Enarson executive-in-residence*</td>
<td>Name and qualifications of visiting professor or executive-in-residence</td>
<td>The School offers an excellent opportunity for the right individual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed a strategy to promote the School supported by the creation of a new website and materials</td>
<td>1. Website 2. Brochures 3. Other materials, e.g. promotional CD</td>
<td>Limited potential at current levels of support staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed public policy and public management minors in collaboration with other departments</td>
<td>1. Curriculum 2. Plans for administration of the minors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The likelihood of this goal being met in the absence of an early decision on the merger is small. The School is not authorized to hire tenure-track faculty in the absence of a permanent director.
By July 1, 2006, the School intends to complete the following tasks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussed permanent internships with State agencies and local governments</td>
<td>The School has an extensive network of alumni working throughout state and local government on which to cultivate internships, but staff capacity is a concern. Collaborating with the Glenn School will be more attractive because of the increased visibility of the School and existing relationships between state and local government agencies and the Institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened current dual and joint degree programs</td>
<td>Matches with advisors and development of informational materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Reorganized staff to address critical needs in student recruiting, admissions, placement, and alumni relations | 1. Organization Chart  
2. Recruitment strategy  
3. Placement Strategy | In the absence of a permanent director it is unclear whether additional staff support will be authorized. Sufficient infrastructure and resources currently available to move effectively. |
| Begun discussion on joint hires                                             | Identified potential departments                                          | Potential source will be existing affiliates of the Glenn Institute. |
| Hired an Office Associate                                                  | Name                                                                      | Can be deployed to enhance more strategic areas. |

Having organized the office staff, hired a new director and a visiting professor or executive-in-residence, the primary tasks for Year Two will be for the director, faculty and other stakeholders to shape faculty hiring, research, and curriculum priorities for the next four years.
## Table 5

### Year Two: AY 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By July 1, 2007, the School intends to complete the following tasks:</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed a blueprint for carving out a distinctive research and teaching profile of the School. To that end we will have:</td>
<td>Blueprint</td>
<td>The blueprint will reflect the new director’s vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted a review of the School’s degree programs and teaching and internship activities</td>
<td>Review documents and recommendations</td>
<td>The School cannot draw upon synergistic development of degree and non-degree programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begun the development of a plan for additional faculty hires based on curricular needs and research opportunities identified in the review</td>
<td>Plan and recommendations</td>
<td>Faculty hires will have to follow growth in enrollment and resulting resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begun substantive discussions with other units on campus regarding profiles of individuals who could be offered joint appointments in the School and the other unit</td>
<td>Report on meetings and potential commitments from different units Memorandum of understanding</td>
<td>Research and teaching in the non-profit sector on organization theory as well as finance through collaborations with health policy, arts policy etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified areas, based on faculty interests and strategic opportunities, which will be the hallmark of policy research conducted at Ohio State</td>
<td>Plan and recommendations</td>
<td>Little leeway until organization theory and public finance faculty have been hired.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPPM | John Glenn School

