ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOHN GLENN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
Resolution No. 2006-106

Synopsis: Approval to merge the School of Public Policy and Management with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy to establish the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, with a reporting line to the Office of Academic Affairs, is proposed.

WHEREAS the consolidation and new reporting line will: help integrate complementary programs offered by the two units; create a focus for policy research, teaching, and service campus wide; enhance interaction with policy matters locally, nationally, and globally; and improve educational opportunities for undergraduate, graduate, and executive education students; and

WHEREAS the consolidation and new reporting line will: eliminate duplicative administrative functions; maximize the use of new facilities in Page Hall; increase the unit's ability to attract external funds; and help establish a platform for further integration of the University's public affairs activities; and

WHEREAS the faculty and leadership of the School of Public Policy and Management and the leadership of the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy unanimously support the proposal; and

WHEREAS the proposal was reviewed with adherence to the procedure outlined in paragraph (B) of rule 3335-3-37 (procedure for alteration or abolition of units); and

WHEREAS as specified by that rule, the proposal was reviewed by the Faculty Council with a formal vote of support on February 2, 2006; and

WHEREAS as specified by paragraph (B) of rule 3335-3-37, the proposal was reviewed and supported by the Executive Vice President and Provost, approved by the full Council on Academic Affairs, and approved by the University Senate at its March 9, 2006 meeting:

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED, That the proposal to merge the School of Public Policy and Management with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy, to establish the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, with a reporting line to the Office of Academic Affairs, is approved effective July 1, 2006.

Upon motion of Mr. Slane, seconded by Ms. Hendricks, the Board of Trustees adopted the foregoing resolution by unanimous roll call vote, cast by Trustees Slane, Duncan, Hendricks, McFerson, Cloyd, Davidson, Ong, Borror, Wexner, O'Dell, Hicks, and Schottenstein.

CERTIFIED

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate excerpt from the minutes of the Board of Trustees meeting held April 7, 2006.

Maureen T. Sharkey
Associate Secretary
Memorandum

To: University Senate

From: Raymond A. Noe, Chair
Council on Academic Affairs

Date: March 1, 2006

A PROPOSAL FROM THE COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS TO MERGE THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY AND MANAGEMENT WITH THE JOHN GLENN INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC SERVICE AND PUBLIC POLICY AND CREATE THE JOHN GLENN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS WITH A REPORTING LINE TO THE OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS.

WHEREAS the consolidation and new reporting line will help integrate complementary programs offered by the two units; create a focus for policy research, teaching, and service campus wide; enhance interaction with policy matters locally, nationally, and globally; and improve educational opportunities for undergraduate, graduate, and executive education students; and

WHEREAS the consolidation and new reporting line will eliminate duplicative administrative functions; maximize the use of new facilities in Page Hall; increase the unit's ability to attract external funds; and help establish a platform for further integration of the University's public affairs activities; and

WHEREAS the faculty and leadership of the School of Public Policy and Management, and the leadership of the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy support the proposal; and

WHEREAS the proposal was reviewed with adherence to the procedure outlined in Faculty Rule 3355-3-37 (B) (procedure for alteration or abolition of departments and schools); and
WHEREAS as specified by that Rule, the proposal was reviewed by the Faculty Council (February 3, 2005, December 1, 2005) and in a formal vote on February 2, 2006 was supported by it; and

WHEREAS as specified by Faculty Rule 3335-3-37 (B), the Executive Vice President and Provost has reviewed the proposal and supports it; and

WHEREAS the proposal was then reviewed and approved by the full Council on Academic Affairs at its meeting on March 1, 2006.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate approve the proposal to merge the School of Public Policy and Management with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy, to become the John Glenn School of Public Affairs with a reporting line to the Office of Academic Affairs, and respectfully request concurrence from the Board of Trustees.
Rankin, Joyce

From: Smith, Randy
Sent: Wednesday, March 01, 2006 5:27 PM
To: desal.i@osu.edu; libby.7@osu.edu
Cc: 'Noc, Raymond'; Rankin, Joyce; Smith, Randy; Snyder, Barbara; Zacher, Chris; Cormier, J. Briggs; Holbrook, Karen; Beck, Paul (.9); Moser, Bobby; Alutto, Joseph (.1); Royster, Jacqueline; Myers, Brad (.7); 'dickhaut.1@osu.edu'; Kovitz, Sonia; Sherman, Michael; Anderson, Carole (.32); Stewart, Mac; Garland, Martha; Platz, Matt; 'Kay Halasek'; Franz, David; Sharkey, Maureen

Subject: School of Public Policy and Management/John Glenn Institute

Anand and Larry:

The proposal to merge the School of Public Policy and Management with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy, to establish the John Glenn School of Public Affairs with a reporting line to the Office of Academic Affairs, was approved by the Council on Academic Affairs at its meeting on March 1, 2006. Thank you for attending the meeting and responding to questions/comments.

Note that the approval of the reporting line to the Office of Academic Affairs is accompanied by the five stipulations specified in the January 20, 2006 Memorandum to me from the ad hoc committee of the Council on Academic Affairs, chaired by Professor E. Kay Halasek.

This proposal will now be sent to the University Senate for action at its meeting on March 9, 2006. Professor Halasek will present the proposal, but it is important that you be in attendance to respond to detailed questions/comments should they arise. If the proposal is approved by the University Senate, it will be sent to the Board of Trustees for action at its meeting on April 7, 2006.

Note that this message represents my formal communication with you about this proposal. Please make a copy of this message for your file(s) on the proposal and I will do the same for the file in the Office of Academic Affairs.

If you have any questions/comments about this action, please contact the Chair of the Council, Professor Raymond Noc (noe.22@osu.edu), or me.

Randy

W. Randy Smith
Vice Provost
"A school, with the exception of the graduate school, shall be responsible to a college for administrative purposes."

Purpose and Rationale for the Proposal
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 (B) of The Bylaws of the Board of Trustees. Said "procedure for the alteration or abolition of departments and schools" 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 (B):

3335-5-37 (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 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

3335-5-37 (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.
January 20, 2006

TO: Vice Provost Randy Smith

FROM: Karen Ahijeveych, Steve Fink, Kay Halasck, 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
- Academic and budgetary guidance and review will be provided by a committee chaired by a Vice Provost and composed of the Deans of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, the Fisher College of Business, and the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, as well as three senior faculty members from the appropriate disciplines appointed by the aforementioned four administrators.
- The Board of Directors of the John Glenn Institute will be reconstituted as the Board of Advisors of the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, and will include these seven committee members and others as may be appropriate. Senator John Glenn will serve as Chair of the new Board of Advisors.
- 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

---

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 Ahijeveych, Fink, Halasck, 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 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 3335-3-7 (B) (2) (a-1) 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.
Memorandum

TO: Council on Academic Affairs

FROM: Barbara R. Snyder
Executive Vice President and Provost

SUBJECT: Proposal to Merge the School of Public Policy and Management
and the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy

DATE: February 27, 2006

I have reviewed the proposal from the School of Public Policy and Management and the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy to merge, become the John Glenn School of Public Affairs (JGSPA), and report directly to the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA).

I have also reviewed the report and recommendation of the ad hoc committee of the Council on Academic Affairs (CAA), whose responsibility it was to assess this proposal thoroughly, following established guidelines, and bring a formal recommendation to CAA for action.

I support the ad hoc committee’s recommendation that the two units be consolidated, and that the reporting line for the new JGSPA be to OAA with the following stipulations:

- Academic and budgetary guidance and review will be provided by a committee chaired by a Vice Provost and composed of the Deans of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, the Fisher College of Business, and the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, as well as three senior faculty members from the appropriate disciplines appointed by the aforementioned four administrators.
- The Board of Directors of the John Glenn Institute will be reconstituted as the Board of Advisors of the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, and will include these seven committee members and others as may be appropriate. Senator John Glenn will serve as the Chair of the new Board of Advisors.
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- 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 the 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.

I very much appreciate the work of the ad hoc committee of CAA, input it received from the full membership of that Council, and the productive, collaborative activities that emerged in the final stages of the review through discussion and suggestions from the constituencies of the University Senate and their leadership.
Raymond Noe  
Chair, Council on Academic Affairs (CAA)  
Professor, Management and Human Resources  
College of Business  
828 Fisher Hall  
2100 Neil Avenue  
CAMPUS

February 23, 2006

Dear Professor Noe:

The Faculty Council considered the proposal to merge the John Glenn Institute (JGI) with the School of Public Policy and Management (PPM) at its December 1, 2005 meeting. The meeting featured presentations by a CAA ad hoc sub-committee formed to address the merger as well as statements from JGI and PPM representatives. Supporting comments were also made by Senator John Glenn himself who was a guest at the meeting. A number of concerns were raised by Faculty Council members including, but not limited to, funding and funding sources, time-line approval, the number of FTE in tenure track lines so as to meet university rules, and tenure and promotion issues. The major argument against the merger related to program reporting lines, more specifically the unusual administrative transfer from a college (the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS)) to the Office of Academic Affairs. During the meeting a sub-proposal was introduced to create an oversight committee composed of the deans of the Colleges of SBS, Business, and Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences; this committee was said to provide the appropriate college-level administrative buffer between the merged academic program and the provost's office. The December 1 meeting ended with my request to the ad hoc committee and to CAA to revisit the merger in light of the aforementioned sub-proposal which would be brought back to Faculty Council at its next meeting.

JGI/PPM was taken up again at the February 2, 2006 meeting of the Council. You presented the ad-hoc committee's modified recommendations and, once again, an abundance of questions and significant deliberation followed. Ultimately, it was moved and seconded that Faculty Council endorse the merger proposal and the motion carried by a vote of 21 in favor, 9 opposed.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Phil J.K. Daniel  
Chair, Faculty Council

cc: Barbara Snyder  
    Christian Zachor  
    Anthony Mughan  
    Allan Silverman  
    Randy Smith
January 18, 2006

Mr. Mike Sherman, Vice Provost
203 Bricker Hall
190 N. Oval Mall
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Mike:

Regarding the creation of the John Glenn School of Public Affairs I will serve on the committee as stipulated below:

- Academic and budgetary guidance and review will be provided by a committee chaired by a Vice Provost and composed of the Deans of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, the Fisher College of Business, and the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, as well as three senior faculty members from the appropriate disciplines appointed by the aforementioned four administrators.

- The Board of Directors of the John Glenn Institute will be reconstituted as the Board of Advisors of the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, and will include these seven committee members and others as may be appropriate. Senator John Glenn will serve as Chair of the new Board of Advisors.

I look forward to working with you to help assure the evolution of a great School of Public Affairs.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Joseph A. Alutto
Dean and
John W. Berry, Sr. Chair in Business
January 13, 2006

Mike Sherman, Vice Provost
The Ohio State University
203 Bricker Hall
190 N. Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Mike:

With regard to the creation of the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, please accept this letter as confirmation that I will serve on the committee as stipulated below:

- Academic and budgetary guidance and review will be provided by a committee chaired by a Vice Provost and composed of the Deans of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, the Fisher College of Business, and the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences, as well as three senior faculty members from the appropriate disciplines appointed by the aforementioned four administrators.

- The Board of Directors of the John Glenn Institute will be reconstituted as the Board of Advisors of the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, and will include these seven committee members and others as may be appropriate. Senator John Glenn will serve as Chair of the new Board of Advisors.

I look forward to working with you to help assure the evolution of a great School of Public Affairs.

Sincerely,

Bobby D. Moser
VP of Agricultural Administration & Dean
VP of Outreach & Engagement
January 12, 2006

W. Michael Shremann, Vice Provost
203 Bricker Hall
190 N. Oval Mall
The Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Mike:

Regarding the creation of the John Glenn School of Public Affairs I will serve on the committee as stipulated below:

- Academic and budgetary guidance and review will be provided by a committee chaired by a Vice Provost and composed of the Deans of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, the Fisher College of Business, and the College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, as well as three senior faculty members from the appropriate disciplines appointed by the aforementioned four administrators.

- The Board of Directors of the John Glenn Institute will be reconstituted as the Board of Advisors of the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, and will include these seven committee members and others as may be appropriate. Senator John Glenn will serve as Chair of the new Board of Advisors.

I look forward to working with you to help assure the evolution of a great School of Public Affairs.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul A. Beck
Dean
January 17, 2006

Council on Academic Affairs
Office of Academic Affairs
203 Bricker Hall
190 N. Oval Mall
CAMPUS

To Whom It May Concern:

I am delighted to support the proposed merger of the John Glenn Institute and School of Public Policy and Management, creating a John Glenn School of Public Affairs that reports to the Provost. The merger seems like a natural, as these units share a common focus. I have admired Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School, and am pleased at this step toward creating a center of excellence for learning, scholarship, and programming in interdisciplinary approaches to public policy at Ohio State.

Sincerely,

Nancy H. Rogers
Dean and Michael E. Moritz Chair
In Alternative Dispute Resolution

NHR/ct
January 18, 2006

Council on Academic Affairs
200 Bricker Hall
190 North Oval Mall
Campus Mall

Dear Colleagues:

I am writing to voice the College of Engineering's support for the proposed merger of OSU's School of Public Policy and Management with the John Glenn Institute of Public Service and Public Policy to create the John Glenn School of Public Affairs, reporting directly to the Provost.

We believe that the proposed new School will significantly enhance research and graduate education in public policy across the campus and make OSU much more visible in the national policy arena. It will increase collaborative research opportunities for faculty and students who are interested in a variety of public policy issues. Since it will not be housed in any particular college, all colleges will benefit from it. From the point of view of the College of Engineering, we expect this to strengthen the already good relationship between the Knowlton School of Architecture (City and Regional Planning) and Public Policy and Management. There will also be many collaborative opportunities with the National Regulatory Research Institute and a variety of research centers which report to the College of Engineering.

Creating a free standing School with the John Glenn name and a public policy focus will create more opportunities for work in public policy from a broader range of the OSU community and will allow those efforts to have significantly more visibility in Ohio and the nation. We are happy to support the effort.

Sincerely,

W. A. "Bud" Baeslack III
Dean, College of Engineering
A 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

This proposal, unanimously submitted by the faculty of the School of Public Policy and Management, seeks to consolidate the School with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy, creating a John Glenn School of Public Affairs. The consolidated School would be a tenure-initiating, degree-granting unit (as the School currently is) reporting directly to the Office of Academic Affairs (as the Glenn Institute currently does). The staff members employed by the School, as well as all students and alumni who have provided input, join the faculty in unanimously supporting this proposal. The faculty and staff members employed by the John Glenn Institute also unanimously support this petition, joining the School of Public Policy and Management in this proposal.

August, 2004
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I. Rationale

A. Introduction

The School of Public Policy and Management (SPPM) is an untapped asset of The Ohio State University, with significant potential to advance the University’s Academic Plan. The School has unique potential to leverage policy research in all nineteen of Ohio State’s academic units, elevating the impact and visibility of that research campuswide. The School is poised to respond to a growing demand for public policy courses, degrees, and co-curricular activities among undergraduates and graduate students with a revitalized interest in public affairs. And the School can provide a critical link in Ohio State’s plans to deepen its outreach and engagement efforts. All of these benefits can be achieved by consolidating the School with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy, a “bottom up” proposal that is unanimously supported by the two units’ faculty, staff, students, and alumni—and that requires no new investment of resources by the University.

SPPM has had a distinguished reputation among Schools of Public Affairs, and has been ranked as high as 13th. The School currently ranks 42nd among 253 programs nationwide; it is 27th among those programs at public universities. In the critical field of Public Policy Analysis, the School ranks among the top 30 programs nationally—and among the top 18 public university programs. Graduates of SPPM’s doctoral program have served as deans and distinguished faculty members at public policy schools nationwide. One currently serves as the Director of the new Truman School of Public Affairs at the University of Missouri-Columbia, while another is a distinguished senior faculty member at Syracuse University’s Maxwell School of Public Affairs and Citizenship, the top-rated school of public affairs in the country. Yet another holds a chaired professorship in the 3rd ranked Public Administration program at the University of Georgia. Other graduates of SPPM have served as Director of the Congressional Budget Office; U.S. Commissioner for Trademarks; members of the U.S. Congress and Ohio General Assembly; mayors of both Columbus and Cleveland; high-ranking officials in both state and federal agencies; directors of nonprofit organizations nationwide; and leaders of private companies. In 2002, one of SPPM’s graduates shared first place in a nationwide competition for the year’s best doctoral dissertation.

SPPM’s national rankings are comparable to those of Ohio State’s widely acknowledged Moritz College of Law and its College of Medicine. Most impressive, SPPM

---

1 Ohio State currently has eighteen colleges and one school (the School of Public Health) that report to the Provost’s office. 

2 The School shares its 27th rank among public schools with Cleveland State University and the Naval Postgraduate School. It shares the 42nd rank overall with schools at those two universities plus the University of Pennsylvania. Unless otherwise noted, all rankings discussed in this petition are based on US News and World Report surveys released April 2, 2004.

3 In all, the School of Public Policy and Management has awarded over 2000 MPA and MA degrees and 57 PhDs since its 1969 founding.

4 The Moritz College of Law ranks 42nd among law schools nationwide, while the College of Medicine ranks 38th in research and 52nd in primary care. Because of the large number of public affairs programs, SPPM’s
has retained its reputation despite its small size, declining resource base, and unusual reporting line for a school of public affairs. SPPM’s persistent reputation is strong testament to the quality of its core faculty and the excellence of its graduates.

The University has a significant opportunity to leverage the assets of this School by combining the School with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy, a unit that reports to the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA), to create a John Glenn School of Public Affairs. The consolidated unit would report, as the Institute currently does, to OAA and would:

- Improve efficiency by eliminating duplicative administrative functions
- Shift resources from a nonacademic unit to an academic one
- Maximize use of the new facilities planned for both units 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 makers 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

All of these goals, notably, can be achieved by combining the current assets of the two units and without the investment of new resources. The consolidation, moreover, is unanimously and enthusiastically supported by all faculty and staff employed in the two units. Feedback from students, alumni, and other constituencies likewise has been uniformly and overwhelmingly positive.

During the last ten years, several major universities—including the University of Michigan, University of California at Los Angeles, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Texas A&M University, and the University of Georgia—have enhanced their public policy programs by reorganizing or renaming those units. These shifts respond to profound changes in both the job market and the policy community, which have created increased...
demand for both public policy graduates and informed policy research. Each of these schools has reaped significant advantage—both programmatically and reputationally—through these changes. The University of Georgia, for example, achieved a third place ranking among public affairs schools nationwide—just behind the venerable Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs and Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government—after creating an independent School of Public and International Affairs reporting directly to the university’s provost. Similarly, the Truman School at the University of Missouri reports that its ranking advanced 13 places after the previous program in public administration was renamed and reconfigured to report centrally. And Texas A&M’s public affairs program jumped from 46th to 35th—displacing Ohio State’s program among others—when it created the independent Bush School of Government and Public Service out of a program in the Political Science Department.

The Ohio State University can join these elite public policy programs by consolidating SPPM and the John Glenn Institute to create the John Glenn School of Public Affairs. Incorporating the strengths of both units, that School has significant potential to establish a public affairs program that ranks again among the top fifteen programs nationwide (and within the top ten at public institutions), to support the highest quality research and teaching on public policy among Ohio’s State’s faculty and students, and to create lasting links with our state, national, and international policy communities. The School’s history, detailed in the next section, makes clear its potential to succeed through this merger and change in reporting line.

B. Brief History of the School

The School of Public Policy and Management is a professional graduate program, offering four types of degrees:

1. The Master of Public Administration (MPA) program accommodates students with a BA in any field. Students may pursue the program on a part-time or full-time basis. Full-time students usually complete the degree within two academic years. The curriculum has four components:

---

6 More than 50% of federal workers will be eligible to retire by 2007, including 69% of the government’s most experienced supervisors. The “brain drain” in federal government is so serious that members of Congress have formed a new Congressional Public Service Caucus to address the issue. Ohio’s Senator Voinovich, one of the Caucus’s co-chairs, has been especially active on this issue. See, e.g., Bipartisan Congressional Public Service Caucus Established to Help Raise the Volume on Challenges Facing the Federal Civil Service (press release issued by the Partnership for Public Service March 3, 2004), available at www.gapublicservice.org. State and local governments face similar shortages in skilled public policy workers as they take on increasing responsibility in human services, environmental policy, health care, and homeland security.

7 Georgia’s Public Administration Program previously had reported to its Political Science Department, located within a College of Arts and Sciences.

8 Plain Speaking (newsletter of the Truman School), Summer 2001, at 2.

9 Much of the material in this section is drawn from Arthur D. Lynn, Jr., Building the House: The Ohio State University School of Public Administration, 1969-89 (mimeo 1989), and from the School’s Self-Study Report submitted to the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) in September 2002.
2. The In-Career Master of Arts (MA) in public policy and management serves talented individuals with a BA who have already completed 3-5 years of significant administrative or analyst work. The flexible program, with courses scheduled to accommodate working students, can be completed in four quarters of full-time study. Most students, however, pursue this degree on a part-time basis over two years. This curriculum has three components:

   a. Required core courses, similar to those for the MPA
   b. Elective policy application courses
   c. Required master’s comprehensive examination

3. Dual Degree Programs with Social Work, City and Regional Planning, Health Services Management and Policy, Natural Resources, and Law allow students to combine those specializations with an MA in public policy and management. The School also offers a Joint MA in Arts Policy and Administration in collaboration with the College of the Arts. The curriculum for these dual and joint degree programs is similar to that for the MPA, but offers students appropriate credit for work completed in the companion field.

4. A Doctoral Program in Public Policy and Management prepares a select number of students for research and teaching positions at universities or for research and leadership positions in other organizations.

Ohio State founded the School in 1969 as the “Division of Public Administration.” The unit grew out of a national recognition that public management—like law, medicine, social work, or dentistry—is a profession that benefits from specialized graduate training. Many of the nation’s schools of public affairs emerged during the 1960s.

In Ohio, the Board of Regents played a key role in starting discussions that led to formation of OSU’s School of Public Policy and Management. In 1966, the Board’s Master Plan for State Policy in Higher Education noted the desirability of establishing a professional graduate school in public administration:

There does not exist in Ohio a professional school of public administration in any state-assisted institution of higher education. Substantial need would appear to exist for such a program to prepare students for public service at all levels. Necessary interest and resources would appear to exist at The Ohio State University for establishment of such a professional program, and its location near the centers of state
government would facilitate worthwhile interrelationships between the program and state government. It would be in the best interest of effective public service for The Ohio State University to consider establishment of a professional school of public administration.\(^{10}\)

Faculty at Ohio State responded enthusiastically to this suggestion. A series of committees composed of faculty from political science, education, business organization, accounting, marketing, social work, economics, law, finance, and management science recommended establishment of a new professional school. Committee members visited a variety of other public affairs schools and drew upon a Carnegie Foundation report to fashion their recommendations. The Carnegie report, as well as conversations with faculty at other public affairs schools, “endorsed the essentiality of a separate identity, a core curriculum, and a nucleus faculty for a graduate professional public administration program.”\(^{11}\)

Weighing these recommendations, the faculty committee concluded that “location in the discipline of Political Science might not be the best arrangement” for the new professional school.\(^{12}\) Instead, the faculty recommended including the new program within the more generic College of Administrative Science, which had been formed to encompass programs related to both public and private management. The faculty also concluded that the program should have four primary features:

1. A two-year Master of Public Administration degree with a curriculum emphasizing an interdisciplinary problem-solving approach.
2. A Ph.D. program stressing research directed toward the solution of complex public sector problems.
3. A research program dealing with policy problems.
4. A service program including continuing education and problem-solving teams for government agencies.

Ohio State’s administration accepted the faculty’s proposal, establishing the Division of Public Administration within the College of Administrative Science. The new program opened in the fall of 1969 with 3.75 FTE faculty and eleven students. The original faculty included individuals with advanced degrees in economics, geography, public administration, law, and psychology.

Faculty and student size grew during the Division’s first five years until, in fall 1974, the unit had 13 regular/tcunured appointments (some part time) and six joint/special faculty appointments. Based on this growth, the University recognized the unit as a School of Public Administration, effective July 1, 1974.

The new School quickly achieved national recognition. In 1980, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) published a list of just 45 schools nationally that met its guidelines and peer review process for a school of

\(^{10}\) Lynn, supra note 9, at 7.
\(^{11}\) Id. at 10.
\(^{12}\) Id. at 8.
public affairs. Ohio State’s School of Public Administration was one of those 45 schools—the only such school in Ohio and one of only two in the Big Ten. During the same year, the School’s Director (Clint Oster) served as President of NASPAA.

External evaluators also ranked the School highly. David Morgan and several coauthors published the first ranking of public affairs schools in 1981. Although Ohio State’s program was only twelve years old, it ranked thirteenth in a reputational survey mailed to public affairs faculty nationwide and ninth in an objective measure of journal productivity. During the same year, Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government ranked just two places above Ohio State’s School of Public Administration in journal productivity.

Similarly, a study found that Ohio State’s School of Public Policy and Management ranked sixth nationally in the number of articles published in top journals by its graduate students between 1986 and 1993. The same study concluded that Ohio State ranked ninth in the country in producing the top scholars then serving on public affairs faculties. This was extraordinary success: to become one of the top producers of highly rated faculty members within just twenty-five year’s of the School’s founding.

Responding to this success, the University endorsed the School’s excellence and recommended further expansion. A 1986 internal review found that the School had “laid a good foundation for the future” by recruiting a “small but first-rate faculty” and developing innovative programs. The report, however, concluded that “[t]he School is too small to do effectively those things that are the essential ingredients of a reasonably distinguished program.” To correct this defect, the University authorized an increased faculty size of 12 FTE for the School. The School enthusiastically pursued that goal and continued to enhance its reputation. In 1989 the School changed its name to the “School of Public Policy and Management,” reflecting its expanded teaching and research mission.

The School thus entered the last decade of the twentieth century as one of Ohio State’s strongest and most promising units, ranked among the top fifteen public affairs schools nationally and the top ten programs at public universities. After 1993, however, the School’s fortunes fell. Faculty size peaked at 11.4 FTE in 1992 and declined thereafter. Student enrollments and reputational rankings likewise have diminished.

15 The Gourman Report likewise ranked Ohio State’s School of Public Policy and Management highly through the early 1990’s. In 1993, for example, that report rated OSU’s program 13th in the nation. Jack Gourman, The Gourman Report: A Rating of Graduate and Professional Programs in American and International Universities, at 98 (sixth ed. 1993). Scholars, however, have questioned the integrity of Gourman’s rankings so we cite these only for corroboration.
16 Lynn, supra note 9, at 37 (quoting Memorandum of Understanding, School of Public Administration, 1986, at 5)).
17 Id. at 38.
In 1994, a NASPAA accreditation team led by Professor Donald Stokes of Princeton University’s Woodrow Wilson School noted with alarm this abrupt change in the School’s fortunes. The College of Administrative Science had evolved into a more focused and traditional College of Business, Stokes observed, and the mission of that College no longer aligned with that of a public affairs school. According to the Stokes report, the “Dean of the College of Business [had] propose[d] reallocating to business curricula roughly half the teaching effort by members of the School faculty.” This proposal would have reduced the faculty FTE’s for public affairs courses to just 5, the bare minimum required for accreditation. It would also have increased enrollments to 60 students per class, too large for the hands-on and writing intensive graduate instruction provided in schools of public affairs. Most disturbing, it would have required the School’s faculty to alter their scholarly and teaching expertise so they could teach basic MBA courses.

The 1994 accreditation team deplored the “profound irony that the College setting of the School ha[d] grown less supportive as the School ha[d] become a distinguished asset for the University as a whole and for Ohio, the Midwest, and the nation.” Indeed, by 1994, the School had achieved what many OSU departments strive for today: It was ranked among the top 15 schools of public affairs nationally and within the top 10 programs at public universities. Yet the University was in danger of losing this asset.

To address the misalignment of the School’s mission with that of the College of Business, the accreditation team recommended that Ohio State follow the lead of other universities that had created independent schools of public affairs, establishing the School as a “new, experimental entity...charged both with delivering the high-quality graduate public policy and management program that is now offered as well as with nurturing the public policy interests and opportunities that are shared across the full range of existing Colleges.” Although the newly autonomous unit “would remain a degree and tenure granting academic unit,” the team also observed that it could “be encouraged to explore and initiate the broadest array of joint appointments (with joint funding of tenure-track positions), joint graduate degree programs, and joint research projects with other OSU academic units.”

Perhaps most significant, the accreditation team concluded that Ohio State could achieve these ends by applying “[r]esponsibility budgeting...to the new unit from the outset.” Although the University as a whole had not yet embraced that budget approach, the School’s strong master’s programs, policy research, and for-fee training programs then “generate[d] in tuition and grant revenues approximately twice its operating budget.” The team, in other words, recognized that an independent school of public affairs could sustain

---

18 The other two members of the team were Professor Robert Biller of the School of Public Administration at the University of Southern California and Professor Dennis Dressing of the La Follette Institute at the University of Wisconsin.
19 Report of the NASPAA Site Visit Team, Apr. 9-12, 1994, at 5.
20 Id. at 5-6.
21 Id. at 4.
22 Id. at 9.
23 Id. at 9-10.
24 Id. at 10.
25 Id. at 7.
itself through master’s programs, funded research, and training revenue, while benefiting the University as a whole through its programs.