- Greater flexibility in developing a diverse research and teaching portfolio.
- Non-degree programs can play an important role in enhancing the School’s and University’s effort to train legislators and senior public servants.
- Greater flexibility in hiring teachers for the non-degree programs who could also offer courses for the degree programs.
- Greater likelihood of involvement due to flexibility in designing collaborative arrangements with current Glenn affiliates and other faculty.
- Current vacancies include School Director, senior hire (SPPM director funds), Wolf Chair plus a junior position.
Table 5
Year Two: AY 2007 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By July 1, 2007, the School intends to complete the following tasks:</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased its faculty size and diversity (including race, gender, academic field, and focus of research/teaching)</td>
<td>1. Number of faculty FTE 2. Diversity indicators</td>
<td>Greater flexibility and opportunities will make it easier to attract senior and diverse faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated recruitment and admissions of masters students</td>
<td>Trends In 1. Number of applications 2. Number of students 3. Quality indicators 4. Diversity indicators</td>
<td>Higher quality and greater numbers of individuals attracted by the named school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified new joint and dual degree programs</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>Greater excitement in being associated with the Glenn School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed undergraduate public policy and public management minors in collaboration with other departments</td>
<td>Enrollment and quality indicators</td>
<td>Affiliation with Glenn School likely to be more attractive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begun development campaign for faculty chairs and student fellowships</td>
<td>Development activity report</td>
<td>Greater likelihood of success with named school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created permanent internships</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>Collaborating with the Glenn School will be more attractive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified the Enarson executive-in-residence</td>
<td>Name and qualifications of individual</td>
<td>Greater likelihood of attracting someone of national prominence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 6
**Year Three: AY 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By July 1, 2008, the School intends to complete the following tasks:</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begun to implement the research and teaching blueprint</td>
<td>Progress report on implementation</td>
<td>More resources for highly visible, targeted research conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begun to implement plans for the School’s degree programs and teaching and internship activities</td>
<td>Progress report on implementation</td>
<td>Broader teaching portfolio of degree and non-degree programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begun to implement plans for additional faculty hires</td>
<td>Progress report on implementation</td>
<td>Greater ability to attract individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begun implementation of joint appointments with other units on campus</td>
<td>Names and qualifications of joint hires</td>
<td>Excitement of being associated with the Glenn School will increase likelihood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed plans for a research center (either new or building on existing initiatives)</td>
<td>Detailed plans including funding sources, research focus and scope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed graduate public policy and public management minors.</td>
<td>Enrollment and quality indicators</td>
<td>No additional course development necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued development campaign for faculty chairs and student fellowships</td>
<td>Development activity report</td>
<td>Affiliation with Glenn School likely to be more attractive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named senior faculty appointments</td>
<td>Number, diversity, and other qualifications of faculty</td>
<td>Greater ability to attract individuals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Year Three: AY 2008 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By July 1, 2008, the School intends to complete the following tasks:</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent internships with State agencies and local governments established</td>
<td>Number of internships</td>
<td>Affiliation with Glenn School likely to be more attractive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased the number, diversity and quality of students enrolling in the School’s masters and doctoral programs</td>
<td>Trends in 1. Number of applications 2. Number of students 3. Quality indicators 4. Diversity indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established funding support for students</td>
<td>1. Funding dollars for masters students 2. Funding dollars for doctoral students</td>
<td>Greater ability to attract money for scholarships and fellowships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After Year 3, the focus will be on maintaining a high research profile and consolidating student recruitment and faculty recruitment, in particular, joint hires.
Table 7
Year Four: AY 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By July 1, 2009, the School intends to complete the following tasks:</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed one year of implementation of joint appointments with other units on campus</td>
<td>Evaluation report on implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress towards establishing a research center</td>
<td>Progress report on implementation</td>
<td>Potentially slow progress depending upon rate of growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued development campaign for faculty chairs and student fellowships</td>
<td>Development activity report</td>
<td>High likelihood of a center being established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified second Enarson executive-in-residence</td>
<td>Name and qualifications of individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named senior faculty appointments</td>
<td>Number, diversity, and other qualifications of individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated the number and quality of students enrolling in the School’s programs</td>
<td>Trends in 1. Number of applications 2. Number of students 3. Quality indicators 4. Diversity indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established funding support for students</td>
<td>1. Funding dollars for masters students 2. Funding dollars for doctoral students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This year completes implementation of many priorities established during the preceding years. It allows refinement of those priorities and development of their most advanced components.
Year Five: AY 2010

By July 1, 2010, the School will have completed a review of its operations, its financial status and standing within the University, the policy-making and public service communities and among Schools of Public Policy/Affairs/Administration/Management.

The School will have consolidated its position within the University and in the larger academic and practitioner communities. Indicators of this status will be greater ties with the State government in terms of funded internships, research activity and training of senior public servants and elected officials.

By maintaining our recent success in hiring at the junior level and with similar success at the senior level we expect to continue to enhance our research productivity.

By presenting at national conferences and through other forms of advertising of our revitalized curriculum, innovative internship programs and other teaching and outreach activities we expect to enhance the visibility of the masters and doctoral programs.

The enhanced strength of the School will help move the School in the rankings and become a viable contender to serve as a home for the flagship public policy and management journal.

The School will have prepared

- a report on a satisfaction survey of students, staff, faculty, alumni and other stakeholders;
- a report on the alumni of the School to highlight the progress of these individuals beyond their training at the School;
- a self-study report for accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA); and
- a five-year plan for continued progress towards excellence and recognition among its various constituencies.

4. Resources and Revenue Scenarios

In FY06, the School will be able to support all faculty and staff remaining on the payroll after July 1 and all current programs. In addition, it will have the following reinvestment funds and endowment interest to support new hiring after taking into consideration raises for current faculty and staff:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reinvestment Funds (including release for Rockman departure)</td>
<td>217,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enarson annual endowment interest</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>302,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the next five years, through a concerted recruitment effort we expect to increase the enrollment in our masters programs from the approximately 90 students we have today to 140 by July 2010. The MPA degree requires 81 hours of coursework and the MA degree requires 56. Recent data show that over 90% of these hours are taken within the School.
This year's incoming class consists of 75% MPA and 25% MA students (Appendix D). The focus of our recruitment efforts will be on MPA students, but assuming conservatively that half the growth in enrollments will in MA students, the average number of hours a new student will take is

\[(81 + 56)/2 = 68.5\] hours.

Again assuming conservatively that 80% of these hours are taken within the School, each additional student will imply a growth of 55 hours.

An addition of 50 students translates into

55 x 50 = 2750 additional hours

The additional revenue to the School for a permanent increase of one credit hour is $185. Appendix C shows how this number is obtained using FY 06 data by once again, conservatively assuming no growth in fees or subsidies and a 24% Central Tax, 3% Federation Tax, and a 20% SBS Tax.

Hence, over the next five years our Present Budget Allocation (PBA) should grow by

\[185 \times 2750 = 508,750.\]

If the merger occurs, then our faculty size will immediately grow. We will add the other half of the Keeler line, the director of the John Glenn Institute and the Wolf Chair. In addition, we will be able to make a senior hire in lieu of the School director. Hence, our faculty size will grow from our current 6.5 FTE to 10 FTE where the three additional FTE will come from senior hires.