Unfortunately, the University did not follow the accreditation team’s recommendation to establish SPPM as an autonomous unit. Instead, in 1997 the University moved the School to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. In that setting, the School’s fortunes have continued to fall. Faculty size has dropped from 11.0 in 1997 to 8.0 in July 2004—more than a twenty-five percent decrease. Similarly, student enrollment in SPPM fell from 209 in spring 1997 to 105 in spring 2004—a fifty percent decline. Through hard work by the Director, faculty, and staff, enrollments rebounded somewhat to 141 in spring 2004. Enrollments, however, remain well below pre-1997 levels, and the decline after moving to SBS is marked.

It is noteworthy, in that context, that enrollment in the School’s doctoral program has remained relatively stable since 1997, while it is master’s enrollment that has declined so substantially. The School enrolled 24 doctoral students in 1997, and still had 20 at the end of 2004.26 Enrollment of MPA students, on the other hand, fell from 77 in 1997 to 31 in 2003;27 MA enrollments dropped from 66 in 1997 to 33 in 2004;28 and students enrolled in the joint degree program in arts policy declined from 28 in 1997 to 10 in 2003.29 SBS has proven a relatively hospitable home for doctoral students, but the School’s core programs (aimed at professional master’s students) have not fit the mission of that College.

The School’s national rankings reflect the same downward trend. When U.S. News published its first ranking of public affairs schools in 1995, Ohio State ranked eighteenth in the nation.30 This ranking already reflected the slippage noted by the NASPAA team under the College of Business, but the School still placed among the top twenty programs nationally and the top ten public university programs. By 1998, the School had fallen to thirty-first nationwide. In 2001, it had slipped to thirty-fifth. And by the spring of 2004, it was ranked forty-second in the nation.

It is not too late to reverse this trend—and to restore the strong national standing that the School enjoyed before 1993. But strong and immediate action is needed. The School’s placement in SBS has not succeeded; instead, that placement has continued the misalignment of mission that the School experienced within the College of Business. The lesson of the last ten years at Ohio State is the same lesson that schools of public affairs have learned at other universities: To succeed in its own scholarly, service, and teaching missions, an interdisciplinary and professional school of public affairs must operate outside the confines of a single disciplinary college. A disciplinary college, whether focused on business or social science, does not share the mission of a school of public affairs.

26 During other years between 1997 and 2004, doctoral enrollments ranged from 18 to 23.
27 In 2004, those enrollments rose slightly, to 41. In other years between 1997 and 2003, enrollments fluctuated between 28 and 41. Thus, even the best year after 1997 saw enrollments roughly half of those in 1997.
28 Enrollment in this program showed somewhat more resilience through 2002, fluctuating between 43 and 66. After 2002, however, the decline was marked: from 49 in 2002 to just 34 in 2003 and 33 in 2004.
29 Again, this program showed some resilience through 1999, with enrollments at 31 in both 1998 and 1999. Starting in 2000, however, enrollment dropped by 50%—to 16—and remains below that level today.
30 The U.S. News ranking of public affairs schools relies exclusively upon peer evaluations of the schools.
C. **Key Contributions to the Academic Plan**

Appendix A outlines in detail the existing programs of both the School of Public Policy and Management and the John Glenn Institute, showing how these programs will combine to create one comprehensive School of Public Affairs. In this section, we highlight the ways in which combining SPPM with the Institute to create a centrally reporting John Glenn School of Public Affairs will contribute to Ohio State’s Academic Plan in key ways. Unlike many other initiatives to advance the Academic Plan, these contributions can be achieved without cost—simply by leveraging two existing campus programs.

1. **Build a World Class Faculty.**

The School of Public Policy and Management has a core faculty of eight excellent policy scholars and several emeriti who continue to contribute actively to teaching, research, and service. The School’s recent lateral hire of Director and Professor Bert A. Rockman brought an internationally recognized scholar to the School. Rockman previously held a distinguished University Professor position at the University of Pittsburgh; in 2001 the American Political Science Association presented a “Founders Award” in Rockman’s honor for a paper in Presidency Research. The School’s recent entry-level hires, Assistant Professors Trevor Brown (2001) and Theresa Heintze (2004), are highly regarded. Professor Brown has already compiled a very strong record and was recently described by a long-time faculty member at Indiana University’s School of Public and Environmental Affairs as one of the two best doctoral graduates to have ever come from that program. As a faculty candidate, Professor Heintze was highly sought after by the University of Georgia (which, with Indiana, ranks third among public affairs programs nationally). We are pleased to have both of these junior faculty members at Ohio State.

A ninth distinguished faculty member will join the faculty in September. Andrew Keeler, a noted environmental economist from the University of Georgia, has been hired with financial assistance from the Office of Academic Affairs (through its spousal hiring program) and the John Glenn Institute (where Keeler will hold a half-time appointment). Keeler was a member of the White House Climate Change Task Force under both Presidents Clinton and Bush, and was a member of the U.S. negotiating team for the COP-6 Climate Negotiations in The Hague in November 2000. He has published widely on environmental policy issues, applying an economic perspective. His work, like that of other public policy faculty, appears in a broad range of disciplinary journals including law, economics, environmental management, and natural resources.

Even with the addition of Keeler, however, the faculty is too small to support a high quality school of public affairs—or even to support existing faculty in their research and teaching. As noted above, the University recognized in 1986 that a school of public affairs needs a faculty of at least 12 FTE to support a distinguished program. A Memorandum of
Understanding executed with the Provost’s office that year promised the School a faculty of at least that size.\textsuperscript{31}

The School’s faculty, however, never reached that target, reaching a peak of just 11.4 FTE in 1992 and standing at only 8.0 today. It will be difficult to increase that size without the proposed merger unless the College of Social and Behavioral Science is able to invest substantial resources in the School. The School has repeatedly explored that possibility, but the College has not chosen to invest further funds in SPPM.\textsuperscript{32}

Combining the School with the John Glenn Institute to create a John Glenn School of Public Affairs will alleviate this condition in four ways. First, the Institute’s Director, a distinguished full professor who currently holds the John Deaver Drisko Chair in the Moritz College of Law and has been recognized as one of the University’s Distinguished Scholars, will resign her position in Law to become a full-time faculty member within the new School of Public Affairs. Merritt’s research and teaching areas complement those of the existing PPM faculty, making an immediate contribution to that faculty. The Glenn Institute’s budget fully supports Merritt’s salary, so that the School will gain immediate access to funds for a tenth tenured position at the most senior level.\textsuperscript{33}

Second, the consolidated unit will be able to leverage income from a number of small endowments currently maintained in each unit. Combining these income streams may make it possible for the School to hire an additional faculty member, a result that would not be possible with income from the School’s endowment alone. Simply creating a larger unit will allow the School and Institute more effectively to spend cash resources, supporting existing faculty and attracting new ones. Within a small unit, cash income can vary greatly from year to year, making sound budgeting difficult. The consolidated unit, with a combined budget of about $4 million per year, will be able to leverage resources more effectively.\textsuperscript{34}

Third, the combined unit will provide better salary, staff, and research support to current and prospective faculty. The units can achieve some efficiencies by combining fiscal, office management, and technology support functions—although, as described further below, this will occur through shifting functions rather than eliminating current staff. The Glenn Institute’s larger staff and budget will provide needed support to faculty in the School.

Finally, the combined unit will be more successful in raising private funds for new faculty positions and faculty research support. The Glenn Institute has been quite successful in fundraising, especially in attracting funds from donors without previous ties to the

\textsuperscript{31} See supra note 16 and accompanying text.

\textsuperscript{32} The College did not contribute any funds to Andrew Keeler’s recent hire beyond those supplied by the School. Contributions from the Glenn Institute and OAA (through its spouses hiring program) made the Keeler hire possible.

\textsuperscript{33} The Institute is also supporting half the salary of Andrew Keeler. From the beginning, therefore, the Institute’s budget will support almost 20% of the School’s faculty.

\textsuperscript{34} This will be particularly important after September 30, when one of the School’s senior faculty members is scheduled to retire. That faculty line will not, in itself, support a new hire and the School lacks sufficient resources to supplement that line. Though the merger, the John Glenn School will be able to draw upon some of the Institute’s resources and fundraising abilities to supplement this line.
University. A significant handicap in raising funds, however, has been the Institute's lack of academic status. SPPM, meanwhile, has a very loyal alumni base that has been disappointed in the program's lack of visibility within the University. Combining the appeal of the Glenn name, the contacts the Institute has made with non-OSU donors, and the loyal SPPM alumni base with the comprehensive academic unit resulting from the merger, will produce a solid fundraising platform to support the School's faculty and academic programs.

In addition to building a world-class faculty within the School of Public Affairs, the proposed merger will enhance Ohio State's recruitment and retention of world-class faculty campuswide. Public affairs schools draw much of their vitality from joint appointments with other departments. These appointments benefit the other departments as well, providing flexibility in hiring, connections to an interdisciplinary unit, and support for policy research.

In its early days, Ohio State's School of Public Administration (now SPPM) likewise featured numerous joint appointments. The first six faculty members included at least three joint appointments—two in Economics and one in Geography. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the School continued to pursue joint appointments. Since moving to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, however, the School has not made a single joint appointment. Although the School has extended courtesy appointments to faculty in other departments, no faculty member currently holds a joint appointment with another department.

Combining the School with the Glenn Institute, and permitting the merged School to report centrally, will reverse this trend and facilitate joint appointments with a wide range of departments. In its four years of operation, the Glenn Institute has been extraordinarily active in collaborating with faculty in many colleges on research initiatives, hiring, and other programs. It has cosponsored or otherwise supported major grant applications originating in Colleges as diverse as Humanities, Human Ecology, Mathematics and Physical Sciences, and Food, Agriculture and Environmental Sciences. The Director has agreed to meet personally with faculty candidates from Colleges as varied as Social and Behavioral Sciences, Law, and Biological Sciences. The Institute was instrumental in persuading a donor to endow a Chair in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and has worked with administrators from the Colleges of Arts and Engineering to pursue a senior-level interdisciplinary hire. The Institute has also funded policy research by scholars from a wide range of departments.

The Institute's status as a University-wide, interdisciplinary unit—reporting directly to the Provost—has allowed the Institute to collaborate in this manner with a wide range of departments.

Cross-departmental collaborations bringing interdisciplinary scholars to campus are essential for Ohio State to build and retain a world-class faculty. Scholars from every discipline, moreover, are realizing the vital role that policy plays in their field. The John Glenn School of Public Affairs can contribute significantly to these efforts, serving as an

15 Private gifts to the Glenn Institute totaled more than $940,000 in fiscal year 2003.
16 The Institute's program for funding John Glenn Scholars attracted 55 applications from faculty in more than 25 departments in its first year. The program funded scholars from Law, Education, Economics, Sociology, and Public Policy in its first round of grants.
anchor for policy research on the Ohio State campus and collaborating with other departments to support world-class scholars from every discipline whose work is informed by policy.

2. Develop Academic Programs that Define Ohio State as the Nation’s Leading Public Land Grant University.

The significant problems of the twenty-first century will not be solved on individual farms or in factories. These issues will be analyzed and debated in the public forum—and the solutions will be implemented through a bewildering array of public-private partnerships. To serve its public mission, a leading land grant university of the twenty-first century needs a strong School of Public Affairs. Certainly a university with the motto “Education for Citizenship” needs such a school.

Although every department in a land grant university contributes significantly to the university’s public mission, a School of Public Affairs plays a special role in furthering that mission. A School of Public Affairs trains graduate students directly for public sector positions, establishing lifelong ties with policymakers at the state, local, and national level. The best Schools of Public Affairs likewise train rising leaders from nations around the world, creating crucial links with those governments. Faculty members at a School of Public Affairs focus much of their research directly on contemporary policy issues, interacting frequently with policymakers on those issues. In all of these ways, a public affairs program has particularly strong and immediate ties to the public sector.

Even more important, a centralized and visible School of Public Affairs plays a critical role in focusing policy work conducted across the full breadth of the University. Ohio State insiders and outsiders have commented that the University’s policy work is remarkably diffuse. The University conducts a substantial amount of path breaking policy research in its many academic units. But, because of the University’s size and the lack of a clear focal point for policy work, the “whole” of these efforts is much less than the sum of the many parts.

As the second largest campus in the nation, located in the capital of the seventh largest state, Ohio State has extraordinary potential to become a leader in policy studies. The research, teaching, and service are already present in the University’s many academic programs. The only piece that is missing is a centralized, interdisciplinary academic unit that will serve as a focal point and catalyst for these programs.

The School of Public Policy and Management cannot serve as that focal point because it is under-funded and hidden within one of eighteen separate colleges. The School has excellent interdisciplinary connections, but cannot rise to the type of central presence needed to give Ohio State’s policy work greater impact. The Glenn Institute serves as a partial focal point for this work—maintaining more than 190 affiliated faculty members from more than 50 academic departments and serving as an umbrella for seven different interdisciplinary policy initiatives. The Institute’s lack of academic standing, however, limits
the full extent of its impact. The essential point of a land grant university is that the university's public mission is tied to its academic work. A central academic unit can catalyze policy studies in a way that a non-academic unit cannot match.

The John Glenn School of Public Affairs will provide that missing link. As a centralized academic unit with ties to departments and policy initiatives across the entire campus, the School will become a focal point for policy research and teaching. Its students and alumni will form a growing network that both anchors the unit's work and continuously expands its impact. Ohio State needs that kind of presence in public policy if it wants to leverage the policy work occurring diffusely across the campus.

Appendix A shows how combining the existing programs of these two units will immediately produce a unit with sufficient depth and breadth to serve as a focus for policy research and teaching at Ohio State. Equally important, the School will serve as a platform for growth—allowing Ohio State to explore more effective ways of leveraging its policy research, teaching, and service. Scholars in other units may choose to work with the School in a variety of ways, from informal affiliations to joint appointments. Together with other academic units, the School will explore creation of an undergraduate minor in policy studies, a master's degree in international public policy, and other avenues that the University has identified as promising areas of growth. Initiatives like these will succeed only if they draw broadly upon Ohio State's expertise across disciplines, and a John Glenn School would work to achieve that collaboration. Creating a central, academic focus for policy research and teaching, however, is an essential first step in exploring these options—and in establishing Ohio State as the nation's leading land grant university of the twenty-first century.

3. Improve the Quality of the Teaching and Learning Environment.

In December 2004, the John Glenn Institute and School of Public Policy and Management will move to the renovated Page Hall. That building represents a $16 million investment in improved classrooms, offices, meeting spaces, and other facilities for Ohio State's faculty and students. The renovated space will vastly enhance the teaching and learning environment at the University. Combining operations of the two major tenants in Page Hall, however, will leverage this renovation to offer a truly remarkable center for policy research, teaching, and discussion at Ohio State.

Page Hall sits between the Oval and High Street, serving as a bridge between the University and the community. The Glenn Institute and SPPM have purposely designed the building to further that function. Attractive ground level entrances on the north, east, and south sides of the building will draw visitors through the building, even if their ultimate destination is another building on High Street or the Oval. A series of meeting spaces, including a policy forum, leadership education center, open lounge, seminar rooms, tiered classrooms, computer laboratories, and a distance learning studio, will facilitate many types of learning experiences. With both pool classrooms and dedicated departmental areas, Page

---

37 The University contributed $11 million of this amount through the capital budget; the Institute is raising $5 million privately.
Hall will host the full range of the University’s teaching functions, from introductory lecture classes to advanced seminars, professional training, individualized computer instruction, formal debates, informal discussions, and distance education. The building will be a center for discussion, interaction, and exploration.

Integrating the John Glenn Institute and School of Public Policy and Management will further these goals, fully capitalizing on the building’s potential. Each unit has created somewhat different spaces in Page Hall. The School has created faculty and staff offices, a graduate student lounge, a graduate student computer center, and a series of seminar rooms. The Institute has established a policy forum, conference rooms, an open lounge, the leadership education center, a distance learning studio, and offices for visiting faculty, policymakers, and journalists. The units have already cooperated in designing the building, but fully integrating these spaces will maximize the potential of all facilities. Full-time faculty members will share hallways and discussions with visiting interdisciplinary scholars and journalists. Graduate students will share informal discussions in the open lounge with visiting scholars and policymakers. Undergraduates will mingle with faculty and graduate students. Public sector employees taking part in leadership education programs will meet full-time faculty members; those faculty and graduate students will have expanded opportunities to participate in leadership education programs as instructors or students. The policy forum and distance learning studio will have permanent links to an academic department, together with its faculty, students, and alumni.

The School and Institute, moreover, plan to hold Page Hall’s facilities open to faculty and students from all departments who are interested in policy research and interdisciplinary collaboration. Faculty members campuswide will be able to apply for temporary space to conduct interdisciplinary policy research with others. Departments will be able to reserve offices for visiting faculty or policymakers who would benefit from the School’s interdisciplinary policy atmosphere. The policy forum, conference rooms, and leadership education center will be available for groups from any department who choose to hold policy workshops or other gatherings in Page Hall.

Separately, the new facilities designed by the School and Institute in Page Hall are an excellent contribution to the University’s teaching and learning environment. As an integrated whole, representing a unified School of Public Affairs, they will create a stunning platform for policy research, teaching, and discussion at Ohio State.

4. Enhance and Better Serve the Student Body.

Consolidation of the John Glenn Institute and the School of Public Policy and Management will benefit four categories of students: graduate students enrolled in the

---

38 The School does not currently operate an undergraduate academic program and, as discussed further below, does not plan to establish a large undergraduate presence. The Institute, however, operates a number of co-curricular programs for undergraduates that it plans to continue. Page Hall has also been designed to be hospitable to all students using the building. With three pool classrooms on the ground floor, which extensively serve undergraduates, we hope to attract those students to informal discussions with Senator Glenn and other policymakers in the School’s open lounge as well as to more formal policy workshops hosted by faculty in the policy forum and conference rooms.
School's current programs, other graduate students throughout the University, potential graduate students, and undergraduates.

Graduate students enrolled in the School's current programs will gain access to the Glenn Institute's considerable resources. These include an office in Washington, D.C.; connections to policymakers and organizations in Ohio and the nation's capital; the Institute's distinguished lecturers, visiting scholars, and journalists in residence; and the Institute's training programs and facilities. In addition, the Institute's resources and the expanded capabilities of the merged unit will increase the faculty size and course offerings at the School. For all of these reasons, students enrolled in the School have enthusiastically endorsed the proposed merger and change in the School's reporting line. Appendix E includes some letters from these students.

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.

Graduate students in other departments likewise will benefit from the merger. Graduate students from several disciplines have approached the School and Glenn Institute, seeking workshops or courses on policy issues to complement their disciplinary work. The Institute has been unable to satisfy these requests because of its lack of standing as an academic unit. The School, conversely, has lacked resources to address these concerns. The School of Public Affairs will be able to offer expanded opportunities to graduate students from many disciplines. These will range from lectures and colloquia on policy topics to oneday workshops and training sessions, jointly listed courses with a policy focus, and interdisciplinary research opportunities. The simple presence of a visible School of Public Affairs in a state capital will enhance Ohio State's appeal to some graduate students with policy interests.

Perhaps the greatest educational opportunities, for both the University and students, lie with new graduate students who will be attracted to the School's programs. Public affairs is a well recognized professional field, with a growing demand for master's degrees. Schools of public affairs, including Ohio State's School of Public Policy and Management, have long operated both full-time and part-time programs, accommodating students with a variety of career and personal needs. The School, in other words, is well positioned to respond to both the economics and demographics of an emerging group of students seeking master's degrees.

Ohio State has already reached its ceiling for undergraduate and doctoral students under the state's budget formula. Considerable room for growth, however, remains for master's programs. The School of Public Policy and Management is particularly well suited to tap that potential, benefiting the University, the students who receive advanced training,
and the employers who receive them. Professional master's degrees should be a key element of both the University's growth plan and the state's economic development plan.

To expand its master's program, the School needs the additional resources, contacts, and brand name that the John Glenn Institute would bring. Location outside a College that focuses primarily on doctoral students and undergraduates—as SBS does—would also help the School better recruit its target audience of professional master's students. As noted above, enrollment of master's students in SPPM declined by 50% in the six years after the School moved to SBS. The current Director, faculty, and staff have worked heroically to raise those enrollments again but the School's current home does not share its mission of training professional master's students. Resources have dwindled so dramatically during the School's last seven years that it has been difficult to maintain vigorous recruiting.

The lost enrollments in SPPM's master's programs are particularly regrettable because those enrollments have been rising at other schools of public affairs. Creating a John Glenn School of Public Affairs, reporting directly to the Provost's office, will help the School regain the master's student enrollments it enjoyed through 1997. The Glenn Institute's staff will bring new resources to recruiting and will also connect the School to recent college graduates and career public servants who would be interested in its programs. Students will be more enthusiastic about enrolling in a School that clearly focuses on professional master's degrees. By raising enrollment in the School's master's programs to the levels that existed a decade ago, the School will be able to achieve greater financial stability and expand faculty size. It can then seek to expand those programs further, meeting new needs among students and producing graduates who will fill important positions in government, nonprofits, philanthropy, and the private sector.

Expansion of the School's master's programs will benefit other graduate programs throughout the University. The School's dual or joint degree programs with Social Work, City and Regional Planning, Health Services Management and Policy, Natural Resources, Law, and Arts Policy and Administration are all popular with students. A strong School of Public Affairs will make these programs even more inviting. Opportunities exist, if other units are interested, to create additional joint or dual degree programs. Opportunities also exist to develop specializations within the School's existing master's degrees that will draw upon advanced courses in other departments. An MPA with a specialization in American Politics, for example, would allow the School's master's students to enroll in advanced courses offered by the Political Science department—which has established an international reputation in that area. Similarly, an MPA with an emphasis on Science Policy would encourage master's students to take appropriate courses in the Physical and Biological Sciences, encouraging useful discussions among policy and science students.

Indeed, with hope that the merger will be approved, Glenn Institute staff have already started working with the School's faculty to produce brochures and other recruiting tools for the master's programs. Through a series of consortia, the Institute has connections with civic education programs at colleges around the country—all of which would provide fertile recruiting grounds for the School's master's programs. And the Institute trains close to 3000 public sector employees each year in nondegree programs, many of whom might pursue a master's degree with appropriate encouragement. We are working to distribute the brochures produced by the Institute's staff to these groups and others.
Particular opportunities exist to develop a new master's degree in International Public Policy. Many other schools of public affairs have created specialized degrees in this area; the demand among students and employers is enormous and still growing. With Ohio State's vast resources in international studies, a master's degree in this field offers a compelling opportunity. Like the undergraduate program in International Studies, a master's degree in international policy would draw upon existing courses and intellectual resources campuswide. The John Glenn School of Public Affairs could develop such a degree program in collaboration with other units with relative ease, drawing upon the Institute's staff resources and its existing connections with academic programs campuswide. Once established, this program could benefit almost every department in the University, bringing to campus new master's students who will draw upon the University's expansive expertise in all aspects of international affairs. The program would also advance the University's reputation as a whole, showcasing the depth and breadth of its international expertise and producing a cadre of professionals working in all aspects of international policy.

This is an especially opportune time to expand master's degree programs in public policy. The federal government is facing a dramatic shortage of workers as the Kennedy generation retires.\(^\text{40}\) Ongoing devolution of federal programs, while failing to relieve the worker shortage in Washington, has vastly increased the number and variety of public positions in state and local government. Threats to homeland security have generated new government jobs at every level. The rise of the nonprofit sector has increased demand for workers in those fields, while privatization has given many "private" jobs a public policy focus. Globalization has rendered all public and nonprofit programs more complex. In sum, the broad field of public affairs offers more jobs, in more specialized areas, and requiring more complex skills than ever before.

Students are responding to this demand. The media repeatedly report that student interest in public affairs is on the rise. A survey conducted by the Brookings Institution found that almost two-thirds of liberal arts students who graduated in 2003 seriously considered a career in public service—and many were acting upon that interest.\(^\text{41}\) More than three dozen public affairs schools reported enrollment increases of master's students between 2001 and 2002, and a few saw increases of 60% or more.\(^\text{42}\) By establishing a strong School of Public Affairs with national visibility, Ohio State can capitalize on this trend by attracting additional graduate students to the campus.\(^\text{43}\)

Undergraduates, finally, would also benefit from the proposed John Glenn School of Public Affairs. The Glenn Institute has collaborated with other campus units to develop numerous programs that stimulate undergraduates' interest in public affairs in the context of

\(^{40}\) See supra note 6.


\(^{42}\) Lynn Franey, Enrollment Picks Up at Universities that Train Workers for Government and Nonprofits, Kansas City Star, Mar. 17, 2003.

\(^{43}\) In addition to strong academic programs, financial support is critical to attracting the best students. The Glenn Institute has already been successful in raising private funds to support scholarships for students participating in its programs and has begun to explore fundraising for graduate student support. SPFPM likewise has attracted private gifts for some student scholarships. As with fundraising for faculty support, combining these efforts will provide a better platform for generating increased private support for graduate fellowships.
their liberal arts studies. The Institute has worked with First Year Experience to include freshmen in its popular and wide-ranging lectures, as well as to cosponsor a special lecture by Senator Glenn for freshmen. The Institute has also worked with departments as diverse as Biology and History to arrange for Senator Glenn to discuss policy issues with classes. The Institute’s Living Learning Program, which enrolls about 60 students each year, quickly established itself as one of the top five programs on campus (as judged by Residence Life) for the quality of co-curricular activities that it provides. The Glenn Institute’s Living Learning Program brings together students from all colleges who have an interest in public service or public policy, helping them see the connections between their fields of study and their civic interests. The program has been particularly successful in engaging students beyond their freshman year and in creating a growing community of undergraduates—one that cuts across colleges and disciplines—with an interest in exploring public service.

The Institute’s Washington Academic Internship Program offers a particularly good example of the type of opportunities the Institute has created for undergraduates. The program enrolls approximately 40 juniors or seniors each year. Each of those students spends a full quarter in Washington, D.C., under the direction of Dr. Elizabeth Boles, who holds a Ph.D. in Political Science and an adjunct appointment in OSU’s Political Science Department. The students work four days a week in carefully supervised internships, while taking two rigorous policy courses from Dr. Boles. The courses require students to complete substantial reading, writing, and speaking assignments. In addition to shorter papers and other assignments, each student writes a major policy paper.

The Washington program reaches out to students in every department, tailoring internships and even course materials so that participants experience the relevance of their liberal arts education—whether centered in physics, poetry, philosophy, or political science—to public policy. Appendix C lists the many departments and colleges that have sent students to this program.

Merging the Institute and School of Public Policy and Management will offer new opportunities to these students by showing them that an academic home exists for graduate study in public policy—as well as in related disciplines that have faculty participating in the School. Many students associated with the Institute’s programs (both its co-curricular ones and the Washington courses) apply to law school. Although law is an excellent career for many students, it is not right for all. We have the capacity to show students alternative

---

44 Before coming to Ohio State and the John Glenn Institute, Dr. Boles held faculty appointments at Sarah Lawrence College, Pomona College, and the University of California at Berkeley. She created Berkeley’s extremely successful Washington Academic Center and received that University’s first Rhoda Goldman Award for Extraordinary Contributions to Undergraduate Education. In 1999, she accepted Ohio State’s offer to establish the Glenn Institute’s Washington Academic Internship Program. Other colleges and universities regularly seek her advice on establishing academic internship programs that appeal to students from a wide range of liberal arts disciplines. Earlier this year, the American Political Science Association selected Dr. Boles as one of 40 scholars nationally to inaugurate the Association’s new initiative to advance teaching and learning in political science.

45 The program has also been successful in working with other departments to prepare some of Ohio State’s top students for competitive fellowships. OSU’s recent Truman and Udall Scholars were both alumni of the Washington Academic Internship Program.
approaches to public policy by including them—as undergraduates—in a community that embraces faculty, alumni, and graduate students with diverse, interdisciplinary perspectives on public policy. A unified John Glenn School of Public Affairs can provide that community.

Most undergraduates will participate in this community through co-curricular activities like those the Institute currently operates. Merger of the Institute and School, together with the opening of Page Hall on the Oval, offers a spectacular opportunity for engaging undergraduates in lectures, faculty workshops, and informal discussions related to public policy. Many undergraduates have strong interests in these areas and a John Glenn School can respond to those interests—often through co-curricular seminars and workshops that are cosponsored with other departments.

The merged School can also serve as a resource for undergraduates interested in pursuing research with faculty members interested in policy issues. The Institute’s director and several of the School’s faculty have already collaborated with undergraduates on research projects. We have also been able to refer undergraduates to faculty members in other departments who are conducting policy-related research. As a combined unit with affiliated scholars from many fields, the John Glenn School can be even more effective in linking undergraduates to advanced research opportunities on distinctive policy issues.

The Institute and School want to further address this interest by working with existing Career Services units to enhance career sessions and counseling opportunities that will show undergraduates the breadth of policy positions available to students with a BA—as well as the additional opportunities available for students who obtain an MA in public administration or other disciplines. The Institute and School have complementary staff and connections that could be combined to create first-rate career counseling assistance in this area. Ohio State could be the first in the nation to create a “pre policy” or “pre public affairs” counseling program for undergraduates that rivals the strength of “pre law” programs at colleges nationwide.

Students and academic departments have also expressed interest over the last decade in establishing an undergraduate public policy minor or major at Ohio State. A stronger

---

46 In addition to the programs described above, the Institute operates NEW Leadership Ohio, an annual weeklong institute for college women interested in public service, and recently assumed oversight of Ohio State’s speech and debate team. The Institute and School collaborate in offering an annual public policy essay competition, open to college students worldwide.

47 Among other examples, the Institute’s Director recently published a scholarly article coauthored with an OSU undergraduate, Deborah J. Merritt & David M. Lieberman, Justice Ginsburg’s Jurisprudence of Opportunity and Equality, 104 Columbia Law Review 39 (2004). And David Landsberger, one of the School’s faculty members, is working with undergraduates from the Institute’s Living Learning Program on scholarly research related to information technology.

48 The Institute designed its space in Page Hall to include carrels for both undergraduates and graduate students working on research projects with faculty. These carrels are interspersed with faculty offices to link students directly with faculty researchers. Faculty offices in Page Hall will house, not only faculty permanently affiliated with the School, but scholars from across campus working on policy projects and visiting policymakers participating in those projects. Undergraduates thus will have the opportunity to participate in an extensive “research laboratory” for public policy.
School of Public Affairs—particularly one that is fully interdisciplinary and operates outside a single disciplinary college—could be instrumental in working with other colleges to achieve this goal. A first-rate undergraduate program in public policy allows some undergraduates to focus their studies on policy outcomes that are particularly meaningful to them. At their best, these programs encourage students to engage deeply with several academic disciplines and stimulate students’ interest by showing the relevance of their studies to solving concrete problems. At the same time, an undergraduate program in policy studies—whether a major or minor—should resist professionalizing the liberal arts curriculum or distracting students from the exploratory nature of the undergraduate years.

The School and Institute both have insights into striking this balance. The appropriate role of undergraduate policy programs has been debated for years in the journals and at the annual meetings of public affairs schools; the SPPM faculty are quite knowledgeable about these issues. The Glenn Institute, meanwhile, has established connections with undergraduate policy programs nationwide—from co-curricular programs to minors and majors. As a combined John Glenn School, we would be happy to work with other units in exploring establishment of a public policy minor or major at Ohio State. Most of the courses needed for such programs already exist in departments campuswide. A John Glenn School could be indispensable in helping those departments pull the offerings together for a coherent policy major or minor.

Other curricular opportunities for undergraduates in public policy and public affairs may emerge. The John Glenn School would be particularly interested in creating advanced courses, perhaps in collaboration with other departments, that offer extensive writing and research opportunities to undergraduates interested in public policy. The Institute and existing School, however, believe strongly in an arts and sciences education for undergraduates and in the need to coordinate undergraduate offerings with other departments. 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.49

Combining the School and Institute into a John Glenn School of Public Affairs, in sum, opens many avenues for improving the education of Ohio State’s graduate students and undergraduates. The School will greatly enhance opportunities for master’s students, and will support expanded programs drawing new master’s students to campus. The School will also support co-curricular activities for undergraduates interested in public policy, extending work those students do in their classes. The School, finally, has the potential to deepen support for undergraduates by creating new research opportunities and career counseling programs—and by collaborating with other units to expand appropriate policy opportunities within the undergraduate curriculum.

---

49 Consultation with Interim 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.
5. *Create a More Diverse University Community.*

Both the Glenn Institute and the School of Public Policy and Management have recruited diverse student bodies to their programs. Both programs are well diversified by gender, with the percentage of women matching or exceeding men in both programs. Approximately 20% of the students enrolled in the School’s MPA program are minority students, while about 15% of its in-career MA students are minorities. Minority student participation in Glenn Institute programs has ranged from 15% to 57%, depending on the program and the year. While statistics reflecting other types of diversity, such as disability and sexual orientation, are not available, both programs are known for their hospitality to diverse constituencies.

Both of these units have a particularly strong record of designing programs with diversity in mind. The School’s in-career master’s program and part-time options allow students with varied backgrounds to pursue a rigorous advanced degree. The Glenn Institute reshaped its High School Internship Program when the original program failed to meet the needs of low-income students. It also created a summer leadership institute for students from Cincinnati’s inner city, focused both on helping those students address racial tensions in the city and encouraging them to attend college. The Institute’s NEW Leadership program, cosponsored with the Women’s Studies Department, addresses the shortfall of women running for elected office by offering training to college women interested in public leadership. And its training program for first-time candidates helps outsiders gain the skills they need to run a winning, ethical campaign.

Combining the School and Institute will strengthen these programs while providing a stronger platform for new programs that advance diversity. The Institute’s ties with the Columbus Public Schools and the Ohio High School Transformation Initiative (a statewide effort, funded by the Gates Foundation, to transform high schools in Ohio’s urban areas) hold particular promise for enhancing diversity. We hope to use these ties to create a pipeline of students from Ohio’s urban districts who are interested in public policy; we can work with these students to expose them to careers in public affairs, encouraging them to pursue both undergraduate and graduate work at Ohio State.

On a more fundamental level, diversity is central to public policy—and public policy is critical to diversity. Diverse communities, whether they differed by race, religion, economic class, age, gender, or other characteristics, have always negotiated their differences in the public forum. Public policy is essential both to promoting diversity and to overcoming prejudice. A strong School of Public Affairs will stimulate research and dialogue on issues that are central to diversity, enhancing the campus’s commitment to these issues.

---

50 In 2004, the Glenn Institute received a certificate of recognition from the Office for Disability Services for excellence in making its public programs accessible, and the Institute’s Director received one of the University’s Distinguished Diversity Enhancement Awards, based in part on the Institute’s innovative programming to enhance diversity.
6. Help Build Ohio’s Future.

The John Glenn School of Public Affairs will provide a key element of Ohio State’s efforts to build Ohio’s future. The University already has deep technical expertise to promote economic growth and improve education throughout Ohio, and has been making important strides both to bring that expertise to the state and to receive recognition for its role in doing so. The missing links in this effort have been sustained access to Ohio’s policymakers and research focused on the policies needed to enhance economic growth and education.

The School and Institute have the assets needed to create these missing links. The School educates many of Ohio’s state and local leaders—as well as policymakers in Washington and around the world who can contribute to Ohio’s growth. Some of those leaders obtained their degree at the beginning of their careers while others participate in the School’s in-career master’s program—a particularly effective way to maintain ties with current policymakers.

The School also fosters extensive research on the policy issues essential to promoting economic growth and educational excellence. Its faculty have always been active both in publishing academic studies of these issues and in preparing reports directly for Ohio’s policymakers. A sample of recent publications and reports from the School’s faculty includes:

- Welfare Reform: Ohio’s Response
- Effects of a Revised Self-Support Reserve on Assigned Collections of Child Support: Final Report for the Ohio Department of Human Services
- Contract Management Capacity in Municipal and County Governments
- Revenue Windfall and School Input Choices
- Local Economic Development and Local Taxation
- Assessing Medicare Outreach Programs: Report to the Ohio Department of Human Services
- Strategic Plan for the Columbus Division of Fire
- Returning to Work After Defense Cutbacks: Report to the Ohio Department of Development
- An Evaluation of State Enterprise Zone Policies
- Education for Leadership at the Top
- Housing Subsidies and Labor Supply
- The Information Technology Industry in the State of Ohio and Its Regions: Report for Ohio's IT Alliance
- Selecting the Right Site: Where Do States Locate Place-Based Economic Development Programs?
- Child Support Enforcement: Incentives and Well Being
- Japanese and American Approaches to Building a National Information Infrastructure
- Fiber Optic Highways and Network Bridges: Planning for the Telecommunications Needs of the City in the 21st Century
• International Technology Transfer: U.S. Policies and Corporate Options

The Institute likewise has extensive ties with state, local, and national policymakers, as well as with scholars producing research on key policy issues to support growth. The Glenn Institute trains newly elected members of the General Assembly after each election, providing an overview of Ohio’s economy and the issues facing it. More than 2500 public employees participate in the Institute’s training workshops and certificate programs each year. The Institute’s work for the Ohio City/County Management Association gives it ongoing ties with local policymakers who are critical to economic development. And the Institute has extensive ties with P-12 education leaders throughout the state through its work on the Ohio High School Transformation Initiative noted above, its work with the Columbus Public Schools on several initiatives, and its sponsorship of both Ohio State’s P-12 Education Initiative and its Center for Learning Excellence.

On the research side, the Institute has supported research by Ohio State faculty on (1) identifying the conditions under which government policies are needed to stimulate economic innovation; (2) building information technology networks to support small social service organizations; (3) evaluating the impact of government policies designed to promote high tech industries; and (4) improving methods for measuring elementary and secondary school success. Community Research Partners, the Institute’s innovative partnership with the City of Columbus and United Way of Franklin County, is engaged in ongoing data collection and evaluation to inform Ohio’s economic development and education policies. The organization has partnered with the Columbus Public Schools on a series of particularly critical research projects to improve education policy.

Combining the School and Institute will maximize the impact of these programs and connections, allowing them to draw strength from one another and to stimulate further policy work supporting Ohio’s economic development and educational excellence. The John Glenn School of Public Affairs will focus Ohio State’s policy research and connections, creating a policy dynamo that complements the University’s technical strength.

D. A Central Reporting Line

To achieve the objectives outlined above, it is essential not only to combine the assets of the John Glenn Institute and School of Public Policy and Management, but to maintain the Institute’s central reporting line to the Provost’s office. This section of the proposal addresses that need in some detail.

The great majority of highly rated public affairs programs report centrally to their university’s provost. As Appendix B shows, all nine of the nation’s top Schools of Public Affairs do.

---

51 Community Research Partners is a separately incorporated nonprofit agency formed by the Institute, the City, and the United Way. Each organization provides support for operating expenses, although CRP draws considerable income from contracts and grants. Representatives of each of the founding organizations sit on CRP’s Board of Directors.
Affairs are autonomous units reporting to the provost. Twenty of the top twenty-five programs are autonomous schools reporting to the provost; the remaining five among this top group report to a comprehensive College of Arts and Sciences. These colleges are at least as comprehensive as Ohio State’s federated Colleges of the Arts and Sciences. Indeed, at least one includes several professional schools within its umbrella.

Similarly, most of our benchmark institutions feature a School of Public Affairs with a central reporting line. The Schools of Public Affairs at the University of California-Los Angeles, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of Texas-Austin, and University of Washington all are autonomous schools reporting to their provost—and all rank well above Ohio State’s School of Public Policy and Management. The University of Wisconsin’s LaFollette School of Public Affairs reports to the University’s College of Letters and Sciences, but that College includes 39 departments and five professional schools (Journalism, Library and Information Studies, Music, Public Affairs, and Social Work). The comprehensiveness of Wisconsin’s College of Letters and Sciences makes it more akin to a central unit than a single college—although we have counted this as a unit reporting to an Arts and Science College. Among our benchmark institutions, only the School of Public Administration and Policy at the University of Arizona reports to a focused college, the Eller College of Business and Public Administration. That school is also the only benchmark school to rank lower than Ohio State’s School of Public Policy and Management—at 46th.

The top forty-five schools of public affairs have the following reporting lines:

Twenty-nine are autonomous academic units reporting to the university’s provost. Ten report to a college of arts and sciences or to a graduate school of arts and sciences.

Six report to a disciplinary unit that is narrower than a college of arts and sciences. One of these (Arizona State) reports to a College of Public Programs, one (Virginia Tech) reports to a College of Architecture and Urban Studies, one (Delaware) reports to a College of Human Services, one (the Naval Postgraduate School) reports to a Graduate School of Business and Public Policy, and two (Florida State and Ohio

---

53 The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, our final benchmark institution, does not maintain a graduate or professional program in public policy, public administration, and/or public affairs. Nor does the campus have an undergraduate program in those fields.
54 Some of these schools include political science or other social science departments within the School of Public Affairs. These arrangements tend to diminish the status and visibility of the social science departments, just as SPFM’s recent location within the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences has tended to diminish its status. We would not recommend locating any of Ohio State’s social science departments within the School of Public Affairs—just as we would not continue the School’s current placement within SBS. The important point for the current discussion is that the overwhelming majority of universities with top-rated Schools of Public Affairs have recognized the importance of establishing a central reporting line for those schools—although a few of them have mistakenly (in our minds) submerged traditional social science departments within those schools.
State) report to a College of Social Sciences. None of these six schools ranks among the top twenty-five schools of public affairs.

The pattern of reporting lines at top schools of public affairs thus shows a clear preference for autonomous schools—and confirms that the most highly rated of those schools have been separated from more focused disciplinary colleges. When a school of public affairs reports to another school or college, that unit almost always is a broadly interdisciplinary college of arts and sciences or graduate school.

Independent scholarly reviews have noted the same pattern of public affairs and policy schools reporting centrally. A 1993 review of the nation’s 33 leading schools of public policy—including Ohio State—concluded that “[t]he general pattern among these 33 schools,” the study confirmed, “is for a public policy program to stand alone organizationally.”

Peer reviewers and faculty at top universities have reached the same conclusion, noting the need for a professional graduate program in public affairs to operate autonomously. The Carnegie Foundation team that reviewed Harvard’s fledgling Kennedy School of Government underscored the “essentiality of a separate identity, a core curriculum, and a nucleus faculty for a graduate professional public administration program.” Similarly, when the University of Chicago reviewed the progress of its interdisciplinary program on public policy studies in the late 1980s, the five University of Chicago deans composing the review committee unanimously recommended establishing an independent graduate School of Public Policy Studies to maximize the program’s potential. The Council of the University Senate unanimously endorsed that recommendation and the School was established.

Notably, even universities with relatively small public affairs programs have improved their profile by making those units autonomous programs reporting centrally. Rutgers University’s program in public administration has just eight full-time faculty members and three jointly appointed faculty, but it has a central reporting line. The University of Missouri’s Harry S. Truman School of Public Affairs has fourteen full-time faculty members, plus several joint appointments and research fellows. Cornell University’s Institute for Public Affairs is a university-wide program with no full-time faculty; all members of this faculty have appointments in other units. A director and four other core faculty members operate the university-wide program at Cornell. Other

56 Id. at 15. The School moved from Business to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences in 1997.
57 Id. at 16.
58 Id. at 10.
59 The current director of that school holds his doctorate from our School of Public Policy and Management; we have attached a letter from him both enthusiastically endorsing the merger and noting the importance of a central reporting line to the success of a public affairs school. See Appendix E.
universities thus have recognized the potential for elevating the strength and prominence of even small public affairs units by giving them a central reporting line.

As noted in the outline of the School’s history above, Ohio State itself has repeatedly recognized the need for a strong public affairs program to operate independently of focused disciplinary colleges. When the University’s faculty committee recommended establishing SPPM’s precursor in the late 1960s, it concluded that the new program should be separate from the Political Science Department and its host College. As a professional program, the fledgling public administration program needed a more independent status.\(^{60}\) The College of Administrative Sciences originally served that purpose, providing a home for several professional schools related to administration. As that College became a more focused College of Business, however, it no longer provided the kind of home that the University’s faculty originally intended. Nor has the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, where the School moved in 1997, satisfied the original intent of University-wide faculty who proposed the School.

The School’s history during the last ten years—including the sharp declines in its faculty size, student enrollment, and reputational rankings—demonstrates that its placement within a disciplinary college has not succeeded. This is not surprising: universities and schools of public affairs nationwide have made the same discovery. The campuswide faculty committee that recommended creation of the School in 1969 recognized that it would not fare well if tied too closely to a disciplinary College. The NASPAA accreditation team reached the same conclusion in 1994, hoping to halt the School’s decline. It is time to heed the hard-won wisdom, gained at Ohio State and other universities nationwide, to establish SPPM as an independent unit.

The John Glenn Institute offers, not only an appropriate complement of programs that can be combined with the School’s programs to create a stronger school of public affairs, but also a reporting line that satisfies the University faculty’s original intent in creating a school of public affairs that would be independent of individual disciplines. In addition to fulfilling that goal and following the clear pattern of public affairs schools nationwide, creating an autonomous John Glenn School of Public Affairs reporting directly to the Provost’s office, will achieve three essential goals: visibility, campuswide connections, and professional stature.

1. **Visibility**

A central reporting line is essential to create needed visibility for Ohio State’s public policy work. Even the University has difficulty keeping track of its current School of Public Policy and Management, with that professional program hidden within a college that serves a very different mission. The University’s Fall 2003 Report on the Academic Plan notes that “U.S. News ranks many [of our] graduate/professional programs among the best in the nation.” The report then names eight colleges and the national ranks they held at that time: Veterinary Medicine (6), Education (17), Business (19), Nursing (19), Engineering (24), Arts.

\(^{60}\) See *supra* note 12 and accompanying text.
(28), Medicine and Public Health (37), and Law (38). The Report, however, omits a professional program that ranked higher than either the College of Medicine or College of Law: Ohio State’s School of Public Policy and Management. At that time, the School ranked 35th nationally in the U.S. News rankings for professional Schools of Public Affairs.61

Ohio State’s recently published “2004 Profile” repeats the same rankings, again missing the opportunity to note a top-ranking program in public affairs. Inexplicably, the Profile even omits SPPM from its comprehensive listing of all colleges and schools on campus.62 The School’s lack of visibility within OSU’s organizational structure makes it difficult even for the University to recognize or capitalize upon its strengths.

As a unit reporting directly to the Provost’s office, the John Glenn Institute has been much more successful in achieving visibility both inside and outside the University. Combining the Institute’s current visibility with the School’s solid programs—and maintaining the central reporting line that the Glenn Institute currently has—will greatly enhance the visibility of Ohio State’s public policy work.

2. Campuswide Connections

The power of a School of Public Affairs lies in its campuswide connections. These programs are inherently interdisciplinary and have been since their founding. Faculty members in the first schools of public affairs or public policy held advanced degrees in political science, economics, business, law, and public health. Even today, faculty members in those and other disciplines greatly outnumber faculty members with degrees in public policy or public administration at schools of public affairs. The six faculty members most recently hired by Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government have advanced degrees in criminology, law, divinity, philosophy, and political science. Other faculty members hired during the last four years at top public affairs schools have degrees in these fields as well as economics, sociology, city and regional planning, international relations, geosciences, applied linguistics, human resource management, information management systems, architecture, and history.63

61 Rankings of SPPM, the Moritz College of Law, and the College of Medicine all declined slightly in the latest U.S. News rankings. These three professional programs, however, still hold comparable rankings within their fields. See supra note 4.
62 Ohio State Profile 2004, at 5. The brochure lists the School of Journalism and Communication within the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences—as well as numerous Schools within other Colleges.
63 These subjects represent faculty hired during the last four years at the top ten schools ranked by U.S. News. Similarly, a study of assistant professors appointed at public affairs schools in 1991 concluded that the new faculty members had doctoral degrees “spread across a staggering variety of disciplines, including accounting, anthropology, city and regional planning, comparative politics, criminal justice, decision sciences, economics, educational administration, information systems, international relations, operations research, political science, public affairs, public policy and management, public service, regional analysis and planning, sociology, and systematics and ecology.” Robert Rodgers & Nanette Rodgers, Defining the Boundaries of Public Administration: Undisciplined Mongrels Versus Disciplined Purists, 60(5) Public Administration Review 435-45 (2000).
To realize the teaching, research, and engagement advantages described above, a School of Public Affairs must cultivate these interdisciplinary connections. This is virtually impossible when the program is a small sub-unit of a disciplinary college—whatever those disciplines might be.

The Glenn Institute, in contrast, has been very successful at collaborating with faculty and students across the entire campus. Students participating in the Institute’s Washington Academic Internship Program are drawn from the Colleges of Arts, Biological Sciences, Business, Education, Engineering, Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences, Human Ecology, Humanities, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, Public Health, Nursing, and Social and Behavioral Sciences—as well as from the Department of Military Science reporting to the Provost’s office. Similarly, the Institute’s Living Learning Program most recently hosted students from Arts; Biological Sciences; Business; Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences; Human Ecology; Humanities; Mathematics and Physical Sciences; and Social and Behavioral Sciences—as well as numerous students who had not yet affiliated with a College. Last year’s group of students is representative of the diversity of Colleges represented in the program each year.

The Institute’s collaborations have also included research, outreach, and funding opportunities. It funded faculty from the Colleges of Education, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Law in its first selection of John Glenn Scholars. It has worked extensively with faculty in Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, as well as Mathematics and Physical Sciences, on major NSF proposals. The College of Social Work partnered closely with the Institute in creating and maintaining Community Research Partners. The Institute and the College of Human Ecology have collaborated on both the Center for Learning Excellence and a variety of service-learning initiatives. In addition to these initiatives, the Institute has cosponsored lectures, fundraising events, and other programs with the Colleges of Arts; Biological Sciences; Education; Engineering; Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences; Human Ecology; Humanities; Law; Mathematical and Physical Sciences; Medicine; Public Health; and Social and Behavioral Sciences. It has also worked with Ohio State’s Office of the First Year Experience, Honors and Scholars Program, and Office of Research in pursuing significant initiatives.

Maintaining a central reporting status for the merged Institute and School is essential to preserving and building upon this strong history of collaboration. In addition, this status is critical to protecting the investment that the University, state, and private donors have made in the Glenn Institute’s university-wide programs. Those investments have created assets—like the Institute’s Washington office and its widely regarded Washington Academic Internship Program—that should not become the property of a single group of disciplines on campus. As a central unit, the John Glenn School of Public Affairs can continue collaborating with units across the entire campus, using its assets to support policy research and teaching.

---

64 Appendix C shows a tally of the departments and colleges represented in the Glenn Institute’s Washington Academic Internship Program.
campuswide. This kind of collaboration is essential to the success of a School of Public Affairs.

For undergraduate programs, interdisciplinary collaboration of this nature can be achieved through the associated Colleges of the Arts and Sciences. Recognizing that, the University recently moved the undergraduate International Studies Program out of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences so that it reports directly to the Arts and Sciences. Similarly, to the extent that a John Glenn School creates undergraduate programs, it can (and will) work with the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee.

As a graduate professional school and research program, however, a school of public affairs has interdisciplinary connections that reach beyond the arts and sciences, into Engineering, Law, Public Health, Medicine, Social Work, FAES, Architecture, Nursing, and every other college on campus. Such a school also has professional dimensions that are analogous to those in many of these professional colleges. The appropriate reporting line for a graduate professional school with interdisciplinary connections this broad is the Office of Academic Affairs—just as the appropriate reporting line for a broadly interdisciplinary undergraduate program is the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences.

3. Professional Stature

A School of Public Affairs, like Schools of Law, Medicine, Business, Engineering, and Social Work, is a professional school. A primary focus of these schools is to train professionals who will serve society in their chosen field. Professional schools maintain particularly close connections with their alumni, often providing continuing education, networking opportunities, and career counseling. These relationships and focus differ from those maintained by arts and sciences departments, which educate undergraduates for a wide variety of careers and graduate programs, while preparing graduate students primarily for academic positions within the discipline.

The research focus of professional schools also differs from that of arts and sciences departments. Professor Mark Moore of Harvard’s Kennedy School explains the difference between a social science department and a school of public policy particularly well:

The normal activities of social scientists are to test, extend, and elaborate the theories that constitute the core of the disciplines. One ‘succeeds’ by developing original propositions which bear specifiable relationships to previously established propositions and concerns and showing—through rigorous logic, empirical evidence, or both—that the propositions are true or false. The goal of policy analysis is quite different: it is to inform policymakers about the likely consequences of alternative policy choices. Thus, the agenda of inquiry is set not by the internal logic of an academic discipline but by the set of issues and questions raised by some contemplated use of governmental authority or resources.\footnote{Mark A. Moore, Social Science and Policy Analysis, in Ethics, the Social Sciences, and Policy Analysis (Daniel Callahan & Bruce Jennings eds. Fluman Publishing Corp. 1983), p. 273.}
Public policy analysis is as rigorous as research in other academic disciplines, and can be just as theoretical. Policy research is not just an "application" of theories developed in other disciplines. But policy research differs from much research conducted in other departments in two ways. First, the research starts with a problem—often a complex problem—generated by the real world. Research in the arts and sciences, as Moore notes, often starts with a problem posed by previous research in that field.

Second, policy research usually incorporates perspectives from multiple disciplines. Public policy work is genuinely interdisciplinary, rather than merely multi-disciplinary. That is, public policy faculty work with colleagues from a variety of fields to determine how their disciplinary perspectives overlap, complement one another, or conflict in the context of a problem under examination. They often combine perspectives to achieve innovative insights into policy problems.

The difference, of course, is one of degree. Although faculty members at professional schools focus on policy issues raised by real-world problems, their research often illuminates and extends core disciplinary theories as well. Similarly, core social science faculty generate useful insights for contemporary policy debates while elaborating disciplinary theories. But the difference in emphasis is fundamental: core disciplinary issues drive the research of social scientists, while current policy problems drive the research of public policy faculty.

Community engagement in professional schools, finally, differs from that in arts and sciences departments. In the professional school—including a School of Public Affairs—engagement arises naturally from training students who will enter a focused profession, ongoing ties to alumni in that closely knit professional community, and research focused on the community's agenda. Schools of Public Affairs, like most professional schools, regularly include internships and other field work in their curriculum. Often these experiences are required for graduation or professional certification. Arts and sciences departments also require students to "do" their discipline—to create a piece of original historical research, to analyze polling data, or to participate in advanced laboratory work—but these experiences more often are internal to the discipline and the university. Engagement is both more central and ubiquitous in professional schools.

Both professional schools and the arts and sciences are essential to the university. Neither is more valuable than the other. It is essential, however, to recognize their somewhat different roles and to provide the appropriate context for each to flourish. Mixing reporting lines is particularly dangerous in compromising the goals of these different units. Having a professional School of Public Affairs report to a College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, as SPPM currently does, is similar to having a School of Engineering report to a College of Mathematics and Physical Sciences or a School of Medicine report to a College of Biological Sciences. The professional school cannot do its best work in this context. Similarly, arranging for the Political Science Department to report to the College of Law or for the Economics Department to report to the College of Business would be likely to damage the missions of the arts and sciences departments.
Faculty members from all parts of the university increasingly work together to produce both theoretical and applied advances in knowledge; exchange between the practical and the theoretical is central to the idea of a university. The constant lesson of higher education, however, is that all units fare best—and richer stores of knowledge emerge—when the reporting lines of professional schools do not mix with those of arts and sciences departments.

Creating an independent School of Public Affairs, reporting directly to the Provost, will resolve this issue for public affairs students and scholars at Ohio State. Public affairs not only is a profession, it may be the fastest growing profession in the twenty-first century. Establishing an independent School of Public Affairs will offer a needed professional identity to students, faculty, and alumni participating in this growing worldwide community.

II. Affected Faculty

As of spring quarter 2004, the School of Public Policy and Management had nine tenured or tenure-track faculty members:

Assistant Professor Trevor L. Brown
Associate Professor Anand Desai
Assistant Professor Robert T. Greenbaum
Assistant Professor Theresa Heintze
Professor Douglas N. Jones
Associate Professor David Landsberger
Professor Sven B. Lundstedt
Associate Professor Mary K. Marvel
Professor and Director Bert A. Rockman

Professor Jones, who held active faculty status when this petition was originally submitted, retired with emeritus status on June 30, 2004. As explained above, Associate Professor Andrew Keeler will join the faculty in fall quarter 2004.66

The School also has several emeritus faculty members:

Professor Emeritus Charles F. Adams
Professor Emeritus Robert W. Backoff
Professor Emeritus C. Ronald Huff
Professor Emeritus Henry Hunker
Professor Emeritus Arthur Lynn
Professor Emeritus Clinton Oster
Associate Professor Emeritus John Stanley
Professor Emeritus Frederick Stocker

66 See supra under "World-Class Faculty."
Other faculty associated with the School are adjuncts, lecturers, or courtesy appointments of faculty members with tenured appointments in other departments.

The John Glenn Institute is not a tenure initiating unit; no faculty are tenured or on the tenure track within that unit. The Institute’s Director, Deborah J. Merritt, is a full professor in the Moritz College of Law. She holds the John Deaver Drisko/Baker & Hostetler Chair in that College.

The Institute has approximately 190 affiliated faculty members from more than 50 academic departments. All of these are courtesy appointments without pay or tenure.

III. Faculty Reassignment or Other Accommodation

The proposed change in the School’s reporting line and its consolidation with the John Glenn Institute will not affect the status of any faculty within the School of Public Policy and Management. All tenured and tenure-track faculty members will retain their current status, teaching assignments, and other responsibilities. The consolidation will provide new resources to support their work and raise the visibility of the School. Similarly, the relationship of emeritus, adjunct, and courtesy faculty to the School will not change with the consolidation.

If the proposal is approved, the Director of the Glenn Institute will resign her Chair and tenured position at the College of Law, accepting a tenured position as a full professor in the John Glenn School of Public Affairs. She fully supports this change.

Faculty affiliated with the John Glenn Institute will retain affiliated status with the John Glenn School of Public Affairs.

The tenured and tenure-track faculty within the School of Public Policy and Management have submitted this proposal unanimously; they enthusiastically support the proposed change in reporting line and merger with the John Glenn Institute to form a John Glenn School of Public Affairs.

IV. Affected Courses

The School of Public Policy and Management teaches approximately 40 courses each year, primarily for masters and doctoral students. The consolidated unit will continue to offer all of these courses.

The John Glenn Institute offers a small number of courses for high school and college students. These courses currently are listed through the Political Science Department or the Office of Academic Affairs. After the consolidation, the School will refocus some of these courses and offer them directly. A Memorandum of Understanding governs the courses
listed through the Department of Political Science; that Memorandum allows the Department or the Institute to cancel the arrangement upon appropriate notice to the other unit. The Institute will follow the terms of that agreement in giving notice.