Assuming the senior hire will cost $180,000, the School's reinvestment funds will have $37,000 ($217,000 - $180,000) left for hiring an office associate.

We can also use the Enarson endowment, which generates over $85,000, to hire an assistant professor.

Given our current funds, we have sufficient resources to hire a new director, an assistant professor (or two joint appointments) and an office associate.

Another immediate expense included in the plan is $90,000 for fees for 10 internships funded by government agencies. We currently have $107,000 in our fees budget hence, we will be able to pay the fees for these interns and will be able to fund two more research associateships.

**Budget Scenarios**

**Growth Scenario (7 percent)**

A 7 percent growth implies that our current PBA of approximately $1.3 million will grow by $91,000.

Since it is highly unlikely that we will be a director this year, the reinvestment funds generated by Rockman’s departure will be carried forward as a cash balance for FY 2006 in addition to the Enarson endowment interest.

The most likely additional expenditure this year will be for an office associate and if the right opportunity arises, for a visiting professor for a part of the academic year.
Under this scenario, we would spend at most $100,000 on the senior visiting professor ($70,000) for a part of FY 2006 and an office associate ($30,000) for the remainder of FY 2006. Hence, at the start of FY 2007 we will be carrying forward a cash balance of approximately $200,000 ($302,000 - $200,000) and will generate reinvestment funds of slightly over $300,000 ($217,000 + $91,000) plus $85,000 in interest from the Enarson endowment.

Hence, at the start of the next academic year, the School should be able to make an attractive offer to a director who will have enough resources to hire an assistant professor plus a visiting professor or executive-in-residence.

**Steady State Scenario (4 percent)**

If enrollments are not affected by the slower growth in funding, the only change from the growth scenario will be a reduction in the growth of the School PBA, which will now be $52,000 instead of $91,000.

A possible consequence of the slower growth will be that the new School director will not be able to hire one of the two professors mentioned in the growth scenario.

**Decline Scenario (1 percent)**

A positive consequence of the School's inability to hire anyone before a permanent director is in place is that there will be adequate cash reserves to allow for modest pay raises for School faculty and staff for each of the following four years.

The new director will still be able to hire an assistant professor using the Enarson endowment interest.

**Growth in Enrollment**

The analyses above exclude the consequences of enrollment growth. The growth in enrollments from 90 to 140 over five years will generate enough revenues ($500,000) to hire an additional two senior professors and an assistant professor. As incremental growth occurs in enrollment, the additional funds generated will allow the School director to follow an aggressive strategy to make some combination of joint and full appointments, up to the FTE equivalent of two senior and a junior professor.

These revenue forecasts do not include any potential additional funding from stronger dual and joint degree programs, the offering of public policy or public management graduate minors or limited participation in undergraduate minors.

With some judicious planning and effort, these conservative estimates suggest that it is possible to implement the strategic plan outlined in this document and to ensure a faculty size of the merged school of 14 FTE with approximately 140 masters students and a small and strong doctoral program.
### Appendix A

**Recruitment and Retention History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Total number of applications</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Total number of applicants SPPM admitted</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Number of Applicants who Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA, MA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Total number of masters students in the School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Data for women (US citizens only) and minorities,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICANTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (US citizens only)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities (US Citizens only)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICANTS ADMITTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (US citizens only)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities (US Citizens only)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICANTS WHO ENROLLED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (US citizens only)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities (US Citizens only)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

### Faculty Arrivals and Departures

**AY 2002-2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1/01</td>
<td>Trevor Brown</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>3/31/03</td>
<td>Charles Adams</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/01</td>
<td>Bert Rockman</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>6/30/04</td>
<td>Douglas Jones</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1/04</td>
<td>Tess Heintze</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>9/30/04</td>
<td>Sven Lundstedt</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/04</td>
<td>Andrew Keeler</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>7/31/05</td>
<td>Bert Rockman</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Estimation of PPM Resources Per New Credit Hour

Each masters student generates $185 per credit hour, net of central tax and cost pools (using FY 06 data):

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{Fee} \quad \text{Subsidy (Mas 2)} \\
& 371.06 \quad 199.96 \\
& \text{Subtotal} \\
& 571.02 \\
\hline
& \text{Central Tax (24\%)} \\
& \times 0.76 \\
& \text{Net After Central Tax} \\
& 433.98 \\
\hline
& \text{Cost Pool 2} \\
& -193.07 \\
& \text{Cost Pool 3 (was 5)} \\
& -2.06 \\
& \text{Total Cost Pools} \\
& (195.13) \\
& \text{Subtotal After Cost Pool} \\
& 238.85 \\
\hline
& \text{Federation Tax (3\%)} \\
& \times 0.97 \\
& \text{Net after Federation Tax} \\
& 231.68 \\
\hline
& \text{SBS Tax (Assumes tax on growth of 20\%)} \\
& \times 0.80 \\
& \text{Final Net} \\
& 185.34
\end{align*}
\]