The John Glenn School will work with the Graduate School (as SPPM currently does) to obtain approval for any new graduate courses or programs. The School does not anticipate making any changes in existing graduate programs, but would work with the Graduate School if such changes became necessary.

Similarly, the School will work with the Curriculum Committee for the Arts and Sciences Colleges to shape and obtain approval for any undergraduate courses or programs (such as a public policy minor). The School does not anticipate creating extensive undergraduate programs, but is happy to work with arts and sciences faculty on any policy courses that would offer stimulating opportunities to undergraduates.

V. Affected Students

The School of Public Policy and Management currently enrolls masters and doctoral students. Those students will experience no disruption in their courses or degrees. The consolidated unit will offer the same courses and degrees currently offered by the School of Public Policy and Management. The students in the School will gain significant advantages from the consolidation. These include:

- Additional faculty and courses
- Improved resources for the School
- Access to the Institute's Washington, D.C., office
- Access to the Institute's network of government and public policy contacts in Ohio and Washington, D.C.
- Access to lectures and workshops offered by the Institute

Representatives of the School and Institute have discussed the proposed consolidation with students currently enrolled in the School through: (1) an open forum for all students; (2) solicitation of comments by e-mail; and (3) ongoing discussion with student leaders. All students have supported the consolidation with the greatest possible enthusiasm. We have attached in Appendix E several letters representing student sentiment at the School. We have not heard any negative reaction to the proposal from any students.

Graduate students in the John Glenn School, like those in the current SPPM, will be admitted through the Graduate School. They will obtain their degrees through the Graduate School and will otherwise be subject to Graduate School regulations. Thus, graduate education will retain the same high quality in the John Glenn School that it currently has in SPPM.

The John Glenn Institute enrolls high school seniors in a High School Internship Program, OSU freshmen and sophomores in a two-quarter course associated with the
Institute’s Living Learning Program, and OSU juniors and seniors in a Washington Academic Internship Program. All of these courses will continue in similar form after the consolidation, with no disruption to current or future students. The courses will be listed in the John Glenn School, rather than in OAA or Political Science, where they currently are listed. Students enrolled in these courses will benefit from the consolidation through:

- Increased interaction with full-time faculty from the School of Public Policy and Management
- Access to the School’s network of government and public policy contacts in Ohio, other states, Washington, D.C., and abroad
- Increased contacts with the School’s many alumni in government and public policy positions

The Institute has used both group discussion and e-mail communications to discuss the proposed consolidation with students currently enrolled in its programs and those students who participated in recent years. All students have enthusiastically endorsed the proposed consolidation and establishment of a John Glenn School of Public Affairs. Some comments from students are attached in Appendices D and E.

VI. Support for Currently Enrolled Students

No special actions are needed to support currently enrolled students through degree completion, because the consolidation will not alter the courses or degree program of any student.

VII. Budgetary Consequences

The John Glenn Institute maintains an annual budget of approximately $2.5 million. The Office of Academic Affairs provides about $550,000 of that budget; the General Assembly allocates about $300,000 through a line item; an earnings unit generates about $800,000 through fee-based training programs; and the remaining funds derive from foundation grants and private gifts. We expect all of those sources of revenue to continue after the consolidation.

The Institute’s budget fully supports its current programs, including the salaries of all of its personnel. All current programs and salaries will continue to be supported after the consolidation.

The School of Public Policy and Management maintains an annual budget of approximately $1.7 million. Most of this budget derives from its internal allocation, with a modest amount coming from private gifts, interest on endowment, contracts, and grants.

The School’s private gifts, interest from its endowments, and contract/grant funds will remain associated with it after the change in reporting line and the consolidation. The
School’s internal allocation will be separated from that of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences using the principles of budget restructuring. Since the College has already implemented budget restructuring at the Department and School level, this should cause little change in the School’s current budget. The College likewise should suffer no negative impact from the School’s departure; it will no longer bear any costs associated with the School, while the revenues it currently passes through to the School will flow directly to the School.

We anticipate that the change in reporting lines and consolidation will have a very positive impact on external fundraising for the consolidated unit. Alumni of the School will be energized by improvements in the School’s resources and visibility. The Glenn Institute will apply its development resources and energy to raising funds for the new academic unit. Until now, the Institute’s major hurdle in fundraising has been its lack of academic standing. Consolidation with the School will encourage several donors—especially those who have not previously given to Ohio State—to support the new unit.

The consolidation will also allow the School to increase recruiting of graduate students, increasing enrollment of master’s students to the levels that existed through the early 1990s. As explained above, those enrollments fell by 50% after the School moved to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Consolidation with the Glenn Institute and a change in the School’s reporting line will provide resources for enhanced recruiting and an environment more attractive to professional master’s students. Increased enrollments in the master’s programs, in turn, will dramatically improve the School’s financial status.

VIII. Services Lost to the University

The Institute and School will continue to offer all of the programs and services they currently offer, including those that benefit the rest of the University.

As described more fully above, changing the School’s reporting line is essential to maintain these services. The Glenn Institute currently serves students and faculty in a wide range of departments and colleges. The Office of Academic Affairs, as well as private donors, have invested significant funds over the last five years to create those university-wide programs. To protect the university-wide reach of the Glenn Institute’s current programs, it is essential that the consolidated unit report (as the Glenn Institute does) to the Office of Academic Affairs.

IX. Impact on External Constituencies

The Institute and School have discussed the proposed consolidation informally with a large number of alumni and other supporters of or participants in their programs. Responses from these audiences have been uniformly and overwhelmingly positive. The Glenn Institute’s Board of Directors voted unanimously in November 2003 to explore the proposed consolidation as quickly and enthusiastically as possible. In May 2004, the Board reviewed a
draft of this proposal and voted unanimously to forward the proposal to the Council on Academic Affairs and other units that will act upon the proposal.

The School does not have an official alumni advisory board but has polled alumni informally and received uniform and enthusiastic endorsements. A few written endorsements are attached in Appendix E.

In early August, after submission of the original version of this petition, the School’s Director wrote to all alumni, informing them of the proposed merger and inviting their input. All responses received to date have been enthusiastically positive. The alumni see the proposed merger and change in reporting line as essential to reestablishing the School’s prior reputation as well as its connections with alumni, state policymakers, and national policymakers.

X. Impact on Governance

Governance within the School will change little as a result of the consolidation. Faculty and staff will continue to report to the School’s Director, following the School’s current Pattern of Administration. The School may create a new position, Director of Academic Affairs (reporting to the School’s Director) to oversee academic programs within the enhanced unit.

The position of Director of the Glenn Institute will be eliminated after the consolidation, creating one leadership position (School Director) for the entire unit. Staff currently within the Institute will report to the School Director along the same lines that they currently report to the Director of the Institute.

Externally, the employees and programs of the Glenn Institute will continue to report to the Provost, although they will do so through the School’s Director rather than the Institute’s Director. The Glenn Institute’s Board of Directors will be renamed as a Board of Visitors for the John Glenn School, and its by-laws will be amended to reflect the shift from advising an Institute to advising a School. Several alumni of the current School will be invited to join the Board. Current members of the Institute’s Board will serve on the renamed Board of Visitors, maintaining their current terms as governed by the Board’s by-laws.

The internal oversight committee for the John Glenn Institute will dissolve, because the Institute will no longer exist.

The major change in governance will be the shift in the School’s reporting line from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences to the Provost’s office. We have explored the need for that change in the “Rationale” section above.
XI. Impact on Diversity

We have discussed student diversity in the two units, as well as the potential for further increasing diversity, in the "Rationale" section above. The Institute and School have both been innovators in creating programs to support student diversity; they will continue to do so as a combined unit.

The consolidation will improve the gender diversity of the School's full-time faculty from 22% women to 33% women. The consolidation will add a particularly senior female professor to the School's faculty.

Racial diversity on the School's full-time faculty will decline slightly, from 11% nonwhite to 10% nonwhite. Consolidation of the two units, however, will provide a stronger financial base from which the School hopes to hire new faculty over the coming five years. A major purpose of the consolidation is to provide a secure foundation from which the School can increase its faculty size. The consolidated School is committed to hiring an excellent, diverse faculty.

The School's staff is 100% female and 33% nonwhite. The Institute's staff is 83% female and 8% nonwhite. After consolidation, the staff will be 87.5% female and 19% nonwhite.

The Institute's Director, who will become a senior member of the School's faculty, is particularly well known for her work on diversity issues. Much of her research has focused on equality, affirmative action, and legal issues related to race, gender, sexual orientation, and disability. She chaired the University's affirmative action committee in 2000-01 and co-authored a brief that supported the University of Michigan's affirmative action plan in the recent Supreme Court decision. The University recently recognized her work with a Distinguished Diversity Enhancement Award. Her record, when combined with the diversity achievements of the two units, promises strong support for diversity in the combined unit.

XII. Impact on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

The proposed change in reporting line and consolidation will have no negative impact on faculty members' academic freedom or responsibility. Faculty within the School will continue to teach and research as they have until now. No responsibilities will be altered. Faculty see this proposal as an opportunity to expand the resources and reach of the School of Public Policy and Management, more fully supporting its mission of teaching, research, and service in the public interest.

Moving the School's reporting line to the Office of Academic Affairs will improve academic freedom and responsibility by giving the School's professional faculty a more suitable home.
XIII. Conclusion

Administrators and faculty members at Ohio State have frequently proposed establishing a stronger presence for public policy work at the University. Creating an academic focal point for such work would, as explained above, have significant benefits for the University's research, teaching, and service missions. Previous efforts have floundered because they were top-down initiatives to combine a large number of units and/or because they required the investment of significant new resources.

This proposal differs on both of these points from previous initiatives. This proposal is bottom up, arising unanimously from the faculty and staff in the affected units. And implementing this proposal would leverage existing resources; it would not require significant investment of new funds.

Ohio State has an exciting opportunity to capitalize on one of its hidden assets, the School of Public Policy and Management, and to create an academic unit with the potential to bring international visibility to Ohio State's public policy work. The John Glenn School of Public Affairs will be a leader both in the public affairs world and on The Ohio State University campus.
Appendix A

Combining Programs from the School of Public Policy and Management and the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy to Create the John Glenn School of Public Affairs

Both the School of Public Policy and Management and the John Glenn Institute have developed rich sets of programs to educate students for public service, train current leaders in public affairs, and inform public policy through research and engagement. Because the Institute focused on developing programs that the School did not already operate, programs from the two units complement one another remarkably well. Joining the two units will create a comprehensive School of Public Affairs that performs teaching, research, and service in the public interest. In addition, this consolidation will create a vibrant public affairs community centered on the School, one that includes students, faculty, alumni, and policymakers from around the world.

This appendix outlines the complementary functions of the two units and the ways in which their current programs will form a unified whole. Programs currently sponsored by the John Glenn Institute are listed in blue. Programs sponsored by the School of Public Policy and Management are listed in red. In addition to showing the ways in which the programs will combine, the appendix notes some of the synergies among programs and the possibilities for future growth based on this firm foundation.

Teaching

Together, the John Glenn Institute and School of Public Policy and Management educate individuals interested in public affairs from kindergarten through retirement. The combined programs include:

- **K-12 Civic Education Networks.** The Institute participates in several initiatives that facilitate civic education programs nationally. These include the National Commission on Service-Learning (cospersoned by the Institute and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation), the Service-Learning Consortium, the Ohio Bicentennial Service-Learning Schools Network, the Ohio High School Transformation Initiative (funded by the Gates Foundation and the KnowledgeWorks Foundation), and a pilot program funded by the Annenberg Foundation to cultivate outstanding high school civics teachers. The Institute does not teach students directly in these programs, but facilitates best practices in K-12 civic education and has developed a strong reputation in this area.

- **High School Internship Program.** Twenty high school seniors from the seven-county Columbus metropolitan area participate in public service internships during the ten weeks of Ohio State's winter quarter each year. Students also attend a public policy seminar at Ohio State, earning dual high school and college
credit for their work. Students have the opportunity to work closely with dedicated public leaders, as well as to discuss policy issues with top Ohio State faculty from several disciplines.

- Specialized High School Institutes. The Institute periodically develops specialized programs for high school students, such as the Summer Leadership Institute for high school students from Cincinnati's inner city.

- Kids Voting Partnership. The Institute partners with Kids Voting Ohio to offer an annual program for about 200 high school students drawn from schools throughout the Columbus metropolitan area.

- Living Learning Program. The Institute's Living Learning Program offers curricular and co-curricular experiences focused on public service and public policy for about 60 Ohio State freshmen and sophomores, living in University residence halls. Juniors and seniors often maintain their ties with the program and continue to participate in activities and classes.

- Washington Academic Internship Program. The Institute's premier academic offering allows Ohio State juniors and seniors to spend a full quarter working and studying in Washington, D.C. Students pursue internships tailored to their interests, as well as a series of rigorous policy seminars.

- NEW Leadership Ohio. This week-long summer institute enrolls college women interested in elected office or other public leadership positions. The program draws women from colleges and universities throughout Ohio and is part of a national network of similar programs.

- International Essay Competition. The Institute and School jointly sponsor an essay competition for college juniors and seniors worldwide. Students submit essays based on a policy topic announced each year. Prizes are awarded to both U.S. and international entries.

- Master of Public Administration. This two-year, full-time program prepares students with a BA for a career in public service. Most students have not yet worked extensively in government or other jobs. About 12% of the MPA students are international. About 40 students receive the MPA each year.

- Dual and Joint Degree Master of Arts Programs. The School participates in one joint degree program, the Joint MA in Arts Policy and Administration, and several dual degree programs. The latter programs include programs with Social Work, City and Regional Planning, Health Services Management and Policy, Natural Resources, and Law.

- In-Career Master of Arts. This flexible MA program allows individuals with 3-5 years of significant post-college work experience to prepare for positions of
leadership in public, nonprofit, and private organizations. Students can complete the program in four quarters of full-time study, although many opt to pursue the degree on a part-time basis. Part-time students usually complete the degree in two years. About 70 students are enrolled in this program at any time.

- **Kiplinger Program in Public Affairs Journalism.** Starting in January 2005, six mid-career journalists will join the Institute community for six months each year, pursuing courses to refine their skills in public affairs reporting. Some journalists may choose to remain longer than six months, earning an MA in one of several fields.

- **Management Development Programs.** The Institute offers a large number of non-degree programs for public-sector managers. Offerings range from one-time, customized seminars to certificate programs spanning two years. More than 2000 individuals participate in these programs annually. Programs include:
  - Management Advancement for the Public Service (MAPS), a series of approximately 50 seminars offered each academic year. Most seminars are full-day. Individuals may register to attend a single seminar, but many agencies purchase subscriptions to support multiple attendance by their workers.
  - Ohio Certified Public Manager Program. This program enhances the skills of public sector managers through a two-year program of study, work-related projects, and testing that leads to a nationally recognized certificate. The Institute manages all Central Ohio cohorts in the program.
  - L2000+ Leadership Academy. This nine-month certificate program offers leadership training to emerging leaders in the mental health and addiction services field. It serves as a model for certificate programs tailored to other policy areas.
  - Ohio City/County Management Association. As Secretariat of the Association, the Institute organizes two conferences each year and produces the Association's newsletter. These activities provide continuing education to city and county officials throughout the state.
  - Custom Programs. Each year the Institute designs and implements customized training programs for 25-30 public agencies, schools, or other nonprofit organizations. The groups request education on a wide variety of leadership and other topics.

- **Training for Candidates and Elected Officials.** The Institute leads a consortium including four other Ohio policy institutes that offers training to newly elected members of the Ohio General Assembly in even-numbered years. The Institute also offers periodic training to mayors, city council members, and county
commissioners. A new program, debuting in April 2004, will offer nonpartisan training on campaign management for candidates seeking their first public office.

- Doctor of Philosophy in Public Administration. Doctoral students prepare for a career in teaching and scholarly research at the university level or for research positions in government and other institutions. One or two students earn the Ph.D. in Public Administration each year.

Synergies

Combining programs from the John Glenn Institute and School of Public Policy and Management creates a continuous spectrum of public affairs education. Students and faculty in each of the programs can draw strength from new developments at other levels. An existing graduate course, for example, may stimulate development of an undergraduate or pre-college course. Seminars offered through Management Development Programs may highlight topics that should be included in regular degree offerings. Instructors may move from one program to another, benefiting themselves and their students from the opportunity to teach across different audiences.

The programs also feed students from one level to another. The Institute’s high school programs build interest in its college offerings. The college offerings may encourage students to pursue a graduate degree. Students enrolled in the graduate programs, as well as alumni of those programs, will develop interest in the nondegree training programs. Public managers enrolled in the latter programs may decide to pursue a graduate degree.

The combined programs, finally, offer an excellent platform for creating new types of instruction or degree programs, such as an undergraduate minor in public policy and/or a 3/2 program that would allow qualified undergraduates to obtain both their BA and MA in five years.

Research

The Glenn Institute and School of Public Policy and Management combine a wide variety of research assets and opportunities. These range from research conducted by tenured faculty members to a unique partnership formed with the City of Columbus and United Way of Central Ohio to conduct applied research. The spectrum of research opportunities includes:

- Research by Full-Time Faculty. The School’s nine tenured and tenure-track faculty members each maintain active research programs. Their work is complemented by the ongoing research of the Director of the Glenn Institute, who maintains a research agenda as a tenured faculty member.
• Adjunct and Emeritus Faculty. The School enjoys links with two dozen adjunct, courtesy, and emeritus professors. Research by these faculty members contributes to faculty colloquia and other initiatives at the School.

• Scholarly Journals. Bert Rockman, Director of PPM, co-edits Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions. Other PPM faculty have edited scholarly journals during their careers and have the capability to bring or establish such journals at OSU.

• John Glenn Scholars in Public Policy Research. The Institute names 4-8 John Glenn Scholars each year through a competition. Scholars are leading OSU faculty members from different departments. Each Scholar completes at least one work on a significant policy issue. Beginning in 2005, Scholars will have offices in Page Hall for the year of their research support, contributing to interdisciplinary discussion among them, the School’s full-time faculty, and other residents of Page Hall.

• John Glenn Social Capital Scholars. Social Capital Scholars, like Scholars in Public Policy Research, are chosen from leading Ohio State faculty members. These Scholars conduct projects that both build social capital within Ohio and contribute to our academic understanding of social capital. Like the Scholars in Public Policy Research, Social Capital Scholars will be housed in Page Hall.

• Kiplinger Program in Public Affairs Journalism. The mid-career journalists participating in this program each pursue a significant work of public affairs research. Fellows are chosen based largely on the quality of the research projects they propose. They are housed in Page Hall to interact with other policy researchers and contribute their own research perspectives.

• Doctoral and Masters Students. Doctoral students conduct research of publishable quality. Each MPA student likewise completes a policy paper that analyzes a real policy problem posed by a public, quasi-public, or nonprofit agency.

• Interdisciplinary workshops and colloquia. These sessions feature School faculty and students, as well as faculty from other OSU units and schools around the world.

• John Glenn Scholars in Service-Learning. The Institute names 10 Scholars in this category each year. Unlike other John Glenn Scholars, these researchers are drawn from an international pool of applicants. The program allows the Institute both to encourage research contributing to the understanding and adoption of service-learning and to establish links with scholars at other institutions. Scholars in Service-Learning do not reside at Ohio State, but the Institute encourages visits and links with these Scholars. We also feature the work of these Scholars on the Institute’s website.
John Glenn Archives. The collected papers of Senator John Glenn offer a unique resource for public policy scholars. In addition to housing the archives, the University is pursuing other paper collections from Ohio elected officials to build the Ohio Congressional Archives.

National Regulatory Research Institute. The School is closely affiliated with this Institute, which is the official research arm of state regulatory commissions nationwide.

Conferences. The Glenn Institute has sponsored two major research conferences, one on Judicial Independence and the other on the Second Amendment. Both conferences generated published volumes of papers. Opportunities exist for an annual major research conference and associated publications.

Policy Initiatives. The Institute hosts six different policy centers and initiatives. These include:

- Center for Criminal Justice Research
- Center for Urban and Regional Analysis
- Environmental Policy Initiative
- Center for Health Outcomes, Policy, and Evaluation Studies (HOPES)
- P-12 Education Initiative
- Second Amendment Research Center

The Institute’s relationship with these centers varies from in-house operation (the Second Amendment Research Center) to looser affiliations. As the Institute moves to Page Hall, it can become a focal point for policy discussions and research sponsored by many of these centers. Integration of the Institute and School will also facilitate greater interaction of these centers with public policy faculty and graduate students.

Affiliated Faculty. The Institute has more than 180 affiliated faculty members from more than 50 different academic departments. Each of these faculty members has expressed a strong interest in public service and/or public policy. These faculty offer a resource for research initiatives of all kinds.

Community Research Partners. CRP is an independent, nonprofit organization formed by the Glenn Institute, the City of Columbus, and the United Way of Central Ohio. Operating out of offices in downtown Columbus, CRP collects data, performs research, and conducts evaluations related to a wide range of human services and public policy issues. The ongoing partnership of academia, government, and philanthropy to conduct applied research on public policy issues is virtually unique. CRP has conducted projects throughout Ohio and is starting to attract national attention.
Synergies

Combining these two research portfolios will strengthen the research of these units and of policy research at Ohio State generally. Integration of the two units both organizationally and physically in Page Hall will bring together many of the above researchers—faculty, graduate students, John Glenn Scholars, Kiplinger Fellows—for interdisciplinary interactions and collaboration. The physical setting, combined with the research anchor provided by a degree-granting School, will draw affiliated faculty and members of policy centers into greater association with this policy center on the Oval.

We will be able to combine the School's history of scholarly workshops and colloquia with the Institute's greater number of affiliated faculty and policy centers. This should generate a particularly exciting series of scholarly workshops. We have already talked about how the Second Amendment Research Center might capitalize on the combined units to begin offering a series of discussions focused on "History, the Constitution, and Public Policy." We hope that the new School, combined with the excellent facilities in Page II Hall, will encourage other affiliated policy initiatives to use Page II Hall for their colloquium series. The Policy Forum, Lounge Library, and/or Board Room might become a regular setting for policy colloquia of all kinds.

Faculty at the School have experience editing scholarly journals. Combining that experience with the breadth of the Institute's programs should generate additional opportunities to create or edit policy journals or a book series at Ohio State.

Two unique organizations associated with these units—the National Regulatory Institute and Community Research Partners—will also develop more extensive links through the combination of the units. These organizations can have an even broader impact on campus and in raising Ohio State's research profile by interacting with the larger community of scholars created by the merger.

The Kiplinger Fellows offer a special opportunity to expand both creation and dissemination of scholarly research. Each Fellow will pursue a public affairs project of his or her own. Conducting that research in the context of both a School of Public Affairs and a mix of visiting scholars will be particularly stimulating for the Fellows, producing first-rate works. The Fellows, in turn, will stimulate deeper research by other scholars through their interactions and will serve a particularly important role in disseminating research produced by the new School and other Ohio State policy researchers.

The new School's research capabilities will also have positive effects on its teaching mission—and vice versa. The Institute and School already integrate teaching and research within their separate organizations, but combining the two units will multiply those effects. A large group of researchers—ranging from full-time faculty focused on public policy and administration to public affairs journalists to affiliated faculty with expertise in specific policy areas—will be available to speak to classes and
mentor students. Students will participate in scholarly colloquia, as well as in informal discussions among researchers.

The Washington Academic Internship Program already offers a strong undergraduate experience in research and writing; papers from this Program often form the basis of senior papers or of published articles. Through the new School, we will be able to expand research opportunities for undergraduates, both through informal interactions and through policy research and writing seminars.

The School’s expanded research capabilities likewise will stimulate educational offerings for public sector leaders and other nondegree students. The Institute’s Management Development Programs already draws upon some School faculty for training sessions or referrals to other teachers. Combining the units within one organization will provide expanded opportunities to use full-time faculty in nondegree programs—as well as to use excellent instructors from the nondegree programs as adjunct faculty or lecturers at the School. Students pursuing certificates, one-day seminars, or other nondegree opportunities will know that the programs are backed, not just by the excellence of Management Development Programs, but by the full resources of a nationally ranked School of Public Affairs.

Engagement

The Institute and School each pursue numerous distinctive forms of engagement. Again, combining the units will create a particularly comprehensive platform for community engagement centered on public service and public policy.

- Strategic Policy Initiatives. Both the Institute and the School have spearheaded strategic initiatives to explore policy changes in Ohio and throughout the world. For example, the Institute joined with Ohio’s Chief Justice, the League of Women Voters, the Ohio State Bar Association, and the Bliss Institute to explore changes in Ohio’s system of electing judges. A public forum, series of working groups, and other meetings produced a set of recommendations that are being considered by the appropriate public bodies. Similarly, two faculty members from the School organized a Community Partnership Grantmaking Program to assist South African local governments, NGOs, educational institutions, and community groups to create community partnership grant making programs. All faculty members from the School have engaged in numerous initiatives of this nature over time.

- Professional Reports, Consultations, and Training Manuals. School faculty members regularly prepare reports on issues of concern to local, state, national, foreign, and international organizations. They also prepare training manuals to guide government and nonprofit leaders in numerous contexts, and consult widely with organizations involved in public policy issues.
- Center for Learning Excellence. This Center supports several state initiatives contributing to K-12 education. In particular, CLEX promotes the use of best practices in education, mental health, substance abuse, delinquency and violence prevention, and family supports.

- Best Practices Awards for Community Action Agencies. The Institute manages this annual competition for recognition among community action agencies. The awards stimulate innovative, efficient, and responsive programs. Associations of Community Action Agencies in several other states have expressed interest in emulating the program. The initiative also serves as a model for other award programs that might stimulate excellence in the public sector.

- Student Internships. High school, college, and masters students all pursue public service internships through Institute and School programs. While enhancing their own academic understanding, these students also contribute to community and public service goals. Offices in Washington, D.C., and throughout the Columbus metropolitan area rely on our students’ professional contributions.

- Policy Briefings. The Institute offers occasional policy briefings to members of the Ohio General Assembly and other policy makers. This format allows the University to feature the work of its researchers while making a direct contribution to current problems.

- Public Lectures. The Institute’s popular lectures introduce policy makers and community members to leaders in government, business, education, the humanities, and other fields. Lectures are combined with a lunch or reception so that community members have an opportunity to mingle with students, faculty, and the featured speakers.

- Washington Policy Salons. The Institute’s Washington office hosts an evening policy salon each fall, winter, and spring quarter. The salons engage OSU alumni, students participating in the Washington Academic Internship Program, and Washington policymakers in discussions of current policy topics.

Synergies

The Institute and School are already among the most active units on campus in community engagement. Engagement is central to the teaching and research missions of a School of Public Affairs, and both of these units already weave engagement into those functions. Despite their small size, both have also gained repute in the community for their engagement. In the case of the School, that repute is global—with several projects having been undertaken overseas.

Combining these units will expand opportunities for further engagement by creating a greater resource base; deepen existing engagement by bringing together faculty
and policymakers from the different units; and offer a stronger focus for policy-related engagement at Ohio State. The combination will enhance research and teaching within the two units as well.

The engagement synergies from this merger may be particularly important in supporting Ohio State’s attempts to leverage its extensive campuswide engagement, which persistently appears smaller than the sum of the many parts. Ohio State is too large to bring all engagement efforts under a single umbrella—much though some community members wish there were a single “portal” to the University. The new School, however, can become one of a few significant portals for engagement. With a tenured faculty of its own, ties to Ohio State’s major interdisciplinary initiatives, links to hundreds of faculty campuswide, offices in downtown Columbus (Community Research Partners) and Washington, D.C. (the Institute’s office), and a strong history of tying engagement to both research and teaching, the new School will offer a particularly powerful center for engagement.

Ohio State currently is leveraging its engagement in several ways; for a University of this size, several mechanisms are necessary. The extension program, a new Vice Presidential office of Outreach and Engagement, interdisciplinary centers around campus, and efforts in individual colleges all play essential roles. The one resource that Ohio State currently lacks in helping provide a focus for its engagement, however, is an academic unit that has a strong focus on engagement, integrates that engagement with research and teaching, and has strong ties with other academic units campuswide.

Engagement efforts in existing academic units tend to focus on that unit or, at most, the College of which the unit is a part. Interdisciplinary initiatives that pursue engagement, like the Glenn Institute itself, have contacts with faculty in multiple units but their lack of independent academic status reinforces the notion that engagement is something one does outside of one’s regular research and teaching. It is particularly difficult to integrate engagement and teaching when the engagement occurs outside of an academic unit. Campuswide initiatives, finally, like the proposed Office of Outreach and Engagement, can help coordinate and inform engagement campuswide but they suffer from some of the same limits that handicap interdisciplinary initiatives: because these campuswide initiatives are not academic units, they reinforce the notion that engagement occurs outside of one’s regular teaching and research.

An interdisciplinary academic unit with genuine ties to departments around campus, as well as a strong engagement mission, adds an essential missing link to Ohio State’s efforts to leverage its community engagement. Other universities use autonomous schools of public affairs to supply that link. Again, it is not the only essential ingredient to create strong university-wide engagement, but it is a significant assist. The John Glenn School of Public Affairs can provide that link for Ohio State, complementing the other excellent engagement work supported in individual departments, interdisciplinary initiatives, and campus-wide efforts.
### Appendix B

**Top Schools of Public Affairs: Reporting Lines**

This table summarizes the reporting lines of the top 45 schools of public affairs, as ranked by *U.S. News and World Report* in April 2004. The *U.S. News* ranking in this field depends solely on peer evaluations and corresponds closely with other rankings of schools in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Reporting Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Syracuse University, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs</td>
<td>One of thirteen autonomous schools or colleges. The others are Arts and Sciences, Graduate, Law, Architecture, Education, Engineering and Computer Science, Human Services and Health Professions, Information Studies, Management, Public Communications, Visual and Performing Arts, and Continuing Education. Notably, the Maxwell School includes the social science departments at Syracuse University. The school, however, was founded as a school of public affairs—the first graduate school of public affairs in the nation—and the social science departments serve that mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government</td>
<td>One of ten autonomous schools. Other schools are Arts and Sciences, Divinity, Business, Law, Education, Design, Medicine, Public Health, and Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Indiana University-Bloomington, School of Public and Environmental Affairs</td>
<td>One of eighteen autonomous schools or divisions. The others are: Arts and Sciences, Labor Studies, Graduate, Business, Continuing Studies, Education, Fine Arts, Health Physical Education and Recreation, Informatics, Journalism, Law, Library and Information Science, Music,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University of Georgia, School of Public and International Affairs</th>
<th>Nursing, Optometry, Social Work, University. One of fourteen autonomous schools or colleges. The others are Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Environment and Design, Family and Consumer Sciences, Forest Resources, Graduate School, Journalism and Mass Communications, Law, Pharmacy, Social Work, and Veterinary Medicine. The School of Public and International Affairs was founded as an autonomous unit in 2001 as a way of bringing more prominence to Georgia’s public affairs work. The School includes three departments: International Affairs, Political Science, and Public Administration and Policy. According to Tom Lauth, Dean of the School of Public and International Affairs, the School grew out of the former Political Science Department, located within the College of Arts and Sciences. The Department included a particularly strong—and nationally well ranked—public administration program. To give that program more visibility, the University created the new School, with its Dean reporting to the Provost. As noted above, Political Science is now one of three departments within the School.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Princeton University, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs</td>
<td>An autonomous school reporting directly to the Provost. Other units reporting to the Provost are the College, Graduate School, School of Engineering, and School of Architecture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of California-Berkeley, Richard and Rhoda Goldman School of</td>
<td>One of fourteen autonomous colleges and schools. The others are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>University/McName</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of Southern California, School of Policy, Planning, and Development</td>
<td>One of seventeen autonomous professional schools. The others are: Architecture, Business, Accounting, Cinema-Television, Communication, Dentistry, Education, Engineering, Fine Arts, Gerontology, Independent Health Professions, Law, Medicine, Music, Pharmacy, Social Work, and Theatre. In addition to these professional schools (as described by USC), there is a College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences and a Graduate School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University, H. John Heinz III School of Public Policy and Management</td>
<td>One of seven autonomous colleges or schools. The others are the Institute of Technology, Fine Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, Graduate School of Industrial Administration, Science, and Computer Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>University of Michigan-Ann Arbor, Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy</td>
<td>One of twenty autonomous academic units. The others are: Architecture and Urban Planning, Art and Design, Business, Dentistry, Education, Engineering, Graduate Studies, Information, Kinesiology, Law, Literature Science and the Arts, Medicine, Music, Natural Resources and Environment, Nursing, Officer Education (ROTC), Pharmacy, Public Health, and Social Work. This School dates from the early twentieth century, but was named after Ford in 2000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>American University, School of Public Affairs</td>
<td>One of six autonomous schools or colleges. The others are Arts and Sciences, Law, Business, Communications, and International Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Duke University, Terry Sanford Institute of Public Policy</td>
<td>The Institute reports to the School of Arts and Sciences, which includes departments analogous to those in our five colleges of the arts and sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>George Washington University, School of Public Policy and Public Administration</td>
<td>The School is part of the College of Arts and Sciences, which houses more than 70 departments. These departments correspond to all of those housed in Ohio State's five colleges of the arts and sciences, plus a few with medical (neuroscience, microbiology and tropical medicine) or business (organizational management) ties. The university, though, does have separate colleges of medicine and business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SUNY-Albany, Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy</td>
<td>One of nine autonomous colleges or schools. The others are: Arts and Sciences, Business, Education, Nanosciences and Nanoengineering, Information Science and Policy, Criminal Justice, Social Welfare, and Public Health. Notably, the College of Public Affairs and Policy has two departments: Public Administration and Policy, and Political Science. The College of Arts and Sciences does not have a Political Science Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Kansas, Public Administration Department</td>
<td>One of 53 departments and programs in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The College includes social science, natural science, and humanities departments. It is comparable in scope to our colleges of the arts and sciences, but without the arts departments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10 | University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, School of Government | One of thirteen autonomous schools on campus. The School, created in 2001, grew out of the Institute of Government, a unit established in 1931 to provide research and training for government officials in North Carolina, and the Master of Public Administration Program. According to the School's history on its website,
the "University created the School in 2001 to advance innovative public service and engagement at the University. In establishing the School, the University recognized the Institute of Government's distinguished 70-year history of practical scholarship for North Carolina state and local government . . . . And, it recognized the importance of training students for leadership in public service. The University raised the standing of these two programs by granting them the higher academic status of a school."

UNC also has a department of public policy, which grants both a BA and a PhD in public policy. That department is one of 42 units within the College of Arts and Sciences. It is the School of Government, however, that grants masters degrees and serves students most comparable to those in Ohio State's School of Public Policy and Management—and that is rated among Schools of Public Affairs.

<p>| 10 | University of Texas-Austin, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs | One of sixteen autonomous schools, colleges, and divisions. The others are: Architecture, Business, Communication, Continuing and Extended Education, Education, Engineering, Fine Arts, Graduate Studies, Information, Law, Liberal Arts, Natural Sciences, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Social Work |
| 17 | Georgetown University, Georgetown Public Policy Institute | A multi-disciplinary program within the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. The program grants its own degrees, offers its own courses, and has its own tenured faculty. The head of the unit is called the &quot;Dean.&quot; |
| 17 | New York University, Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public | One of about a dozen autonomous schools and colleges. The others |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Include Arts and Sciences, Business, Law, Dentistry, Medicine, Social Work, Education, and Arts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago, Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies</td>
<td>One of six autonomous professional schools. The others are Business, Law, Medicine, Divinity, and Social Service Administration. The University also has an Undergraduate College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison, LaFollette School of Public Affairs</td>
<td>One of 39 departments and 5 professional schools within the College of Letters and Sciences. The other professional schools are Journalism, Library and Information Studies, Music, and Social Work. The departments cover the full range of what our colleges in the federation of arts and sciences encompass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Los Angeles, UCLA School of Public Policy and Social Research</td>
<td>One of seven autonomous professional schools. The others are Arts &amp; Architecture, Education and Information Studies, Engineering and Applied Science, Law, Management, and Theatre Film and Television. The University also encompasses a College of Letters and Science and several Health Science Schools. The School was founded in 1994 around two prominent departments, those of Social Welfare and Urban Planning. Creation of the School through combination of these and other units was designed to bring greater visibility to policy studies at UCLA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Maryland-College Park, Maryland School of Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona State University, School of Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florida State University, Reubin O'D. Askew School of Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Georgia State University, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University, Institute for Policy Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Rutgers State University-Newark, Graduate Department of Public Administration, Public Affairs Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>University of Nebraska-Omaha, College of Public Affairs and Community Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>University of Washington, Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Virginia Tech, School of Public and International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>University of Kentucky, Martin School of Public Policy and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Cornell University, Cornell Institute for Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Indiana University-Perdue University-Indianapolis, School of Public and Environmental Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Northern Illinois University, Division of Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University-College Station, Bush School of Government and Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>University of Colorado-Denver, Graduate School of Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>University of Delaware, School of Urban Affairs and Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>University of Missouri-Columbia, Truman School of Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Cleveland State University, Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 42 | Naval Postgraduate School, Graduate School of Business and Public Policy | Reports to the Graduate School of Business and Public Policy, which is one of four autonomous schools. The major business degree within this...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>42</th>
<th>The Ohio State University, School of Public Policy and Management</th>
<th>Reports to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, one of eighteen autonomous colleges.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania, Fels Institute of Government</td>
<td>Originally founded in 1937 as part of the Wharton School of Finance. The Institute is now one of thirty-eight graduate programs in the Graduate Division of the College of Arts and Sciences. These programs encompass areas roughly equivalent to our five Colleges of Arts and Sciences. I.e., music, sociology, romance languages, astronomy, biology, and history are representative programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Participation of Students from Undergraduate Colleges in the John Glenn Institute’s Washington Academic Internship Program

This table notes the number of majors and minors from each College who have participated in the Glenn Institute’s Washington Academic Internship Program. This Program serves college juniors or seniors from any major. Many students have double majors or minors; those students are counted under each College in which they listed a major or minor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Majors</th>
<th>Minors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>History of Art, Art</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Microbiology, Biology</td>
<td>Zoology, Evolution, Ecology &amp; Organismal Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Pre-Education</td>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Engineering</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Aerospace Science, Computer and Information Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Human Ecology</td>
<td>Human Development and Family Science</td>
<td>English, Spanish, French, Italian, Women's Studies, History, Russian, German, Philosophy, Religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Humanities</td>
<td>Spanish, Women’s Studies, Italian, Medieval &amp; Renaissance Studies, English, History, French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Philosophy, African Studies, African-American studies, Film, Arabic</td>
<td>Studies, Finnish, Middle Eastern Studies, Classics, Black Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical and Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Math, Physics</td>
<td>Math, Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Health Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Military Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>Military Science &amp; Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Bert,

The faculty of the School of Public Policy and Management enthusiastically support and concur with the arguments for the merger as articulated in "The Case for Integrating the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy with the School of Public Policy and Management."

As a land-grant institution, the Ohio State University pursues the separate but mutually reinforcing goals of teaching, research, and service. The proposed merger will provide a venue to showcase the already rich portfolio of educational programs, scholarly research, and outreach and engagement activities that the School and the Institute now separately provide. Beyond highlighting these offerings, the merger will enrich and energize existing programs and activities, providing immediate benefits for students, the University and larger community. Importantly, this initiative will provide the University with the springboard to achieve greater visibility, attract higher-quality students and scholars, and a stronger claim to external resources and opportunities.

The merger of the School of Public Policy and the John Glenn Institute provides the University with the opportunity to strengthen its role as a leader not only in the generation of knowledge but in the conversion of that knowledge into action. It represents a tangible manifestation of Ohio State's commitment to scholarship in the public interest.

We urge swift approval of the merger.

Mary Manuel

Arvind Desai

Scholarship in the Public Interest
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Merritt, Deborah

From: kdvilt [kdvilt@osc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, February 03, 2004 2:58 PM
To: merritt.52@osu.edu
Subject: Re: Fwd: Open Forum on School Merger

Dr. Merritt...

I can't attend the meeting on Wednesday, but I think a merger between the two would be an excellent way to bring the School of Public Policy and Management up to par with the other prestigious Public Policy related groups on campus. It sounds like a great idea!

Thanks!

....Kendra

Carol Norton wrote:

Dear Students,

As background information for the upcoming open forum on the possible merger of SPPM and The John Glenn Institute, you may find it helpful to learn more about the JGI by visiting their website (www.gleninstitute.org) and to review the attached document making the case for joining the two units.

Hope you plan to attend the open forum! Details are included in the message below.

Thanks,

Carol

Date: Fri, 30 Jan 2004 13:16:09 -0500
To: schoolppm@lists.acs.ohio-state.edu, ppm.phd@lists.acs.ohio-state.edu
From: Carol Norton <norton.36@osu.edu>
Subject: Open Forum on School Merger
Cc: coreppmfaculty@lists.acs.ohio-state.edu, cinadr.1@osu.edu, merritt.52@osu.edu

OPEN FORUM FOR ALL PPM STUDENTS

TO DISCUSS

THE POSSIBLE MERGER OF SPPM AND THE JOHN GLENN INSTITUTE

ISSUES, ASPIRATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

WITH 65.

Prof. Berl Rockman, Chair
School of Public Policy and Management
The Ohio State University
300 Fisher Hall
Columbus, OH 43210

Dear Prof. Rockman:

It was with enthusiasm I heard about the possible merger of The Ohio State University's (OSU) School of Public Policy and Management (SPPM) and the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy (JGI).

As a community organization that works with both institutions on a regular basis by sending visiting international public policy practitioners and scholars to meet and train with faculty and staff, the International Visitors Council, Inc. (IVC) believes that a consolidation of these organizations would add tremendous value to students, alumni, visiting scholars, and the community at large. This merger would provide a "one-stop-shop" at OSU for public policy citizenship, training and research services and programs at all levels of education, which would provide a clearer message to the community and allow both groups to take mutual advantage of their strengths.

As a SPPM MA student myself I was actually amazed when I enrolled in the school that the school and institute were separate. I believe the marketing potential to attract new graduate (and hopefully undergraduate students) in the future be combining the institutions under the John Glenn name is immeasurable.

I encourage the Board of Trustees to give serious consideration to this proposed merger and look forward to working with the new John Glenn School of Public Affairs (or whatever name the combined institution would be dubbed).

Please contact me if you have any questions, phone (614) 225-9057, fax (614) 225-0656 or e-mail kevin@columbusivc.org or webb.58@osu.edu.

Sincerely yours,

Kevin R. Webb
Executive Director
Stephanie Bridwell  
11780 Clay Pike  
New Concord, OH 43762  

February 8, 2004  

Dr. Bert Rockman  
School of Public Policy and Management  
The Ohio State University  
2100 Neil Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  

Dear Dr. Rockman:  

I am writing today to express my support for the proposed merger between the School of Public Policy and Management and the John Glenn Institute. As a recent enrollee I have been well satisfied with the academic offerings of the School but would enjoy the increased access to public figures and the professional development opportunities that the John Glenn Institute could provide. The John Glenn Institute’s multidisciplinary connections would create more public policy research opportunities for students with broad interests. The merger would also increase awareness of the School to potential students and employers outside of Ohio which is especially important to raising the national profile of the School. These benefits alone merit serious consideration of this proposed merger by the Board of Trustees, and I truly hope the outcome is positive.

Best regards,  

Stephanie Bridwell  
OSU MPA Part-Time Student
February 13, 2004

Barbara Snyder,
Provost
The Ohio State University
200 Bricker Hall
CAMPUS

Dear Barbara,

I am writing to you in support of the proposed merger between The School of Public Policy and Management and The John Glenn Institute at The Ohio State University. I believe that this begins a process toward enhancing research and the teaching and study of public affairs at OSU and in promoting its visibility as a distinctive part of the OSU profile. This is a major way in which the University connects to the public and to those who help pay our bills in the legislature and Governor’s office. What, after all, can we do to connect our knowledge to public needs and to public attention? This merger is a way to begin the process of generating a more visible profile in public affairs for Ohio State, a way to bring complementary activities together, and a way to begin to create sustainability and viability for a public affairs school that for far too long has been neglected even while its alumni are sprinkled throughout critical positions across all levels of government, in the academic world, in non-profits, and even in the private sector.

There is already a good bit of buzz among our students on behalf of the merger, and you will hear from them later. I have read many of our admissions files, and quite a number of our applicants make mention of the John Glenn Institute as an attraction. Being a part of a newly merged operation with JGI will be that much more attractive as we will be able to plan and promote activities together. You will hear more from students at a later date as I am collecting their responses to an open forum that Debby Merritt and I conducted among our students. Please note for now the enclosed and highly enthusiastic accompanying letter from our faculty.

I have been careful to suggest that no one in PPM should expect miracles arising immediately from the merger. But with the merger, there may be a golden opportunity for the University to make the strides it needs to make to create an enhanced public affairs, and perhaps also international affairs, operation of the quality and size that most of our Big 10 competitors have. The fact is that we already have many of the elements here at OSU, but it is inadequately organized and fragmented. I hope that the present action will provide a platform on which to build a viable, high quality public
affairs entity that magnifies our University's prowess in research, teaching, and outreach, and enhances our ability to bridge the worlds of policy choice and policy analysis.

There is much enthusiasm at PPM for the merger, and we hope that we can move as expeditiously as possible on it.

warm regards,

Bert A. Rockman

attach

cc: Carole Anderson, Deborah Jones Merritt
Date: Fri, 13 Feb 2004 09:12:44 -0500
From: Nan Bozzolo <bozzolo.2@osu.edu>
Subject: SPPM Merger
To: "Burt A. Rockman" <rockman.1@osu.edu>
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
Original-recipient: rfc822;rockman.1@osu.edu

Dr. Rockman,

Thank you for taking the time to discuss the proposed merger with us. As a first-year MPA student, I continue to be impressed by the individual attention that we receive from our thoughtful faculty and staff.

I support the merger of our two programs without reservation. I believe that these two institutions can be far more effective as one unit. The benefits to the student body, the community and our field of study would be significant. Any potential problems should be weighed heavily against these great benefits and I am convinced that after doing so the university and our administrative body will agree that a merger is in the overall best interests of this university, its staff, and students.

Sincerely,

Nan Bozzolo
MPA student
School of Public Policy & Management
Date: Fri, 13 Feb 2004 11:10:40 -0600
From: JEFF ROSEN <rosen.67@osu.edu>
Subject: SPPM Glenn Institute Merger
To: rockman.1@osu.edu
X-Mailer: iPlanet Messenger Express 5.2 HotFix 1.14 (built Mar 18 2003)
X-Accept-Language: en
Priority: normal
Original-recipient: rfc822;rockman.1@osu.edu

Professor Rockman,

I am writing to express my enthusiastic support for the proposed merger between SPPM and the Glenn Institute. I think it presents a number of exciting opportunities for doctoral students. Foremost, I think this relationship has the potential to facilitate close interaction between doctoral students and the policy community, which I hope will help doctoral students develop better research agendas. Again, I think it is a great move for SPPM.

Jeffrey Rosen
February 18, 2004

Professor Bert A. Rockman
Director and Professor
School of Public Policy and Management
The Ohio State University
306E Fisher Hall
2109 Neil Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210-1144

Dear Professor Rockman:

On behalf of the students of the School of Public Policy and Management we would like to extend our support for a merger between the School and the John Glenn Institute. It is the opinion of the students listed below that the merger will provide long-term benefits for the School and their careers. We believe the added presence of a Washington D.C. office, and nationally recognizable name will aide students in earning internships and careers in prominent Washington offices.

The timing of a merger could not be better, with the remodeling of Page Hall and respective anniversaries of both the school and institute, the merger is practical. The relocation of the school and merger will help the school obtain a national name increasing the reputation of the institution and will give OSU a prominent place in the realm of public policy.

Sincerely,

Aaron Bloom
First Year MPA Student
The School of Public Policy and Management

[Signatures]
Please read and sign if you agree.

Dana
Camilla
John L.
Carrie

[Blank space for signature]

[Blank spaces for signature]

[Blank spaces for signature]

[Blank spaces for signature]

[Blank spaces for signature]
February 18, 2004

Ms. Barbara Snyder
Interim Executive Vice President and Provost
The Ohio State University
203 Bricker Hall
190 North Oval Mall
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Ms. Snyder:

We are writing to you on behalf of the Public Administration Student Association of the School of Public Policy and Management in support of the proposed integration of the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy with the School of Public Policy and Management. The students want to communicate our full support and anxious anticipation of the proposed merger to the Office of Academic Affairs.

Although situations like this are rare, this is one that appears to offer nothing but positive outcomes. The two institutions share a common goal in the promotion of public service and can jointly produce greater and more widespread results. In particular, the students look forward to an increase in available resources, in terms of knowledge, contacts and expertise, which can be gained from the current Glenn Institute. Also, we are eager to lend our scholarly experiences as graduate students, which are currently unavailable to the Glenn Institute, to aid the advancement of the joint institution in policy research and education.

The integration of the Glenn Institute and the School of Public Policy and Management would serve to catapult the resulting comprehensive program to rapid growth and national recognition. This benefits not only both institutions in their present form and their staff, faculty and students, but also the University as a whole as yet another program from Ohio State becomes a leader in its field. The Public Administration Student Association wholeheartedly lends its support to the proposed integration and appreciates your consideration.

Sincerely,

The Public Administration Student Association Executive Board

[Signatures]
February 21, 2004

Ms. Barbara Snyder
Interim Executive Vice President and Provost
The Ohio State University
203 Bricker Hall
190 North Oval Mall
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Ms. Snyder:

As a current graduate student in the In-career Master of Arts in Public Policy and Management program, I want to express my full support for the proposed merger of the School of Public Policy and Management and the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy.

After attending the recent information session with professors Deborah Merritt and Bert Rockman, I believe this merger will serve as a positive step for both the School and the Institute. The academic focus of the School of Public Policy and the mission of the Glenn Institute are very complementary. The combination of knowledge, staff and resources resulting from such a merger will benefit both as well as the students and elected public officials served by the respective programs.

If I may provide additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Mari-jean Siehl
I just wanted to pass along that I think this is a great opportunity for the John Glenn School of Public Affairs. As a senior in High School, I was in the first class of John Glenn Institute Interns, and now I am actually in a 3-2 program at the University at Albany, New York. After majoring in Political Science as an undergraduate, I am now obtaining my Masters in Public Administration, and working full time for a U.S. Senator's district office. Merging these programs at Ohio State will benefit all of the students as well as the program as a whole. I cannot stress enough how much I advocate such a program. If there is any way that I can be helpful in the support of these opportunities, please let me know. Thanks for allowing us to weigh in!

Bethany Lesser
April 19, 2004

Dr. Bert Rockman  
Director and Professor  
School of Public Policy and Management  
300E Fisher Hall  
2100 Neil Avenue  
Ohio State University  
Columbus, OH 43210-1144

Dear Bert:

I am writing as a follow up to our conversation at the recent ASPA meeting in Portland. As an alumnus, I care deeply about the School of Public Policy and Management and would welcome nothing more than its return to the vitality and prominence it has historically enjoyed. I believe we have a largely congruent view of the problems facing the School: (1) lack of a critical mass in faculty; (2) loss of visibility; and (3) structural arrangements that limit the School's capacity to develop toward success.

Critical Mass

I was dismayed to learn from you that the core faculty in SPPM now stands at seven. This is about 50% less than the peak numbers of the past and, frankly, is close to the minimum needed for viability let alone vitality. Over the past decade, many institutions have made substantial investments in public policy and management—examples among public universities include Texas A&M, Georgia, Arizona, and the University of Missouri—and, as a result, the bar has been raised considerably. In this environment, it is no surprise that Ohio State has declined in its overall ranking. More critically, so small a faculty will have a harder time attracting the best students or establishing itself at the cutting-edge of research.

I don't believe there is a magic number (and there are a number of excellent schools with relatively small faculty complements), but clearly SPPM needs to get bigger. You will appreciate that this growth must be targeted, both as to field and rank. However, I would argue that a very strong case can be made for hiring at the senior level. Ohio State has not really replaced the recent losses of its most senior people, neither through in-house development nor outside hires. In many ways, such hires could be a vital shot-in-the-arm for SPPM.

Visibility

The situation with faculty numbers contributes to the declining visibility of the School. Not so long ago, SPPM was a leader in the public affairs community, largely by virtue of the
accomplishments of its faculty and alumni. As the circle of leading schools has grown over time, the School’s visibility and influence has declined relative to its peers. Your appointment as director has helped in this regard, but additional steps will be needed for Ohio State to regain the leadership role it once had.

Structural Arrangements

The location of SPPM within the Ohio State structure has been a problem for nearly twenty years. Relationships within the College of Business were strained when I was a student during the early 1980s and they obviously deteriorated thereafter. My sense from you and others at Ohio State is that the current placement of the School within the College of Social and Behavioral Science has been no less problematic.

Ohio State is not alone in struggling with the placement of its public affairs program. At Missouri, for example, we spent many years languishing at the margins of the Business School. The establishment of the Truman School as an autonomous entity was crucial for our growth and development. The public affairs/public administration programs at Wisconsin, Arizona, Kansas, Georgia, and Florida State have also experienced structural challenges. While there are many ways of organizing these programs, there is much evidence that autonomous status confers important, positive benefits. Without autonomous status, it is much harder for programs to build distinctive excellence or carry out the multidisciplinary scholarship, professionally-focused educational programs, and engagement with the policy community called for by their missions.

The Future

Bert, I am delighted that Ohio State is considering the consolidation of SPPM and the John Glenn Institute. I think that this makes terrific sense for both units and sets out a framework for addressing the issues I’ve raised above. Within the context of a Glenn School, there would seem to be a clear path ahead for building a stronger faculty cohort, restoring the School’s visibility and leadership (both within Ohio State and the public affairs community), and resolving the longstanding structural issues. I am confident that SPPM alumni would share my enthusiasm for this exciting development. Please let me know if I can do anything to help.

Sincerely,

Bert

Barton Wechsler
Director and Professor of Public Affairs
May 28, 2004

Barbara Snyder  
Executive Vice President and Provost  
The Ohio State University  
200 Bricker Hall  
190 North Oval Mall  
CAMPUS

Dear Barbara:

I add my wholehearted support to the enthusiasm that students, faculty, staff, alumni, and community members have expressed over the last year for consolidation of the John Glenn Institute with the School of Public Policy and Management to create a John Glenn School of Public Affairs. The merger will bring together two excellent programs that can create an outstanding School of Public Affairs for Ohio State. Combining the programs will allow the University to further all six points of its Academic Plan without investing new resources in the combined unit.

Our scheduled move to Page Hall, as well as the maturation of the Institute (which will soon mark its fifth anniversary), make this an ideal time to consolidate the programs. As I have talked with alumni and other friends of Ohio State around the country, I am impressed by the enthusiasm expressed for this proposal. Our supporters outside the University are genuinely excited by the prospect of a John Glenn School of Public Affairs at Ohio State. As you know, the Glenn Institute’s Board of Directors unanimously supports the proposal as well.

The most important points about this proposal, however, are that it is a “bottom up” initiative from the faculty and staff and that it is strongly supported by students in both units. Members of the Institute and School have talked informally about combining our two units since I joined the Glenn Institute in July 2000. The current proposal began to take shape last fall when the Director and faculty of the School of Public Policy and Management expressed strong and unanimous interest in consolidating their unit with the Glenn Institute. The proposal arose naturally from several initiatives we were undertaking jointly at the time, such as our move to Page Hall, our international essay competition, and some of our undergraduate initiatives. Staff members in both units likewise have endorsed the proposal without reservations. And the response from our students and alumni has been overwhelming in its enthusiasm.

If, as the proposal requests, a John Glenn School of Public Affairs reporting to the Provost is established, and if I am offered a tenured appointment in the new School, I will resign my chair and tenured line in the Moritz College of Law to accept the new appointment. I have...
very much enjoyed serving with Moritz's fine faculty—and hope to maintain ties with my colleagues in Law—but I can imagine no greater honor than joining the faculty of a John Glenn School of Public Affairs.

Please let me know if I can provide any further information about the proposal.

Sincerely yours,

Deborah J. Merritt
Director and John Deaver Drinko/Baker & Hostetler Chair in Law

DJM/bj
MEMORANDUM

TO: Vice Provost Randy Smith for the Council on Academic Affairs

FROM: Paul A. Beck, Dean

SUBJECT: SBS Response to Glenn-PPM Proposal

DATE: August 27, 2004

At your invitation, I am writing in response to the July 8, 2004, proposal to merge the School of Public Policy and Management (PPM) with the John Glenn Institute (JGI) and to change the reporting line of the merged school from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences to the Office of Academic Affairs. As I see it, there are three major issues for the Council on Academic Affairs to engage and resolve in reviewing this proposal: the merger, the change in reporting line, and the oversight of academic programs and curriculum. In the following pages, I support the merger but contend that SBS is the logical home for the proposed merged School and that college oversight is essential for ensuring the fit of its academic program and curriculum into broader University priorities.

1. The merger between JGI and PPM. This merger makes good sense, and I support it. It is enthusiastically endorsed by members of both units – faculty and students in PPM and the Director, staff, and advisory committee in JGI. Each unit brings valuable strengths to the table, and the merger has the potential to create a whole that will be stronger than the simple sum of its two parts. The School of Public Policy and Management (a) delivers academic programs at the graduate level; (b) contains a core of 8 faculty1 who teach, provide service, and conduct research in public policy and management; and (c) has a loyal alumni base and national standing as a school of public policy and administration. The John Glenn Institute (a) runs non-degree training programs for public-sector managers, candidates for public office, and elected officials; (b) maintains co-curricular programs at OSU (e.g., a living learning program, the Speech and Debate team, its newly-acquired Kiplinger Program in Public Affairs Journalism); (c) offers contacts and programming experience through public-service internship programs for high school students here in Ohio and OSU students in Washington, DC and the summer programs and institutes in which it participates (e.g.,

1This faculty count includes Andy Keeler, hired as an untenured associate professor in Summer 2004, and the retirements of full professors Doug Jones and Sven Lundstedt.
for high school students in Cincinnati, for college women in Ohio); and (d) participates in nationwide civic and engagement programs.

Although not all of the JGI programs naturally contribute to the mission of a graduate school of public affairs, returning training programs for public officials to the proposed School\(^2\) would provide a valuable complement to its graduate teaching programs and the sharing of its staff resources would be especially helpful to the School. Involving the Director of JGI as a faculty member would strengthen its core faculty by adding a second full professor to the current PPM Director, to provide leadership for the new school and bring it a distinguished scholar in law and public policy. Beginning in December, JGI and PPM will be collocated in a renovated Page Hall, which will increase the ties between them and make their merger even more natural. There is always the threat that a concentration on JGI's non-academic programs might dilute the academic focus of the merged School, but I think we can depend upon its leadership and the continuing commitment of School faculty to their master's and doctoral programs to avoid that outcome.

2. The Reporting Line to OAA. The case for a merger is much stronger than the justification for changing the reporting line of PPM from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) to OAA. SBS, the home of PPM since it moved from the College of Business seven years ago (in 1997), would welcome the proposed School, and it should remain there even after the merger.

Following Provost Ray's admonition to decentralize budget responsibility as much as possible under the new budgeting system, SBS gives its departments and schools extensive autonomy in handling their own affairs. Because they are treated as budget responsibility centers, the new school (like PPM currently) would retain authority over its revenues and responsibility for its costs, subject only to a small College tax on the net growth in its general funds budget.\(^3\) Under current College policy, all indirect cost recoveries and income earned through income-generating accounts flow untaxed to the unit generating them, so the proposed school would not see any diversion of its grant and contract income to other purposes. Such budgeting practices would be conducive to the development of the merged unit and would protect the integrity of existing Glenn Institute and PPM programs.

The College also has extensive experience with research centers and currently hosts three centers that are deeply involved in research on public policy— the Center for Human Resource Research (CHRR), the Center for Urban and Regional Analysis (CURA), and the Center for Criminal Justice Research (CJRC). Beyond its centers, many SBS faculty are engaged in policy research, teaching, and service. All in all, the new school would benefit from its association with SBS as it works to strengthen its

\(^2\) Much of this training was originally provided by PPM and was shifted to the Glenn Institute when it was created in 1998-99.

\(^3\) Because PPM has had little revenue growth overall since the inception of the new budgeting system, the tax it paid to the College, on net, has been very close to $0.
faculty and its programs, just as SBS would benefit from having a thriving school of public affairs within it.

If the new school is not located in SBS, where would it be located? The proposal requests that the merged unit report directly to OAA. University Faculty Rule 3335-3-34(D)(4) provides that a “school, with the exception of the graduate school, shall be responsible to a college for administrative purposes.” To make an exception to this rule for the new school might open the door for other units, dissatisfied with their location or their status, to seek to become autonomous “college-like” units. This may make sense for a unit that is in transition to becoming a college, but it makes little sense for a small school, as the 1983 CAA Guidelines for Determining College Status (IVA) acknowledge:

“an organization wishing to attain college status should meet the following minimum quantitative requirements unless persuasive academic reasons demonstrate the need for exceptions: (A.) Fifty regular FTE faculty spread through the three academic ranks from assistant professor to professor. At least 50 percent of these shall have attained tenure. (B.) An annual budget of at least three million dollars (or $7.15M in 2004 dollars). (C.) Graduate 100 professional or undergraduate students annually. (D.) At least three departments or academic faculties.”

The proposed new school does not come close to qualifying as a college on these grounds, so there must be other reasons to justify a direct reporting line to OAA.

A compelling rationale for by-passing University rules and guidelines is not to be found in following the lead of peer universities. It turns out that there is no single model for the reporting lines of public affairs schools at other universities that OSU can replicate, nor is it at all plausible that a change in reporting line would be sufficient to catapult the new school into a ranking commensurate with those of public affairs schools at OSU’s peer universities. The 44 schools of public affairs currently ranked ahead of or tied with PPM follow four different organizational models:

**Model I:** Sixteen are autonomous colleges of public affairs or public policy in the sense that they report to the equivalent of our provost and have their own faculty. The best of them have very large faculties: e.g., over 100 at Harvard, about 50 at Indiana.

**Model II:** Six are free-standing colleges of the Model I type but largely draw faculty from other units, who are jointly appointed with the school.

**Model III:** Eight are autonomous colleges like those of Model I but combine two or more different disciplinary departments under a school of public affairs umbrella. The top-ranked Maxwell School essentially is Syracuse’s college of
social sciences. Several others (e.g., Georgia, American, SUNY-Albany) include departments of political science and public administration.

**Model IV:** Fifteen (including Duke, George Washington, and Kansas) report directly to a college—usually the college of arts and sciences, but sometimes the graduate school (for graduate program schools) or a social science college.5

With but nine prospective faculty after the merger, only two of whom would be full professors, the proposed school is presently too small to stand alone outside of a college structure. There appear to be no plans or resources from OAA or the Glenn Institute to make the kind of investment necessary to have its faculty size approach that of the top Model I schools. Under these circumstances, it needs to be linked to and to draw strength and support from one or more of the existing OSU colleges.

The current home of PPM, the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, is the natural place to locate the proposed School. More of PPM’s current no-salary courtesy faculty come from SBS than from any other College; 6 of its 13 “no salary” full professors are in SBS. The current Glenn Institute to draws more upon SBS faculty than those from any other college. Of the 191 affiliated faculty and staff listed on its web page, 71 come from SBS departments/schools – 59 of 179 (one-third) excluding the present PPM faculty.6 More significantly, six of the first eight Scholars in Public Policy Research selected by the Glenn Institute were drawn from SBS departments outside of PPM. There are other loci of public policy and public affairs strength across OSU’s various colleges, but no single one of them offers the concentration of public policy and public affairs specialists that SBS does.

One attractive way to expand the faculty strength of the proposed Glenn School is for it to make joint faculty appointments with other departments—in SBS and other colleges.7 SBS welcomes joint appointments, and its departments have made them with units inside and outside of the College. SBS culture and practice would encourage the proposed School to draw jointly appointed faculty from wherever on the campus seems relevant. Moreover, the new school could benefit from the high national standing of the SBS departments most relevant to a school of public affairs.

---

4 The Maxwell School contains the departments of Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Political Science, Public Administration, and Sociology.
5 It is important to bear in mind that the social sciences at most universities are contained in a large college of arts and sciences, so a social and behavioral sciences college is not available to provide the home for a school of public affairs or public policy in most cases.
6 Another 21 affiliated faculty come from other colleges in the Arts and Sciences. The college with the second highest number of Glenn Institute affiliated faculty/staff is the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences with a total of 18.
7 PPM currently has no such joint appointments among its core faculty. The current PPM Director was strongly encouraged by the College to pursue this strategy when he took over in 2001-02, but the School chose to invest its faculty hiring resources in faculty with 1.0 FTE appointments in the unit.
In 1997-98, the School of Public Policy and Management was moved from the School of Business, where it had been located since its creation in 1969, to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. PPM faculty voted unanimously (11 to 0) in favor of the move, and its student organizations supported it as well. SBS faculty approved the merger by a vote of 163 yes, 15 no, with 2 abstentions and 1 invalid ballot. As stated in the January 11, 1997, Proposal for Relocation (page 3):

"The core of the rationale for the relocation of the School ... to [SBS] is the complementary missions and the excellent match of interests in research, teaching, and service. The School takes a broad multidisciplinary approach to public policy and management, an approach consistent with the diversity of interests in SBS. Programmatic initiatives by the PPM faculty will find natural linkages with the faculty and programs in SBS. Similarly, many SBS faculty members are interested in the topics covered by PPM, and SBS programmatic initiatives that are policy relevant will now link more easily with PPM."

This rationale applies no less today than it did seven years ago, and SBS is prepared to devote even more attention than it has in the past to fulfilling it.

With the lone exception of the School of Public Health, which is on its way to becoming a college, all schools and departments at OSU report directly to a college. The inclusion of academic units within a college structure is important for upholding University standards in appointments, promotion, and tenure. Peer review of faculty within departments and for purposes of promotion and tenure by faculty in cognate departments within the same college are vital first steps in ensuring that comparable standards are applied across faculty in the same and similar units. The proposed merged School, with two full professors one of whom would be its Director, would not have a sufficient number of full professors to conduct promotion reviews of associate professors. Nor would it contain sufficient colleagues to enable assistant professors to be reviewed by tenured faculty in their unit who have similar professional training and disciplinary/interdisciplinary specializations. A college review, in a college with the disciplinary and interdisciplinary reach of the SBS faculty, provides important academic oversight in these respects. If the new school does not report to a college, the University Promotion and Tenure Committee cannot play the valuable review role that a college of cognate departments and schools like SBS can, with its interdisciplinary faculty and mix of pure and applied research.

3. **Oversight of Academic Programs and Curriculum.** A reporting line to a college is especially important at OSU for the development of academic programs and curriculum. The University vests in college curriculum committees the initial responsibility for overseeing the development of academic programs and curriculum.

---

8 Removing the School of Public Health, which currently has 26 tenure-track and 4 clinical faculty, from the college structure was necessitated by accreditation requirements. A formal exception had to be made to University rule 3335-3-34(D)(4) to permit this change.
before they are referred to the Committee on Academic Affairs for University-wide review. College oversight of programs and curricula is especially important for an interdisciplinary school that offers courses drawing upon a variety of different disciplines. The early opportunity for feedback and concurrences, which college-level review regularly provides, preserves the integrity of programs and prevents costly duplication and detrimental course "poaching," which are acknowledged problems under a budgeting system that rewards units for enrollments.

If the merged Glenn-PPM School reports to SBS, the process of review (first by the SBS Curriculum Committee, then by the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and for graduate courses by the Graduate School, before going to CAA) would not change. The process has worked well, neither impeding PPM’s ability to launch new courses and programs in its mission area nor permitting unnecessary course duplication. Because PPM’s academic program has such strong foundations in SBS disciplines,° the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences is a natural forum for initial curriculum and program review.

The Proposal states (p. 12) that the merger “will provide a firm platform for expanding public policy opportunities to Ohio State’s undergraduates ... (T)he combined unit will be able to create (emphasis mine) an undergraduate minor in policy studies ...” Currently, PPM has only two undergraduate courses. Each has been taught only once since 1996: PPM 522 enrolled 2 students in Summer 2000, while PPM 594 enrolled one continuing education student for 5 credits in Autumn 2003. Because it is not a curricular unit, the Glenn Institute has no undergraduate courses of its own. The courses for its Washington internship program are taught through the Department of Political Science by an adjunct Political Science faculty member based in Washington, DC.°° Its high school internship course is offered through Academic Affairs and taught by Glenn Institute staff. The “firm platform” claimed in the merger proposal is not present.

Programmatic expansion of the proposed School into undergraduate education (through a minor it would “create”) represents a major change in the missions of each unit. A regular faculty of nine, barely sufficient to maintain its current two masters and PhD programs, would be stretched too thin if it also took on the responsibility for staffing a new program at the undergraduate level, and no new undergraduate program should be launched without regular faculty participation.°°° Moreover, like PPM, most

° Nationwide, schools of public administration and/or public policy grew out of departments of political science or interdisciplinary social science programs, and most of their faculty even now were trained in the social and behavioral sciences and continue to have professional links to those disciplines.
°° JGI pays all of the costs associated with this course and, under an agreement with the Department of Political Science, receives 75% of its revenue.
°°° More modest PPM involvement at the undergraduate level is feasible. In recent years, especially in response to a decline in its masters’ enrollments, PPM was encouraged by the Dean of SBS to partner with other College departments (a) to develop its idea for a 3/2 program through which students could earn a BA and an MPA in five years and (b) to offer its undergraduate courses regularly. Up to this point, PPM has not adopted either of these initiatives.
of the nation’s top schools of public affairs focus their attention solely on graduate programs, reflecting the widely-shared view that meaningful interdisciplinary training in public policy and public affairs is best left to post-baccalaureate professional programs.

If the proposed school nonetheless undertakes the development of an undergraduate program in public policy, it is essential that the program and its curriculum be subjected to the normal process of college review. The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences is the logical place to begin the review, given the centrality of a number of its current courses to any public policy program and of the economics and political science disciplines to schools of public affairs and public policy. Subsequent review would come through the Colleges of Arts and Sciences process and its well-developed procedures for concurrences from affected departments and colleges.

For several years, SBS has been planning an interdisciplinary undergraduate program in public policy, which would draw upon units outside of SBS as well as SBS departments. Its new Dean has made an undergraduate policy minor one of his programmatic priorities, and the Executive Dean and the Provost have approved funding for an SBS program coordinator who would take the lead in developing the minor. The proposed school can be an important partner in this endeavor. To facilitate this partnership and ensure cooperation rather than competition in the development of a new policy program for undergraduates, it is essential that such a program be subjected to the full SBS and Colleges of Arts and Sciences review processes. This will occur naturally if the new school remains in SBS.

Major programmatic initiatives at The Ohio State University should be guided by the goals and priorities of the Academic Plan and the Leadership Agenda. A merger of the School of Public Policy and Management with the John Glenn Institute has the potential to realize some of these important goals. Giving the merged School special status outside of the normal college structure by allowing it to report directly to OAA, by contrast, not only contravenes University rules and norms for schools and departments, but it also is a questionable strategy for realizing the University’s goals. Nor should the new school be permitted to create an undergraduate program outside of the existing channels for program and curriculum review. Instead of pursuing a quixotic structural solution to fulfilling the aspirations of PPM and JGI, we need to work with them through regular academic channels to realize their potential.

---

12 An interdisciplinary Undergraduate Public Policy Major Committee, appointed by the Dean of SBS at the request of the Provost and chaired by SBS Associate Dean Don Haurin with members from five different colleges, proposed an undergraduate policy major in 2000 to the Office of Academic Affairs. No action was taken by the Provost to implement this proposal. With the new budgeting system in place, it is now feasible for SBS to implement this proposal on its own initiative and with its own resources.
December 2, 2004

TO: Kay Halasek
FROM: Deborah Morrill, Director, The John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy
RE: Proposal to form a John Glenn School of Public Affairs

Thank you for the invitation to comment on the PPM faculty’s petition to merge with the John Glenn Institute, forming a John Glenn School of Public Affairs that would report to the Provost. On behalf of the Institute, I wholeheartedly support that petition. The PPM faculty do an excellent job outlining both the advantages of the merger and the necessity of the central reporting line.

It may be most helpful if I address the issue of the reporting line from the Glenn Institute’s perspective, especially since the SBS Dean has suggested that the merger should proceed, but with the new School reporting to that College. I would be happy to expand upon these comments or answer other questions at any time.

Necessity of a Central Reporting Line

From the Glenn Institute’s perspective, there are four reasons why the merged school must establish a central reporting line:

First, the Institute’s central reporting line has been essential to developing our own University-wide programs, which include students and faculty from every college on campus. The central reporting line has also been crucial to developing and maintaining the very large number of partnerships we have with external organizations. CAA and the University Senate understood that a central reporting line would be integral to the Institute’s success; the proposal they approved in 2000 explicitly called for that reporting relationship. Shortly

---

1 The Institute regularly partners with a wide range of government and nonprofit organizations, such as the City of Columbus, the Ohio Legislative Service Commission, the United Way of Central Ohio, the Ohio Supreme Court, the League of Women Voters, the World Bank, the Woodrow Wilson International Center, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the KnowledgeWorks Foundation, the Education Commission of the States, and dozens of others. We also have ongoing partnerships with Ohio’s four other public policy institutes, Harvard University’s Institute of Politics, the Sorensen Institute at the University of Virginia, and several other academic institutions around the country. All departments maintain some relationships with external organizations, but the Institute’s ongoing external partnerships are extraordinarily diverse.

2 The proposal provided:

The Director of the Glenn Institute will report to the Executive Vice President and Provost. Reporting directly to the Executive Vice President and Provost signals that the John Glenn Institute is a university level initiative. To be successful, the Institute will need to tap into the resources of the university at large, not just those of a single college.
after the Institute's formation, the University decided that the Mershon Center similarly needed a central reporting line to support its diverse policy programs; it moved Mershon out of SBS so that it could report to the Office of International Affairs.

All of the Institute's current programs will survive the merger; a major advantage of the proposal is to join these programs (which are typical of highly regarded schools of public affairs) with the degree-granting programs offered by the School. The Institute's programs are not small initiatives that are incidental to the merger: They provide educational and co-curricular opportunities to undergraduates in every college that enrolls undergraduates; offer scholarships for undergraduates and financial support for graduate students from several colleges; fund lectures, conferences, and fundraising opportunities that other colleges share; support faculty policy research from any discipline; train almost 3000 elected officials and public sector managers each year; and maintain important links with the City, General Assembly, Ohio congressional delegation, and other key external constituencies.

CAA and the Senate realized in 2000 that programs of this nature would not thrive within a single college; the same is true today. Indeed, SBS has already rejected the Institute's largest current program: The Institute's training programs for elected leaders and public sector managers originated within PPM, but SBS transferred those programs to the Glenn Institute in FY 2000 because the College was not interested in administering them. The Institute has more than doubled the scope of these training programs, raising gross revenue from $404,000 in FY 2000 to an estimated $900,000 this year. That revenue represents almost 3000 annual contacts with elected officials and public sector professionals throughout Ohio, a service that is improving the University's reputation daily among that group. It would be a serious mistake to move these programs back to SBS, which was not interested in maintaining them, or to any other college lacking that commitment.³

Similarly, the Kiplinger Program in Public Affairs Journalism, which brings mid-career journalists to campus to hone their public affairs skills, recently moved from SBS to the Glenn Institute because the foundation financing the program concluded that SBS did not share the program's goals. Over the last 5-7 years, the number and quality of mid-career journalists applying to the Kiplinger Program had fallen dramatically. The Glenn Institute has been able to turn the program around immediately, attracting 43 highly qualified applicants for the six fellowships in our first year of administering the program; the 2005 Kiplinger Fellows are award-winning journalists from major newspapers and television stations nationwide. This program has the potential to enhance public affairs journalism, to contribute to public affairs discussions on campus, and to raise the University's national profile.⁴ The program would not survive if returned to SBS, and it is unlikely to thrive in any other college. An essential element of the program is the journalists' interaction with faculty and departments University wide.⁵

³ Notably, these programs do not require any investment of general revenues, they are part of an earnings unit that supports itself and pays overhead to the University. The programs do, however, require interest and commitment to operate; SBS made clear that it lacked this interest.

⁴ Each of the journalists will produce a major piece of public affairs journalism while at Ohio State. They will also develop lasting relationships with the University and with individual faculty generating research in diverse areas.

⁵ Although the Kiplinger Program is small, we have configured it so that all colleges can receive enrollment revenues from the Fellows. Kiplinger Fellows may enroll in any course open to them; the
The Institute's programs, in sum, depend on a central reporting line. The Institute's Board members and I do not believe that these programs would prosper within a single college—a conclusion that CAA and the Senate shared in 2000. Although much discussion of the merger naturally has focused on PPM's academic programs, the Institute's programs are also important to the University. Our initiatives serve a large number of individuals both on and off campus, and we have worked effectively with many units campuswide. We would not enter a relationship—such as one that requires us to report to a single college—that would endanger these programs. Nor, I think, would other members of the University want us to jeopardize these initiatives.

Second, in addition to safeguarding the Glenn Institute's current programs, CAA and the Senate should not allow the Glenn Institute's significant revenues to become the property of a single college. The Institute's annual income now exceeds $2.5 million. About one-fifth of that revenue derives from central University funds; the remainder stems from a state line item, fees for our training programs, and private gifts. The central funds are intended to support University-wide programs. Most of the other funds similarly have been invested in the Institute's programs because of their University-wide reach. Shifting these revenues to a single college would violate the aims of our funding sources, ending some of our current support and compromising our ability to obtain similar support in the future. Moving these funds to a single college would also create serious risks of that college preferring its own faculty and students in administering the funds.

On the other hand, I want to underscore a point made by the PPM faculty: The central reporting line poses no financial threat to the colleges. Instead, the proposed merger and central reporting line will create a successful School of Public Affairs that will prosper through expansion of its professional master's program. It will neither need the investment of new central funds nor draw revenue away from other departments.

I have studied PPM's budget and the University's current budgeting formula carefully, and have reviewed them in detail with the Glenn Institute's Board of Directors. I have also looked at enrollment trends at other schools of public affairs nationwide, which show a strong upward trend in demand for master's programs. Joining the Institute and School will create a financially healthy unit by (1) achieving administrative efficiencies; (2) allowing both units to maximize current endowment income; (3) increasing access to government grants; (4) considerably enhancing enrollment in the professional master's program; and (5) expanding revenue opportunities in the Institute's training programs.

The most important of these strategies, unfortunately, will not work if the School remains lodged within SBS—and probably would not work within other colleges on campus. SBS has already shown a disinclination to administer the Institute's training programs, and I colleges teaching those courses will receive revenues generated by the Fellows. More important, perhaps, will be the lasting connections that each college can cultivate with journalists interested in reporting on academic research.

---

0 The Kiplinger Endowment, which currently generates about $200,000 per year, is one example of a fund intended for a University-wide program. The foundation supporting that endowment has pledged another $1.5 million if the program continues to meet its goals. Moving the Institute's programs to a single college—especially SBS, where the program previously encountered difficulties—almost certainly would terminate that pledge.
have not seen training programs of this size in most other disciplinary colleges. Similarly, the School’s professional master’s enrollment has declined severely within SBS. That is not surprising: SBS is a strong arts and sciences unit focused on doctoral degrees and undergraduate classes. Although a few other master’s programs exist within the college, they are not dominant. In theory, the John Glenn School could operate professional master’s programs and extensive training programs—both essential to the budget and academic mission of a School of Public Affairs—within SBS or another college. But in practice, it is very difficult for a school following one financial and academic model to pursue that model aggressively in a college that has very different assumptions and reward structures.

Ironically, creating a John Glenn School within SBS is likely to produce just the evil that some faculty have feared from the central reporting line: a School that will “poach” upon the enrollments of other units by creating large undergraduate courses. SBS is a college that stresses doctoral programs and uses large undergraduate courses to fund its doctoral students and faculty. During the last seven years, SBS has continuously pressed PPM to look and act more like its other academic departments—and during the last three years (since budget restructuring) it has pressed PPM to create large undergraduate courses that would draw students from other colleges. The PPM faculty so far have resisted this pressure, because their field values professional master’s education. But, as noted above, it is difficult for a unit focused on professional master’s degrees to prosper in a college structured around doctoral programs and large undergraduate programs. If PPM remains part of SBS (or if a John Glenn School becomes part of that College), it almost certainly will begin creating the large undergraduate courses feared by some faculty. Indeed, SBS has already laid the groundwork for this through the plans for an undergraduate public policy program described in Dean Beck’s memo.

Any “poaching” conducted by a School that remains within SBS, of course, would be directed largely at other colleges rather than peer units within the college. For this reason, the SBS faculty do not fear the School developing undergraduate courses while lodged within SBS; they express concern only about a School reporting outside SBS. The truth, however, is that a Public Affairs School reporting centrally would focus on its professional master’s program, just as most other public affairs schools do; both reputational and financial incentives support that direction. Any undergraduate courses would be small, high-quality offerings complementing the work of other departments. A School remaining within SBS, on the other hand, is quite likely to begin offering large undergraduate courses.

---

7 In FY 2004, the School’s master courses generated $228.12 per credit hour, net of taxes and cost pools. A BAC 1 course generated just $146.39 per credit hour net of taxes and costs. Professional master’s courses are somewhat more expensive to teach than undergraduate ones, but they are not nearly as costly as doctoral courses; the increased revenue from professional master’s students is sufficient to fund their courses. The School, moreover, lacks both the infrastructure (e.g., advising systems) and the large pool of doctoral students that make undergraduate courses feasible and financially attractive for other units.

8 To avoid any possibility of “poaching” in the creation of these courses, as well as to assure the quality of undergraduate education, PPM and the Institute have agreed that a centrally reporting John Glenn School would submit any undergraduate courses or programs to the Arts and Sciences Colleges’ Curriculum Committee for approval.
aimed at drawing students away from other colleges. Simply comparing the enrollment patterns of other centrally reporting schools of public affairs (most of which offer no undergraduate courses) with the enrollment patterns of SBS departments reveals these probabilities.

A central reporting line, in sum, is essential to preserve the Glenn Institute’s assets for University-wide programs and to enable the merged School to support itself financially as most schools of public affairs do: through professional master’s programs and training initiatives. The central reporting line will not in any way endanger revenues flowing to any college, including SBS. On the contrary, it will allow the School to draw new master’s students who have the potential to benefit all units academically and financially.

Third, the PPM faculty make an excellent case that successful schools of public affairs report centrally—and that a central reporting line is integral to the success of those schools. The external letters of support strongly support this point. And PPM itself vividly underscores the lesson: it has suffered a record of continuous decline over the last ten years, while housed within two different colleges.

The Glenn Institute’s Board of Directors and I have independently examined the evidence related to PPM and other schools of public affairs, and I have talked with a number of faculty members and directors at other schools. The Board members and I find the evidence overwhelming that schools of public affairs do not succeed when lodged within a single college—and that the need for a central reporting line is becoming more critical as more universities establish strong, centrally reporting schools of public affairs. The internal and external evidence are completely consistent on the difficulty of a top public affairs school surviving within a single college.

Based on this evidence, the Glenn Board members and I believe that a School of Public Affairs that reports centrally can succeed at Ohio State, making significant contributions to the University’s academic mission. We are enthusiastic about lending the Glenn Institute’s assets to that venture. The evidence, however, just as strongly counsels that a School of Public Affairs confined within a college would not succeed, and would be a poor investment of the Institute’s resources.

Finally, the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences appears to be a particularly poor home for the proposed school. It is possible that a School of Public Affairs could

---

8 As noted in footnote 7 above, the School lacks a sufficient infrastructure and pool of doctoral students to implement large undergraduate courses on its own. SBS, however, could supply both that infrastructure and students from other departments eager for support. E.g., the School likely would face pressure to establish public policy courses taught by doctoral students in economics or political science.

9 This, notably, has not been true at all other universities. The University of Georgia, for example, recently improved the stature of its public affairs program by creating an independent School of Public and International Affairs reporting to the provost. The new director of that unit told me that his one regret was that the University had not been able to persuade the Carl Vinson Institute—an independent policy institute similar in many ways to the Glenn Institute—to merge with the new school. In his opinion and that of many others, that merger would have further enhanced the new school of public affairs. Those affiliated with the Vinson Institute, however, were determined to retain their independence, creating a somewhat awkward situation at Georgia.
succeed within another college on campus—although I have grave doubts about that, based on the three points above—but SBS clearly is a poor home for this School.

SBS describes its focus as “the core of the social and behavioral science enterprise, which involves theory-driven systematic empirical investigation of numerous phenomena involving the behavior of humans, both as individuals and in various kinds of collectivities.”¹¹ PPM’s mission, on the other hand, is to “foster outstanding research relevant to public affairs, to promote excellence in education in public policy analysis and management in an interdisciplinary framework, and to engage in an ongoing relationship with the public and non-profit sectors.” The unit specifically notes its desire to “fuse theory and application” and to “train [individuals] for the public service and non-profit sectors.”¹²

These missions are related, but the latter does not fit comfortably inside the other. PPM’s relationship to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences is similar to the College of Medicine’s relationship to the College of Biological Sciences: social science research is one of the fields that informs public policy work, but it has a different focus than public policy, and it is far from the only field that informs public policy. A School of Public Affairs should draw upon social science research, but it should not be governed by a social science college.

The mismatch of missions between PPM and SBS is evident in numerous ways. The College focuses on doctoral programs and large undergraduate majors; the School focuses on professional master’s students. The College supports “theory-driven systematic empirical” research while the School fosters a wide range of research—both quantitative and qualitative—focused on public affairs. Research within the College responds to questions posed primarily by academic disciplines; research in the School responds primarily to problems posed by communities. The College trains graduate students to become academics; the School trains graduate students to hold positions in government, nonprofits, and other segments of the public sector. The College supports some interdisciplinary work, but the School’s research and teaching are inherently and systematically interdisciplinary. The College supports some community outreach and co-curricular programs, but the School’s mission aligns much more closely with the extensive training and outreach programs maintained by the Institute.

Given this dissonance, it is not surprising that PPM has suffered such a continuous and precipitous decline while housed within SBS. The statistics summarizing that decline are quite striking: They can not be ignored in evaluating the School’s future. When measured on a percentage basis, I doubt that any other unit on campus has seen its national rankings, student enrollment, and faculty size drop so markedly during the last seven years. The sad fact is that ten years ago PPM fulfilled one of OSU’s major academic objectives: It ranked among the top 15 schools nationally in its field and among the top 10 public schools in that field. Since changing its reporting line to SBS, that is no longer true.

In addition to the lack of fit between SBS and a School of Public Affairs, the Glenn Institute has found SBS a difficult partner. We have established several partnerships with SBS; all of these have been more difficult than our partnerships with other colleges. I can detail these difficulties if CAA or the Senate believes it necessary. I prefer to rest the case for a central reporting line on the more forward-looking reasons outlined above. But an

¹¹ SBS Website.
¹² PPM Website.
additional reason is the difficulty of working with SBS on cross-college initiatives. Almost all of the Institute's programs, and most of those that a strong School of Public Affairs should maintain, include units outside SBS. Based on my own experience, those units would find it unnecessarily frustrating to partner with a unit located in SBS.

Conclusion

I believe that Ohio State can establish a strong, dynamic School of Public Affairs by merging the John Glenn Institute with the School of Public Policy and Management. Such a School would significantly further the University's academic plan and leadership agenda. It would do so, moreover, at no financial cost to other units. On the contrary, the School would draw new master's students to campus and would contribute to the health of other units in myriad ways.

These benefits, however, depend upon moving the School out of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and establishing a central reporting line for the School. PPM has declined markedly within SBS; it would be foolhardy to ignore the dramatic indicators of that decline. Two of the Institute's largest programs moved from SBS to the Institute because SBS either lacked interest in the program or was unable to support its goals; it would be counterproductive to move these programs back to SBS. SBS, moreover, shows little enthusiasm for any of the Institute's other programs. Other universities have followed a very clear path of creating central reporting lines for their schools of public affairs, and have established remarkably successful schools in that manner.

The upside potential for a John Glenn School of Public Affairs that reports centrally is large, while the downside is minimal. In particular, fears that the School would “poach” upon undergraduate enrollments in other units are misplaced; poaching is more likely to occur if PPM remains within SBS. The upside potential for a School of Public Affairs that reports to SBS, on the other hand, is small while the downside is huge: SBS is unlikely to prove a hospitable home for the Institute's programs, the College would acquire custody of significant revenues intended for University-wide programs, PPM already is declining within that College, the College's mission does not embrace a school of public affairs; other schools of public affairs have found a central reporting line essential for their success, and SBS is a difficult college for other units to partner with.

For all of these reasons, the Glenn Institute continues to welcome merger with PPM to form a centrally reporting John Glenn School of Public Affairs—as the PPM faculty have proposed. On the other hand, we would not participate in a merger that housed the School within SBS: The University would be better served by preserving the Institute's programs in their current form.

---

13 Dean Beck's memo notes that "not all of the JGI programs naturally contribute to the mission of a graduate school of public affairs" and that "there is always the threat that a concentration on JGI's non-academic programs might dilute the academic focus of the merged School." Beck Memo at 2. The PPM faculty have enthusiastically embraced all of the Institute's programs as quite complementary to the School's mission, and other leading public affairs schools maintain similar programs. Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government, in fact, has praised the Institute's programs as models that other public affairs schools should emulate. 1 Interpret Dean Beck's comments to mean that the Institute's programs do not contribute to SBS's vision of a public affairs school's mission and focus. Again, SBS appears to have a different vision than PPM, the Kennedy School, and other schools of public affairs.
December 7, 2004

TO: E. Kay Halasek

FROM: Debby Merritt and Bert Rockman

RE: Letters of Support for JGI/PPM Merger and Central Reporting Line

For the subcommittee’s convenience, we have attached the letters of support that we received from external deans and faculty. We have already forwarded most of these letters as attachments to our original petition or as we received them. We thought it would be helpful, however, to collect these letters and also to separate them from letters provided by current students, alumni, and PPM faculty. The latter are also important endorsements but do not address the merger and reporting line issues in the same ways these letters do.

We have also included in this set a recent letter from Chris Zacher, Professor of English and Director of OSU’s Institute for Collaborative Research and Public Humanities. We have not generally sought letters from other Ohio State faculty and administrators, but Chris was particularly interested in supplying a letter as Chair of the Glenn Institute’s Oversight Committee.

Most of the external writers identify themselves but it may be helpful to give a bit more background on them. They are all quite familiar with schools of public affairs; many are also familiar with PPM, the Glenn Institute, or other programs at Ohio State.

Barbara Nelson is Dean and Professor of Policy Studies and Political Science at UCLA’s School of Public Affairs, which was established as an independent school in 1994. Before assuming the UCLA deanship, Nelson was Vice President and Distinguished Professor of Public Policy at Radcliffe College. She previously served on the faculties of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs (Princeton University) and the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs (a degree-granting school at the University of Minnesota). Nelson has authored six books and over 60 articles or books chapters; she is internationally regarded in several fields including conflict mediation and social movements. She currently serves on the Executive Council of NASPAA, the professional association of schools of public affairs. Nelson earned her B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. in Political Science from The Ohio State University.

Frank Thompson is Dean of the Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Professor of Political Science at SUNY-Albany. He is a leading figure in public affairs scholarship, with numerous books and articles on health policy, policy implementation, and administrative politics. He served as a professor and Acting...
Provost at the University of California-Berkeley before taking his position at the Rockefeller College. Thompson is a former President of NASPAA, the professional association of schools of public affairs, and is a Fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration. He holds a B.A. in Political Science from the University of Chicago and an M.A. and Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of California at Berkeley.

Jeffrey Straussman is the Associate Dean and Chair of the Department of Public Administration, as well as the Maxwell Professor of Teaching Excellence, at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs (Syracuse University). The Maxwell School currently is ranked as the top public affairs school in the country; Straussman is internationally recognized for his work on public management strategies. He is a member of the Executive Council of NASPAA, the professional association of schools of public affairs, and has participated actively in site visits and other activities for that association. Straussman was a member of the team that reviewed PPM in 2003. He holds a B.A. in Political Science from Hofstra University, an M.A. in Political Science from Hunter College of the City of New York, and a Ph.D. in Political Science from the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York.

Edward Jennings, Jr. is Director of the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration, and Professor of Public Administration and Political Science, at the University of Kentucky. He held previous academic and administrative positions at the State University of New York-Buffalo and University of Missouri-Columbia. He is particularly well known for his academic work on intergovernmental relations. Jennings is a past President of the American Society for Public Administration, a recipient of the 1998 Jeffrey Pressman Award for the best article in the Policy Studies Review, and editor of the Journal of Public Affairs Education, a position that gives him particular perspective on developments in public affairs education nationwide. As he reports in his letter, the University of Kentucky currently is developing a College of Public and International Affairs that would report to the Provost. Jennings holds his B.A. and M.A. in Political Science from the University of New Orleans and his Ph.D. in Political Science from Washington University.

Barton Wechsler is Director and Professor of the Harry S. Truman School of Public Affairs at the University of Missouri-Columbia. Missouri established the Truman School as an autonomous unit, giving it Truman's name, in 2001. Wechsler is a well known scholar in the areas of leadership, strategic planning, and organization theory. Before accepting leadership of the Truman School, he served as Dean of the Edmund S. Muskie School of Public Service at the University of Southern Maine. He was previously a faculty member at the University of Illinois and Florida State University. Wechsler is a PPM alum, holding his Ph.D. in Public Administration from The Ohio State University (1985).
C. Ronald Huff is Dean and Professor of the School of Social Ecology at the University of California, Irvine. Huff is a national leader in the fields of criminology and crime prevention. He is a Fellow in the American Society of Criminology and a past President of the American Society of Criminology. Before accepting the deanship at Irvine, Huff was Professor and Director of PPM, as well as Director of the Criminal Justice Research Center. He previously taught at Purdue University and the University of California Irvine. Huff holds a B.A. in Psychology from Capital University, an M.S.W. from the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor, and a Ph.D. in Sociology from The Ohio State University.

Robert L. Lineberry is a Professor of Political Science at the University of Houston. Lineberry is the co-author of a well known textbook on American government, now in its eighth edition, as well as of scholarly books and articles on public policy and government. He was an early leader in the field of public policy, serving as the first section chair of the Public Policy Section of the American Political Science Association and President of the Policy Studies Organization. He has served as a faculty member in government or political science at the University of Texas-Austin, Northwestern University, University of Kansas, and University of Houston. He was Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Kansas and Provost/Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs at Houston. Lineberry's B.A. is from the University of Oklahoma and his Ph.D. from the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill.

Stanley N. Katz is the former Class of 1921 Bicentennial Professor of the History of American Law and Liberty at Princeton University; he currently is a Lecturer with rank of Professor at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs (Princeton University). He also serves as Acting Director of that School's Program in Law and Public Affairs and as Director of its Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies. Katz is President Emeritus of the American Council of Learned Societies and is a noted authority on American legal and constitutional history, as well as on nonprofit and nongovernmental organizations. Among many other works, he is the editor of the 11-volume Oliver Wendell Holmes History of the United States Supreme Court. Katz is also a trustee of the Newberry Library, the Copyright Clearance Center and the Social Science Research Council. He consults widely with other universities on academic issues. In 2001, Katz consulted with Associate Provost Jerry Ladan and a faculty committee about establishment of a School of Public and International Affairs at Ohio State; he also consulted with Ohio State about directions for the John Glenn Institute. Katz holds a B.A. in English History and Literature from Harvard University, as well as an M.A. and Ph.D. in American History from Harvard.

Max Sherman holds the Max Sherman Chair in State and Local Government at the LBJ School of Public Affairs, University of Texas-Austin. He was Dean of the LBJ School from 1983 until 1997. He previously served as President of West Texas State University. Sherman is a past President of NASPAA, the national association of schools of public affairs, and a Board Member of the National
Academy of Public Administration. He is also Vice President of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation and served on the Ford Foundation's National Committee on Innovations in State and Local Government for thirteen years. Sherman has won numerous awards for his work in higher education. Like Katz, he consults frequently with other universities and has advised Ohio State on several matters. He joined Katz in 2001 in advising an OSU faculty committee about establishment of a School of Public and International Affairs. Sherman holds a B.A. in history from Baylor University and a J.D. from the University of Texas-Austin.
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Dear Bert,

I was very interested to learn that the School of Public Policy and Management and the John Glenn Institute for Public Policy are in the process of merging. Looking from afar, it seems to me that Ohio State had been missing an important opportunity for strength and excellence in this field by separating the two programs. I wish you and the campus, of which, as you may know, I am an alumna, every success in this project.

You have asked me to comment on the reporting lines for the UCLA School of Public Affairs. I am very glad to do so. A little history will be helpful. The UCLA School of Public Affairs (formerly known as the UCLA School of Public Policy and Social Research) was created in 1994 from two nationally ranked units, Urban Planning and Social Welfare, plus a newly created Department of Public Policy, with 11 new faculty positions plus a number of faculty who transferred parts of their FTEs to the new School. In addition, the 10 policy-oriented research centers were located in the School. Based on graduate and undergraduate student FTEs the UCLA School of Public Affairs is the largest such school in the AAU. But even with our size, we are the second smallest School on campus. Only the School of Nursing is smaller.

The School of Public Affairs has always reported directly to the Executive Vice Chancellor, the person who on many campuses would be the Provost. This has been a very successful arrangement, as the dean of every professional school at UCLA reports directly to the Executive Vice Chancellor. In addition, UCLA has a Council of Professional School Deans, an excellent and useful group, to which I, as the Dean, belong. The direct reporting line to the Executive Vice Chancellor, the recognition as a full fledged professional school, and the helpful collegiality of belonging to the Council of Professional School Deans were crucial components of the School’s success. I would not have taken the position of Dean without this level of campus recognition of the mission of the School.

We have had three Executive Vice Chancellors in my tenure at UCLA. All are very
talented (the first became the CEO of a major university based research laboratory, the second became a university president, and the third is in place at this time). Each has firmly believed that the value of having all professional schools report directly to him was worth the larger number of people who are part of his daily life. I realize that each campus is different in its approach, but this arrangement contributes to a culture of respect, cooperation, and accomplishment at UCLA that is very beneficial to the campus, and of great help to each dean.

I would be glad to answer any other questions you might have.

Cordially,

Barbara

Barbara J. Nelson, Dean
UCLA School of Public Affairs
3284 Public Policy Building, Box 951656
Los Angeles, CA 90095

310-206-7979 (tel)
310-206-5773 (fax)
Nelson@spa.ucla.edu

For assistance, please contact:
Selene Garcia Baldenegro, Assistant to the Dean
Baldenegro@spa.ucla.edu
Merritt, Deborah
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Dear Kay, Randy, & Joyce,

I am forwarding an e-mail letter from Frank Thompson, Dean of the Rockefeller College of Public Affairs at SUNY-Albany, and a leading figure in public administration scholarship on the issue of the proposed merger of JGI and SPPM and the proposed new reporting line. Please add to the growing inventory of external academic leaders. Many thanks.

Bert
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Subject:  Observations On Glenn School
To: "rockman.1@osu.edu" <rockman.1@osu.edu>
X-Mailer:  Internet Mail Service (5.5.2657.72)
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Dear Bert:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the possible creation of the John Glenn School of Public Affairs. As someone who has had an excellent opportunity to observe institutional trends in public affairs education for some three decades and who (as a former President of NASPAA) believes that public affairs education is now more important than ever, I am delighted by the news.

The creation of a Glenn School of Public Affairs with a reporting line to the Provost would be a major step forward for the Ohio State program. I have long had great respect for your program -- especially the extraordinarily strong graduates of your doctoral program and the research accomplishments of you and several of your faculty. But I have also been impressed that Ohio State is something of an underachiever relative to its great potential. I suspect this partly has to do with institutional factors there.

The trend in public affairs education for the best programs has clearly been toward housing them in free-standing schools with a reporting line to the Provost's Office. For instance, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill recently took this step as did the University of Georgia. Of the top 20 programs in the country (using the reputational measure of U.S. News), I count only four that are not housed in schools of public affairs of this type.

If Ohio State moves in this direction via a new Glenn School, the
opportunities for generating external funding and for elevating excellence in all aspects of its mission would in all probability increase.

Please keep me posted on developments.

I hope our paths cross again soon.

Sincerely yours,

Frank
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Dear Bert:

This email is a long belated follow-up to the NASPAA site visit we did about a year and a half ago. It struck me then that time that your unit was truly in a no-win situation. The then dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences was not really supportive of SPPM and the provost was, at best, indifferent. Furthermore, SPPM seemed caught in an organizational "whipsaw" with few advocates--this, despite the fact that you are a major player in the state capital that educates current and future public servants. Furthermore, the organizational separation between the Glenn Institute and SPPM made no sense to the three of us (NASPAA team). When you think about how professional programs like law, social work, and many public affairs graduate programs, they generally report directly to the provost. Indeed, I asked the associate dean of the LBJ School about this a couple of days ago and he said that the LBJ dean reports directly to the provost. The faculty size at LBJ is about 25.

At the Maxwell School the Public Administration Department (which has a faculty of 28 and is roughly analogous to SPPM) reports to the Maxwell School dean. For promotions and tenure we also must go through the College of Arts and Sciences. This is a rather strange arrangement which I would not recommend to anyone but, since the PA Department is a very strong department, it has caused us no problems.

For you, reporting directly to the provost makes sense given the dual mission of educating future leaders and doing high quality interdisciplinary research. I would allow you to do what good policy programs do without getting into the destructive warfare that happens when disciplinary purists attach policy and management researchers as being second class. The top programs like Maxwell, Indiana, Kennedy and Georgia have demonstrated that there is no diminution of quality when policy and management units are given autonomy. In addition, I personally believe that a direct report to the provost will permit SPPM and the Glenn Institute, particularly after merger, to be more responsive to the external environment if you are to be fully engaged, especially with state government. I wish you the best as this issue moves forward.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey D. Straussman
Associate Dean and Chair
Department of Public Administration
Maxwell School
Syracuse University
215 Eggers Hall
Syracuse New York 13244
Tel: 315-443-4000
Fax: 315-443-9721
email: jstrauss@maxwell.syr.edu
November 19, 2004

Bert A. Rockman  
Director and Professor  
School of Public Policy and Management  
and Co-editor, Governance  
The Ohio State University  
300E Fisher Hall  
2100 Neil Avenue  
Columbus, OH 43210-1144  
USA  

Dear Bert:

As I told you in a conversation this week, I was quite surprised when Ohio State created the John Glenn Institute and failed to make it part of the School of Public Policy and Management. It is so natural to have these two units working together. The synergies that could come from a close connection between the two enterprises are quite considerable. I hope you are successful in linking the two together. Such a marriage has great potential to enhance both units.

It will help your program immensely if the university recognizes the wisdom of having you report directly to the chief academic officer instead of reporting through a division in a college. If you look at the top 20 public policy programs around the country, almost all report to the provost, chancellor, or president. And, the movement is clearly in that direction. The University of Georgia created the new College of Public Affairs to highlight its program two years ago and the University of Missouri created the Truman School reporting directly to the provost to give its program greater prominence. We are in the midst of discussions at UK to create a College of Public and International Affairs reporting directly to the provost.

Best wishes,

Edward T. Jennings, Jr.  
Director
April 19, 2004

Dr. Bert Rockman  
Director and Professor  
School of Public Policy and Management  
300E Fisher Hall  
2100 Neil Avenue  
Ohio State University  
Columbus, OH 43210-1144

Dear Bert:

I am writing as a follow up to our conversation at the recent ASPA meeting in Portland. As an alumnus, I care deeply about the School of Public Policy and Management and would welcome nothing more than its return to the vitality and prominence it has historically enjoyed. I believe we have a largely congruent view of the problems facing the School: (1) lack of a critical mass in faculty; (2) loss of visibility; and (3) structural arrangements that limit the School’s capacity to develop toward success.

Critical Mass

I was dismayed to learn from you that the core faculty in SPPM now stands at seven. This is about 50% less than the peak numbers of the past and, frankly, is close to the minimum needed for viability let alone vitality. Over the past decade, many institutions have made substantial investments in public policy and management—examples among public universities include Texas A&M, Georgia, Arizona, and the University of Missouri—and, as a result, the bar has been raised considerably. In this environment, it is no surprise that Ohio State has declined in its overall ranking. More critically, so small a faculty will have a harder time attracting the best students or establishing itself at the cutting-edge of research.

I don’t believe there is a magic number (and there are a number of excellent schools with relatively small faculty complements), but clearly SPPM needs to get bigger. You will appreciate that this growth must be targeted, both as to field and rank. However, I would argue that a very strong case can be made for hiring at the senior level. Ohio State has not really replaced the recent losses of its most senior people, neither through in-house development nor outside hires. In many ways, such hires could be a vital shot-in-the-arm for SPPM.

Visibility

The situation with faculty numbers contributes to the declining visibility of the School. Not so long ago, SPPM was a leader in the public affairs community, largely by virtue of the
accomplishments of its faculty and alumni. As the circle of leading schools has grown over time, the School’s visibility and influence has declined relative to its peers. Your appointment as director has helped in this regard, but additional steps will be needed for Ohio State to regain the leadership role it once had.

Structural Arrangements

The location of SPPM within the Ohio State structure has been a problem for nearly twenty years. Relationships within the College of Business were strained when I was a student during the early 1980s and they obviously deteriorated thereafter. My sense from you and others at Ohio State is that the current placement of the School within the College of Social and Behavioral Science has been no less problematic.

Ohio State is not alone in struggling with the placement of its public affairs program. At Missouri, for example, we spent many years languishing at the margins of the Business School. The establishment of the Truman School as an autonomous entity was crucial for our growth and development. The public affairs/public administration programs at Wisconsin, Arizona, Kansas, Georgia, and Florida State have also experienced structural challenges. While there are many ways of organizing these programs, there is much evidence that autonomous status confers important, positive benefits. Without autonomous status, it is much harder for programs to build distinctive excellence or carry out the multidisciplinary scholarship, professionally-focused educational programs, and engagement with the policy community called for by their missions.

The Future

Bert, I am delighted that Ohio State is considering the consolidation of SPPM and the John Glenn Institute. I think that this makes terrific sense for both units and sets out a framework for addressing the issues I’ve raised above. Within the context of a Glenn School, there would seem to be a clear path ahead for building a stronger faculty cohort, restoring the School’s visibility and leadership (both within Ohio State and the public affairs community), and resolving the longstanding structural issues. I am confident that SPPM alumni would share my enthusiasm for this exciting development. Please let me know if I can do anything to help.

Sincerely,

Bert Wechsler
Director and Professor of Public Affairs
Dear OSU Colleagues:

During a recent return visit to OSU, I learned that a proposal to merge the School of Public Policy and Management (SPPM) with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy (JGI) will soon be considered. After informing myself about the specifics of the proposal, I am writing to convey my excitement and my strong support for that proposal which, in my judgment, will significantly advance the future prospects for both units and bring enhanced visibility to the University.

By way of introduction, I received my Ph.D. in sociology at OSU in 1974 and later, after serving on the faculties of both the University of California, Irvine, and Purdue University, returned to OSU, where I served as associate professor and professor in SPPM for 20 years (1979 – 1999) while also directing OSU’s Criminal Justice Research Center. I also served as director of SPPM from 1994 – 1999 and have been professor emeritus since then. Although I now have a demanding set of duties as a dean and professor here at the University of California, Irvine, I have retained my strong sense of dedication to and interest in OSU. During the latter part of my years at OSU, I had an opportunity to be involved in the early, formative discussions and plans that led to the development of JGI. I also initiated the transfer of some staff associated with SPPM’s management development programs to JGI, since it was apparent to me that those programs, when linked with JGI, would greatly facilitate the mission of JGI and ensure a sound financial basis of support for the programs while continuing to serve the needs of SPPM’s alumni and others throughout Ohio who benefited from the high quality training that we had provided in SPPM for many years. By all accounts, the merger of those staff with other JGI staff has been a successful one, just as the proposed full merger of these two units will now, in my judgment, be very successful.

In commenting on the proposed merger, it is important to note that the organizational locus of SPPM has been a continuing issue for a number of years. In fact, it was one of the most important issues that I attempted to address during my 5+ years as director of SPPM. To review that history briefly, I had discussions with Provost Sisson regarding the School’s future and expressed my concern that it would not be able to function well within the Fisher College of Business, where it was previously located, given the increasingly focused priorities of that College which, understandably, included a strong emphasis on improving the MBA degree program and other business programs. When a new organizational arrangement proposed by Provost Sisson (a new college) failed to win approval, I asked him for permission to discuss a merger with the School of Social and
Behavioral Sciences (SBS), which seemed to offer a more compatible, although still not optimal, organizational home for SPPM.

Unfortunately, neither the School’s previous organizational affiliation nor its current one has proved to be functional with respect to the School’s development. In fact, I am sad to say that the School’s national stature has declined under the current organizational arrangements, as have its resources and its enrollments. The decline in rankings and resources is likely to have a continuing negative impact on future enrollments and on faculty and staff morale. In my judgment, this decline must be addressed now by OSU; otherwise, the reputation of a school that was once one of the nation’s most respected schools of public affairs, based in the capital city of one of the nation’s largest and most important states, will continue to erode. This would be a serious mistake, especially at a time when major public universities throughout the nation are increasing their commitment to research and outreach/engagement that benefits the public interest.

While the proposal to merge SPPM and JGI, with the resulting John Glenn School of Public Affairs reporting directly to the provost, departs from the OSU tradition of having schools report to college deans, it is also important that form follow function (and not only in architecture!). In my judgment, this proposed arrangement is far more likely to allow both SPPM and JGI to maximize their potential than does the current arrangement, and it is important to OSU and to the people of Ohio that both SPPM and JGI be given their best chance to succeed. I would also add that in my current position as dean of an independent, interdisciplinary school that had its origin in our School of Social Sciences, the fact that I report directly to our executive vice chancellor (our equivalent to the OSU provost) has been enormously beneficial to our School’s development and external visibility.

Finally, the new John Glenn School of Public Affairs will greatly increase the stature and public visibility of both SPPM and JGI. It will also give Ohio State a named school of public affairs, just as two sister Big Ten universities have had for many years -- the Hubert Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota and the LaFollette School of Public Affairs at the University of Wisconsin. And just as the names of those schools helped generate significant increases in external support and funding, I would predict that the same result will occur at OSU with the new John Glenn School of Public Affairs.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. I would be pleased to clarify or elaborate on these remarks at any time, if that would be helpful while this proposal is being considered.

Sincerely,

C. Ronald Huff
Dean and Professor
September 15, 2004

Professor Bert Rockman
School of Public Policy and Management
The Ohio State University
300E Fisher Hall
Columbus OH 43210-1144

Dear Bert:

You inquired about the issue of reporting authority for the School, and asked for my comments (for what they are worth) as a former dean and provost. Here they are.

First, a somewhat irreverent, but entirely accurate observation from a former vice chancellor at Kansas I used to work with. There are, he says, two kinds of units in a university which want to report to the top. The first are units which believe that they will get a lot of clout from reporting to the top, e.g., affirmative action. The second are units which know that they won't get much supervision if they report to the top, e.g., the athletic department.

Reporting authorities, as this little cynical observation suggests, are among the most contentious and important issues in a university. And many issues are idiosyncratic to the particular organization and history of an institution, about which I know nothing in this case.

Let me offer the most general rule I can think of which covers centers, institutes, and degree programs: the greater the reliance of a program on faculty among and across different schools or colleges, the greater the argument for reporting to a CAO rather than a dean. Our most successful research program by far at the University of Houston is the Texas Center for Superconductivity (which now has a new name). It began in our College of Natural Sciences, but became a part of the provost's responsibilities because it relied on engineers, physicists and others across colleges. It would never have succeeded if it continued to reside in a dean's office. (We have at UH what is called the "Aumann rule" after a former Provost: if a center has members from one department, it reports to a chair of that department; if it has members across two departments in the same college, it reports to the dean of that college; if it has members across two colleges, it reports to the provost [or Vice President for Research]).
A second issue which is relevant to your situation is the reporting authority of other public affairs schools, your peer group. Without question the best public affairs schools in the country are at Harvard, Michigan, Princeton, Wisconsin and (possibly) Texas. So far as I know, all of them report to a provost. I would go down the list of the members of the public affairs consortium, and then check out their reporting authority. I would doubt that any of them report to a dean, even an arts and sciences dean, and much less a social sciences dean.

I could be more expansive if you need at a later time, but I hope this helps.

Sincerely,

[forwarded by e-mail without signature]

Robert L. Lineberry
Professor of Political Science

University of Houston
Provost, University of Houston (1988-90)
Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, University of Kansas (1981-88)
Merritt, Deborah

From: Stanley N. Katz [snkatz@Princeton.EDU]
Sent: Sunday, November 28, 2004 11:35 AM
To: Merritt, Deborah
Subject: John Glenn School of Public Affairs

Dear Deborah,

I was thrilled to hear that at long last the good work that so many people at OSU have put into the creation of a School of Public Affairs has paid off. Your description of the John Glenn School sounds like just the sort of thing we hoped for when I was a consultant to the Glenn Institute in 2000-2001. The idea of merging the School of Public Policy and Management with the Glenn Institute seems to solve the problem of the pre-existence of a weak unit (at that time) with a strong unit, and I think it is a happy solution. I gather that the resources to go the next step and create a School of Public and International Affairs (like my own School at Princeton) are not yet in place, but perhaps that can be the next step in the evolution of the new unit. And the thought of moving into the renovated Page Hall is just wonderful.

My only concern would be the administrative independence of the new School. I think that what has made the Woodrow Wilson School so successful at Princeton is that it is a truly independent graduate program. The Dean of our School reports directly to the Provost of the University, and indeed our Dean has a monthly appointment with the President of the University. This has given us tremendous leverage in the University, and has ensured that we do not get caught up in departmental or divisional politics. The University is committed to the agenda of the Woodrow Wilson School, and I think it is satisfied with what we do. I would hope that a comparable relationship to your central administration, in whatever form would be appropriate at OSU.

I cannot tell you how pleased I am to have this news. If there is ever anything I can do to help out in the future, please let me know.

Best wishes for the new School,

Stan

Stanley N. Katz
Lecturer with the rank of professor
Acting Director, Law and Public Affairs
Director, Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies
Woodrow Wilson School
428 Robertson Hall
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08544
Ph: 609-258-5637; Fax 609-258-1235
Webpage: www.wws.princeton.edu/~snkatz
Center: www.princeton.edu/~artspol/
CPANDA: www.cpanda.org
LAPA: www.princeton.edu/~lapa
November 30, 2004

Deborah J. Merritt
Director and John Deaver/Baker & Hostetler Chair in Law
The John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy
The Ohio State University
400 Stillman Hall
1947 College Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Debby,

Thank you for informing me of the exciting possibility of finally having the John Glenn School of Public Affairs at Ohio State. Let me explain why I am so enthusiastic.

During my 14 years as Dean of the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, I also served as President of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs. Because of that broader responsibility, I tried to know as much as possible about other schools in other states. I signed on to chair or serve on the accrediting committees at Syracuse, Pittsburg, Ohio State and other programs. It was a great learning experience.

One of the clear lessons was that the strong and in many instances outstanding programs were those that were free-standing and that reported directly to the Provost and President. I inherited such a program at LBJ and can take no credit for the insight of President and Ladybird Johnson and their advisors. Because of them, the LBJ School is and always has been one of the 16 colleges and schools at UT-Austin.

When I chaired the Ohio State committee, I made this same recommendation to the then provost. It was a premature suggestion because many of the ingredients of the program were not in place. I did meet with many of the leaders of Ohio State in Senator Glenn’s office to discuss the possibilities for the university having such a school. Again I made the same recommendation. Again it was premature because of changing university leadership. I should add that in 1995, I served on a committee of external experts appointed by the Ohio Board of Regents reviewing all of the Ph.D. programs in the state, which gave me further insight into essential elements of strong and successful programs.
The central part of the United States needs a strong and vibrant school of public policy. The John Glenn School of Public Affairs can be that school. In my opinion and based on my experience with all of the major programs, one of the most important steps for Ohio State to take is to have the school report centrally. This is not only important from an operational point of view, it is a powerful statement by one of the premier universities in the country that public service and public policy are a high priority.

If you or any of those involved in “next steps” would like for me to expand on any of these observations, please feel free to call me at 512-474-4862.

Sincerely yours,

Max Sherman
Professor and Dean Emeritus
Holder, Chair in State and Local Government
December 7, 2004

Vice Provost William Smith
Office of Academic Affairs

Dear Randy,

I write to support the proposal to blend the School of Public Policy and Management and the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy in order to form a John Glenn School of Public Affairs and also to permit the new unit to report to the Provost. My experience directing two interdisciplinary programs here (a center and a department) and an institute that promotes faculty collaboration as well as my stint on the Glenn Institute's oversight committee (and serving this year as its chair) have persuaded me that the requested merger and changed reporting line offer academic benefits for everyone concerned, for several reasons.

First, The Glenn Institute's broad academic reach makes it an ideal home for a program like PPM that aims to engage its students and faculty with a variety of disciplines—and at the same time that reach makes it logical for a new School of Public Affairs to report centrally rather than to a more narrowly concerned authority. Second, in such parlous budgetary times as ours, anchoring a new program like this in a fiscally secure and growing unit like a Glenn School would seem a responsible move. Third, it is impressive that the faculty involved are unanimous in their desire to make this change. And lastly, the new School would underscore its concern for the academic core of the University by seeking approval for curricular efforts from the equally broadly focused Arts and Sciences curriculum committee.

The Glenn Institute has become one of the most intellectually valuable engines of interdisciplinary activity on campus, and approving this expansive merger and giving the School a reporting line that matches its purview would be sound decisions that also made us a better university.

Sincerely,

Christian Zacher
Director and Professor of English
January 15, 2005
Updated

TO: Kay Halasek
FROM: Debby Merritt
RE: Glenn Institute Support for the School of Public Policy and Management

At the last meeting of the CAA subcommittee charged with reviewing the School of Public Policy and Management's petition to merge with the Glenn Institute, committee members asked if I could provide a list of financial and administrative support that the Institute currently provides the School. I outline here the major aspects of our current support. At the end of the memo I explain why I chose to make these somewhat unusual investments and, conversely, why most of the investments will end if the John Glenn School is not created.

I. Current Support

Faculty Support

- To enable the School to take advantage of an attractive spousal hiring opportunity, the Glenn Institute is paying one half the salary and benefits of Andrew Keeler, the School's most recent appointment. For the next three years, contributions from the Office of Academic Affairs and the spousal hiring department will offset some of these costs. After the third year, the Institute will be responsible for a full half of Professor Keeler's salary and benefits. Estimated costs for this fiscal year are $19,600; for FY 2006, $20,200; for FY 2007, $20,800; and for FY 2008, $64,250.

- This investment allowed the School to maintain faculty strength at eight, rather than falling to seven.1 Even a faculty of eight is critically small, but it would have been very difficult for the School to maintain its programs with a faculty of only seven. I thought it was essential to help the School avert this crisis in faculty strength, but SBS would not allow the School to take advantage of this opportunity on its own—even with the assistance provided through the spousal hiring program. Although the School had some

---

1Two faculty members retired from the School in the summer/fall of 2004. One of these had been supported by central funds, dating from the faculty member's service as Director of the National Regulatory Institute. The other retiring faculty member had a very low salary, significantly lower than the current starting salary in schools of public policy. These two retirements thus deprived the School of two of its nine faculty members, while releasing funds insufficient even for one entry level hire.
cash reserves, and a retirement anticipated within three months of the offer, the College would not allow the School to draw upon any of those resources to make this hire. To assist with this situation, the Institute both pledged to cover half of Professor Keeeler’s line indefinitely and to take the up-front risk that the anticipated retirement would not occur. We also agreed that Professor Keeeler will have no obligation to provide services to the Institute until he obtains tenure within PPM. In order to support Keeeler’s full development as a scholar and teacher, and help PPM through this critical period of diminished faculty size, the Institute is providing support during Professor Keeeler’s probationary period without receiving any of his time.

Graduate Student Support

- The School’s enrollments have suffered in part because it has so little financial support for top students. To begin addressing this problem, the Institute has created support for eight students. Two of these students are supported with full fellowships (including tuition and fees); six are supported with hourly stipends. The total cost of this support for FY 2005 is about $75,000.

- These students are also benefiting from unique educational opportunities through the Institute’s support.
  
  o Two of the students are teaching small policy courses regularly offered by the Glenn Institute. These teaching opportunities, previously unavailable to doctoral students in Public Policy and Management, are enhancing their skills and marketability as tenure-track faculty members.
  
  o Two of the students are research fellows at Community Research Partners, the Institute’s innovative partnership with the City of Columbus and United Way of Central Ohio. These fellows, along with the full-time staff at CRP, perform applied research and data analysis for Central Ohio policymakers, government agencies, and

---

2 The Memorandum, signed in July, provides: “Because the School currently lacks the funding to pay its share of Prof. Keeeler’s salary and benefit costs, the Institute will pay the School’s share until School resources become available. The School pledges resources from its next faculty resignation or retirement to pay its portion of Keeeler’s salary and benefit costs.” The anticipated retirement did occur at the end of September.

3 Units questioning the proposed merger and change of reporting line seem to fear that the merged School will use doctoral students to teach a large number of undergraduate courses. As explained in previous documents, this is an unfounded concern: The School has a very small doctoral program, concentrating (as do all schools of public affairs) on its professional master’s program. The School, however, currently suffers from a dilemma that is as serious as the poaching concern expressed by some other units. Because the School offers only graduate courses, and doctoral students are not allowed to evaluate master’s students, its doctoral students lack an essential part of their training: courses to teach. Doctoral students at other schools of public affairs frequently teach undergraduate courses in other departments, such as economics, political science, or social work. Students at some universities teach in a small number of undergraduate courses hosted by their own public affairs schools. Ohio State’s budgeting system has precluded PPM’s doctoral students from teaching in other units; those units hire their own doctoral students and are reluctant to hire students from other units. At the same time, the School currently lacks any courses that its doctoral students may teach. This imposes a serious handicap on doctoral education.
nonprofits. The students are polishing their analytical skills while obtaining a
unique perspective on the ways in which academic research informs policy.

- One student is a research fellow at the Ohio Grantmakers Forum, researching policy
issues and helping Ohio philanthropic organizations address policy issues through
thoughtful grantmaking. Through this partnership, the Institute and OGF are at the
forefront of policy initiatives among private foundations. The student fellow has an
unusual opportunity to participate in this emerging aspect of policymaking.

- One student directs the Glenn Institute’s Living Learning Program. This student has
a special opportunity to develop extracurricular activities related to public service
for more than 50 college freshmen. During the fall quarter, this master’s student
was one of the campus leaders in organizing voter education efforts among students.

- One student performs research for the Institute and School, gathering information on
emerging trends in public affairs education and scholarship.

- One student coaches the undergraduate speech and debate team, now housed within
the Institute. This position enhances the student’s public speaking and
organizational abilities, as well as his policy analysis and research skills.

Undergraduate speech and debate focuses on contemporary policy issues.

Recruiting Assistance

- One of the School’s most pressing problems is its dramatic decline in enrollment of
master’s students. Without master’s students, the School can maintain neither its
reputation nor its budget. Yet the School’s faculty and staff have shrunk to the point
where it lacks the resources to recruit aggressively. To begin reversing this downward
spiral, the Institute has devoted both staff time and cash to designing and producing
recruiting brochures. Estimated value of this assistance so far is $10,000 of staff time
and $1,500 for production.

- This relatively modest infusion of support allowed the School’s staff to leverage their
own resources and begin more effective recruiting. The School complemented our
investment with its own staff time and production of new materials.

Administrative Support

- The School’s faculty and staff are so lean that it has difficulty meeting all of its
administrative functions. As a result, the Institute has assisted the School with
numerous administrative tasks. In particular, the Institute’s staff provided substantial
assistance for the School’s recent move to Page Hall. Institute staff members are also
troubleshooting many of the School’s problems with furniture delivery, construction,
etc. in the new building. Estimated value of this staff time for FY 2003 is $20,000.

- Particular problems have arisen with the School’s computer system because of
disabilities suffered by its single systems coordinator. The School has little back up for
this coordinator, so the Institute’s systems manager and student workers coordinated
transfer of the School's computers during the recent move, installed most of the
School's computers, and maintained the School's IT system through January 5. On
January 5, we had to cease assisting PPM with its IT system because SBS had concerns
about the manner in which PPM was working with JGI. The objection appeared to
reflect internal disagreements between the SBS Dean and PPM, rather than an objection
to our actions, but it was too difficult for our systems manager and students to continue
providing free assistance under those circumstances. The Institute helped PPM find
other sources of support, communicated with those sources, and has remained available
(still without charge) as consultants to those new sources. The new sources of support,
unfortunately, have not been nearly as satisfactory for PPM as partnership with JGI
was: a computer lab for which students pay a special fee was delayed in opening,
faculty have suffered breakdowns of their computer access, the School's website was
hacked, and there have been delayed responses to all of these problems. But we have
done our best to consult with PPM's new sources of computer support in this difficult
time. Estimated cost of the services we provided through January 5 is $8,000.

Space

- The University allocated the School of Public Policy and Management space within
Page Hall roughly equivalent to the space it previously occupied in Fisher Hall. To
enhance the School's operations and facilitate the merger, if approved, the Institute has
temporarily shifted some space assignments within the building, giving the School's
faculty more desirable offices within the Institute's space and granting the School
access to the seminar rooms, training rooms, distance learning studio, and other
specialized facilities the Institute controls. These include lounges for both faculty and
staff—neither of which was available within the School's space.

- The Institute will pay maintenance fees on areas it is sharing with PPM; those fees will
be assessed by the University later this month.

Development Support

- From the start, the Institute has taken full responsibility for fundraising to pay for the
Page Hall renovation. Although the School was always designated as a primary
occupant of the building, it was not charged with any fundraising responsibilities. The
Institute's Director, its Director of Development, and other staff have devoted
considerable time to this endeavor over the last five years—and will continue to do so.
The capital campaign also entails costs for materials, events, and travel. The Institute
and OSU Development bear all of these costs on the School's behalf. Over the last five
years, the total cost of development work focused on Page Hall (as distinct from work
related to general Institute fundraising) has exceeded $100,000.

- Since the fundraising campaign for Page Hall has not yet reached its goal (a common
occurrence campuswide given the poor economy during the last four years), the
Institute will also use its budget to cover debt and interest payments on a bridge loan to cover construction costs. The School is not charged with these costs, so the Institute will pay all debt and interest on space occupied by the School, including space permanently assigned to the School. Interest payments on the School's portion of the building will amount to about $12,000 per year. Debt for that portion of the building amounts to $1.2 million.

- In addition to the development expenses related to Page Hall, which date back more than five years, the Institute has begun assisting the School with all of its other fundraising efforts. The SBS development officer has not been able to offer the School any assistance during the last year. To prevent the School from losing ground with existing donors, and to leverage opportunities for the School's programs offered by donor excitement surrounding the move into Page Hall, the Institute has stepped in to maintain the School's development work. Our efforts have included a mailing to all of the School's alumni, with two more mailings planned during the first half of 2005; meetings with several donors and potential donors; and detailed work on proposals with several School donors. It should be stressed that this work focuses exclusively on donations that would benefit the School's programs. The value of both staff time and costs (mailings, meals, etc) for development work focused exclusively on the School's programs is about $32,000 for this fiscal year.

II. The Rationale for Investment

The Glenn Institute's support for PPM may seem unusual in the context of the University's compartmentalized budgeting system. It may be useful for the committee to understand the two reasons I undertook these investments. First, and most important, PPM was in a precarious position when the School's faculty and director first raised the possibility of merging with the Glenn Institute in the fall of 2003. I thought PPM's merger proposal made sense and held significant promise for advancing Ohio State's academic plan. At the same time, the School's budget, enrollments, faculty size, and other measures of quality were slipping fast. The School appeared on a downward spiral and SBS, despite repeated pleas from the School, had not done anything to halt or reverse that trend. I did not think it would be in the Institute's interest to merge with the School if the School continued to decline during the 1-2 years that would be necessary to obtain approval for a merger and change in reporting line. Thus, to allow the possibility of a fruitful merger—and to preserve an essential public policy asset at the University—I decided to make a limited number of investments that would at least preserve PPM's status quo.

Second, academic units have different budget and investment patterns than non-academic ones do. In particular, academic units invest much more in graduate students and permanent faculty than a non-academic unit does. Non-academic units are not TFU's so investments in permanent faculty are difficult. And graduate students—especially those on full fellowship support—are more costly to hire as workers than many other types of employees. For an academic unit, the additional expense makes sense, because the expenditure is an
investment in the unit's own students and academic reputation. For a non-academic unit, the additional cost rarely is worth bearing.

Considering these differences, and the budget/culture clash that might occur if we tried to merge JGI and PPM too abruptly, it made sense to make some investments in PPM over the last year that would accomplish the transition to a possible merger more slowly. I purposely, therefore, began supporting graduate students when I had an opportunity to do so, and made a number of other budget decisions as a merged School (rather than an independent Institute) would. These decisions, of course, also accomplished my first objective of helping the School maintain its status pending the possible merger.

III. The Future

If the merger and change in reporting line are not approved, some of the commitments noted above will continue. These are the Institute's support for one-half of Professor Keeler's line; development work to conclude the fundraising campaign for Page Hall; and debt/interest payments for the remaining debt on the building.4

The other forms of support, however, will cease if the Glenn School is not created. The rationale that prompted my "bridge" investments in PPM work in reverse as well. If the merger does not go forward, then it is not the Glenn Institute's place to help PPM regain its financial stability and reputation; SBS or another unit will have to take on that responsibility. And the Institute will need to focus its resources on programs that enhance its reputation and contributions as a non-academic unit. For us, supporting graduate students will no longer be a high priority. We will also need to reclaim the space we have allocated to PPM faculty, and charge the School for its use of any of our special facilities.

The Institute obviously would also eliminate its support for the School's fundraising programs, recruiting, computer systems, and other administrative tasks if the merger did not go through. In a few instances—such as maintenance of the computer system—the School might find it cost effective to purchase these services from the Institute. But the Institute would have to recover at least its costs (including administrative time) for providing these services.

Please let me know if I can provide any further information.

4 Although the Institute will continue support for half of Professor Keeler's salary indefinitely, it will shift the focus of his work over time if the John Glenn School is not created. As noted above, the Institute does not benefit from any of Professor Keeler's time until he obtains tenure. Once he obtains tenure, if the Glenn School has been created, we will merge his obligations so that he provides teaching, research, and service in the same mix that other faculty do. If the School has not been created, the Institute will use its half of Professor Keeler's line for more administrative work and interactions with the community on policy initiatives.
March 28, 2005

Provost Barbara Snyder
203 Bricker Hall
190 N Oval Mall
CAMPUS

Dear Provost Snyder:

As members of the faculty of the School of Public Policy and Management, we unanimously and unequivocally express, once again, our unconditional support for the merger of the School with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy, together with a reporting line to the Provost for the merged unit.

We urge swift approval of the merger.

Yours sincerely,

[Signatures]

Trevor Brown          Anand Desai          Theresa Heintze
Robert Greenbaum     Andrew Keeler        David Randhagen

Mary K. Marvel       Bert Rockman

Copy: Carole A. Anderson
Paul A. Beck
E. Kay Halasek
W. M. Sherman
W. Randy Smith
March 28, 2005

Provost Barbara Snyder
203 Bricker Hall
190 N Oval Mall
The Ohio State University

Dear Provost Snyder:

I am writing to indicate my unqualified support for the merger of the School of Public Policy and Management (where I am an assistant professor) with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy. In addition, I am wholeheartedly in support of a central reporting line for the merged unit.

Sincerely,

Trevor L. Brown
Assistant Professor

Copy: Carole A. Anderson
Paul A. Beck
E. Kay Halasek
W.M. Sherman
W. Randy. Smith
March 28, 2005

Provost Barbara Snyder
203 Bricker Hall
190 N Oval Mall
CAMPUS

Dear Provost Snyder:

This letter is in enthusiastic support of the proposed merger of the School Of Public Policy and Management with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy. Given the close alignment of the mission of the School with the land grant mission of the University, I also believe that it is important that the merged unit report directly to the Provost.

Yours sincerely,

\[signature\]

Anand Desai
Associate Professor

Copy: Carole A. Anderson
Paul A. Beck
E. Kay Halasek
W. M. Sherman
W. Randy. Smith
March 28, 2005

Provost Barbara Snyder
203 Bricker Hall
190 N Oval Mall
CAMPUS

Dear Provost Snyder:

I wish to personally express my strong support for the proposed merger of the School of Public and Management and the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy. The merger, coupled with the central reporting line, will bring together two units that naturally compliment each other.

Yours sincerely,

Robert T. Greenbaum
Assistant Professor

Copy: Carole A. Anderson
Paul A. Beck
E. Kay Halasek
W. M. Sherman
W. Randy Smith
March 28, 2005

Provost Barbara Snyder
203 Bricker Hall
190 N Oval Mall
CAMPUS

Dear Provost Snyder:

As a member of the faculty of the School of Public Policy and Management here at the Ohio State University, I wish to indicate my absolute support for the merger of the school with the John Glenn Institute. I also whole-heartedly support a new reporting line for the new merged unit that reports directly to you.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Theresa Heintze, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School of Public Policy & Management

Copy: Carole A. Anderson
Paul A. Beck
F. Kay Halasek ✓
W.M. Sherman
W. Randy Smith
March 28, 2005

Provost Barbara Snyder
203 Bricker
190 N Oval Mall
Columbus, Oh 43210

Dear Provost Snyder:

I am writing as a faculty member of the School of Public Policy and Management to express my support for the merger of the School with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy. I also wish to express my support for the merged unit to be organized with a central reporting line. I believe that these changes will significantly improve the teaching, research, and service mission of the University, and will improve the operation and reputation of both units.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Andrew G. Keeler
Associate Professor

Cc: Vice-Provost Carole Anderson
    Vice-Provost W. Randy Smith
    Vice-Provost W.M. Sherman
    Professor Kay Halasek
    Dean Paul Beck
March 28, 2005

Provost Barbara Snyder
203 Bricker Hall
190 N Oval Mall
CAMPUS

Dear Provost Snyder:

I enthusiastically support the merger of the School of Public Policy and Management with the John Glenn Institute with a central reporting line for the merged unit.

It is a matter of extreme urgency both for the State of Ohio and our university, that our state know about the rich portfolio of educational programs, scholarly research and outreach and engagement activities that Ohio State offers. The merged unit would become another showcase by which the resources of the university could be displayed to the wider community.

I urge your continued support for the swift approval of this merger.

Yours sincerely,

David Landsbergen

Copy: Carole A. Anderson
Paul A. Beck
E. Kay Halasek ✓
W.M. Sherman
W. Randy. Smith
March 28, 2005

Provost Barbara Snyder
203 Bricker Hall
190 N Oval Mall
CAMPUS

Dear Provost Snyder:

I enthusiastically support the merger of the School of Public Policy and Management with the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy, together with a central reporting line for the merged unit.

Sincerely,

Mary K. Marvel
Associate Professor

Copy: Carole A. Anderson
    Paul A. Beck
    E. Kay Halasek
    W. M. Sherman
    W. Randy Smith
April 15, 2005

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.
The John Glenn School of Public Affairs
Profile as of July 1, 2005

| Faculty Size | 7 (4 tenured associate professors, 1 untenured associate professor, 2 untenured assistant professors) |
| Faculty Degree Fields | Public Policy (5), Political Science (2), Social Work, Agricultural and Resource Economics, Law² |
| Joint Appointments | None |
| Emeritus | 10, with 1 actively teaching and in residence full time |
| Adjuncts/Lecturers | 11, 7 from the community and 4 from non-tenure-track administrative positions at OSU. Seven currently teach. |
| Affiliated Faculty | Approximately 200, from more than 50 different OSU departments |
| 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) | 85 |
| Doctoral Student Enrollment | 19 |
| Staff Support | Associate Director (1), Fiscal/Human Resources (1.5), Training Programs (4.3), Office Manager (0.8), 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 | Second Amendment Research Center, Service-Learning Scholars Initiative |
| 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.
NEW Leadership  
Living Learning Program  
Undergraduate Speech and Debate Team  
National/International Essay Competition

| Training Programs/Executive Education | Kiplinger Program in Public Affairs Journalism  
| | Orientation for Newly Elected Legislators  
| | Leadership Retreat for Legislators  
| | Management Advancement for the Public Service  
| | First Time Candidates Institute  
| | Ohio Certified Public Management Program  
| | L2000+ Leadership Academy  
| | Ohio City/County Management Association |

| Applied Research | Community Research Partners |

| Lectures, Conferences, Workshops | Annual Policy Conference  
| | 6 annual high-profile lectures, each supported by outside funding  
| | Battelle Annual Policy Papers and Workshop  
| | Faculty Workshops |

| Revenue Available for Current Year | $4,757,555,10.81 |

| Endowment Principal | $5,936,672.00 |

| Annual External Support (Including Private Gifts, Foundation Grants and Government Contracts) | $326,656.00 |

| 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 |

Analysis:

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.
The John Glenn School of Public Affairs
Priorities for Year One (AY 2006)
The Year of Reorganization and Launch

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.
The John Glenn School of Public Affairs
Priorities for Year Two (AY 2007)
The Year of Faculty Growth and Definition

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
The John Glenn School of Public Affairs
Priorities for Year Three (AY 2008)
The Year of Synthesis and Setting New Directions

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 non-degree 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
April 15, 2005

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


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>Carryforward from JGI</th>
<th>216,601.48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<tr>
<td>State Line Item (JGI)</td>
<td>285,952.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees from Training Programs (JGI)</td>
<td>906,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JGI Endowment Interest</td>
<td>210,750.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM Endowment Interest</td>
<td>124,145.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JGI Cash Gifts and Grants</td>
<td>313,970.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM Cash Gifts and Grants</td>
<td>12,885.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JGI Other Income1</td>
<td>60,325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM Other Income</td>
<td>28,982.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projected Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,757,510.81</strong></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 FY06.¹

Most of these income projections are quite secure. It is possible that the state budget crisis will force OAA to cut PBA 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.² 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 FY06.³

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.\textsuperscript{5} 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\textsuperscript{5}</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.\textsuperscript{6} 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.

\textsuperscript{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.

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

\textsuperscript{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) @</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>43,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 apiece</td>
<td></td>
<td></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):

\[
\begin{align*}
345.82 + 195.94 + 541.76 & \quad \text{Fee} \\
541.76 & \quad \text{Subsidy (MAS 2)} \\
541.76 \times 0.76 & \quad \text{Total} \\
411.74 & \quad \text{Central Tax} \\
411.74 \text{ Net after Tax}
\end{align*}
\]

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 these students has remained relatively steady (16-24). 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 \times\ credits \times\ net\ revenue\ for\ each\ year:

\[ (35\ MPA\ students\ \times\ 36\ credit\ hours\ \times\ $227.50) + (34\ MA\ students\ \times\ 15\ credit\ hours\ \times\ $227.50) = $206,650 + $116,025 = $402,675. \]

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 | 110,000 | 29,700 |
| Three half-time (joint appointment) associate professors @ $40,000 apiece | 120,000 | 32,400 |
| One full-time assistant professor | 66,000 | 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;12 (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.13 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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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: 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 61 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. 16-18 (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. \(^3\) 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.

\(^3\) 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 most 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. The 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 Program8

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 differences10 and the coursework is more advanced:

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

---

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.
- Seminar in Quantitative Methods
- Seminar in Public Sector Economics
- Public Finance

- Quantitative Methods and Analysis
  - Applied Regression and Correlation Analysis
  - Applied Economic Models and Forecasting
  - Policy Modeling Seminar

- Organization Theory and Behavior
  - Problems in Public Organization Theory

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, must 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.html#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

---

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.\(^\text{12}\)

III. **Undergraduate Programs\(^\text{13}\)**

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;\(^\text{14}\) 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 PS679G, 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 expensive 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. This is less than two-thirds the revenue generated by professional master’s students. To realize the same $45,500 in a

\[26\text{ For FY 05, the net effective fee rate for undergraduates is $171.17; the BAC 1 net effective subsidy rate is $77.32. Combining these figures yields $248.49 gross revenue. Subtracting the 24% central tax leaves $188.85. Further subtracting Cost Pool One (Undergraduate) of $39.42 and Cost Pool Five (All Students) of $1.51 yields $147.82.}\]
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.21 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 those 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] Roytst 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>Number</th>
<th>Primary Degree Field/Department of Joint Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Faculty</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Appointments</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Faculty</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Law (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Administration (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Appointments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>Full Time Faculty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Political Science (2) Public and International Affairs Public Policy Economics (7) Developmental Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Appointments</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Statistics Economics (4) Public Health (Medicine) Sociology Political Science History of Science 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. La Follette 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 La Follette 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 La Follette 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 Stanla, 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By July 1, 2008, the School will have completed the following tasks:</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established priorities and developed implementation plans based on the research and teaching blueprint.</td>
<td>Priorities and implementation plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established priorities and developed implementation plans for the School's degree and non-degree programs and teaching and internship activities</td>
<td>Progress report on implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established priorities and developed implementation plans for additional faculty hires</td>
<td>Progress report on implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begun implementation of joint appointments with other units on campus</td>
<td>Memoranda of Understanding with other units regarding joint hires</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>
</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>
<tr>
<td>Named senior faculty appointments</td>
<td>1. Number, diversity, and other qualifications of faculty FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Names, diversity, and other qualifications of senior faculty members</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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Number of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Quality Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Diversity indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established funding support for students</td>
<td>1. Funding dollars for masters students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Funding dollars for doctoral students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced existing Institute Programs</td>
<td>Trends in the number and profile of applicants for the Kiplinger program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington Academic Internship Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other student programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other training programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year Four (AY 2009): Homestretch Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By July 1, 2009, the School will have completed the following tasks:</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 Abijeoyeh, 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 Abijeoyeh, 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 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.

| Faculty Size | 7 (6.5 FTE) (4 tenured associate professors, 1 untenured associate professor; 2 untenured assistant professors) |
| Faculty Degree Fields | Public Policy (5), Political Science (1), Agricultural and Resource Economics (1), Law (1) |
| 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

---

*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.*
admiringly in both goals, placing graduates in tenured positions at schools ranked above the School and in high-level government positions.5

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 Heinze'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 Keefer'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 Landsberger 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 Landsberger'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.

5The 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**

<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>Funding Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Total $’000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Dec 2002</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Dec 2003</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Dec 2004</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Dec 2005</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$952</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, that 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
dge 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>
<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>1. Website 2. Brochures 3. Other materials, e.g. promotional CD</td>
<td>SPPM</td>
<td>John Glenn School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed a strategy to promote the School supported by the creation of a new website and materials</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 public policy and public management minors in collaboration with other departments</td>
<td>1. Curriculum 2. Plans for administration of the minors</td>
<td>Limited potential at current levels of support staff.</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.
### Table 4

**Year One: AY 2006 (continued)**

<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>Discussed permanent internships with State agencies and local governments</td>
<td>Negotiations with government entities to establish internships</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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened current dual and joint degree programs</td>
<td>Meetings with advisors and development of informational materials</td>
<td>Greater excitement in being associated with the Glenn School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganized staff to address critical needs in student recruiting, admissions, placement, and alumni relations</td>
<td>1. Organization Chart 2. Recruitment strategy 3. Placement Strategy</td>
<td>In the absence of a permanent director it is unclear whether additional staff support will be authorized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begun discussion on joint hires</td>
<td>Identified potential departments</td>
<td>Potential source will be existing affiliates of the Glenn Institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired an Office Associate</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Essential to maintain daily School operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>Began 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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SPPM</th>
<th>John Glenn School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater flexibility in developing a diverse research and teaching portfolio.</td>
<td>Non-degree programs can play an important role in enhancing the School’s and University’s effort to train legislators and senior public servants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater flexibility in hiring teachers for the non-degree programs who could also offer courses for the degree programs.</td>
<td>Greater likelihood of involvement due to flexibility in designing collaborative arrangements with current Glenn affiliates and other faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current vacancies include School Director, senior hire (SPPM director funds), Wolf Chair plus a junior position.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By July 1, 2007, the School intends to complete the following tasks:</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<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</td>
<td>SPPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Diversity indicators</td>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified new joint and dual degree programs</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Began development campaign for faculty chairs and student fellowships</td>
<td>Development activity report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created permanent internships</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified the Enarson executive-in-residence</td>
<td>Name and qualifications of individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Year Two: AY 2007 (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>Began 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>Began 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>Began to implement plans for additional faculty hires</td>
<td>Progress report on implementation</td>
<td>Greater ability to attract individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Began 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>Affiliation with Glenn School likely to be more attractive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed graduate public policy and public management minors.</td>
<td>Enrollment and quality indicators</td>
<td>Greater likelihood of success with named school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued development campaign for faculty chairs and student fellowships</td>
<td>Development activity report</td>
<td>Greater ability to attract individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named senior faculty appointments</td>
<td>Number, diversity, and other qualifications of faculty</td>
<td></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>SPPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress towards establishing a research center</td>
<td>Progress report on implementation</td>
<td>John Glenn School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued development campaign for faculty chairs and student fellowships</td>
<td>Development activity report</td>
<td>Potentially slow progress depending upon rate of growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified second Enarson executive-in-residence</td>
<td>Name and qualifications of individual</td>
<td>High likelihood of a center being established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named senior faculty appointments</td>
<td>Number, diversity, and other qualifications of faculty</td>
<td>Greater likelihood of success with named school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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 | |
| Established funding support for students | 1. Funding dollars for masters students 
2. Funding dollars for doctoral students | |

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:

Reinvestment Funds (including release for Rockman departure) 217,700

Enarson annual endowment interest 85,000

Total Resources 302,700

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

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

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

\[55 \times 50 = 2750\text{ additional hours}\]

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 associate ships.

**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 FRA, 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>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</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>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</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>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Data for women (US citizens only) and minorities,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicants admitted</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicants who enrolled</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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):

- $371.06 Fee
- $199.96 Subsidy (Mas 2)
- $571.02 Subtotal

$ 433.98 Net After Central Tax

- $193.07 Cost Pool 2
- $2.06 Cost Pool 3 (was 5)
- $195.13 Total Cost Pools
- $238.85 Subtotal After Cost Pool

$231.68 Net After Federation Tax

$ 185.34 Final Net