Subject: Strategic Focus

Date: September 4, 1998

From: Ed Ray
Bill Shkurti

To: Brit Kirwan

The purpose of this memorandum is to share with you our recommendations concerning the next step(s) in the Academic Planning process. There appears to be a consensus across campus that Ohio State University should continue its current momentum to become a leader among public teaching and research universities. That spirit to compete and achieve has been expressed by the goal of becoming one of the top ten public institutions in the country. The challenge we face as an institution is defining what we mean by top ten and how that relates to our mission.

A sharper strategic focus is critical to the success of our academic planning process including strategic indicators and budget restructuring. In our discussions across campus we sense agreement that the University's leadership needs to be more definitive about where it wants the University to go and how we plan to get there. However, there is no consensus as to the details. Our objective here is to initiate a dialogue that will eventually lead to a more definable set of objectives and action steps.

We have organized this memo into four parts. The first part discusses our aspirations (what we want to be). The second discusses strategic choices (how do we get there). Measurement is explored in the third section (how will we know we are successful). In the concluding section we talk about the next steps.
I. ASPIRATIONS

The statement that we want to be among the top ten public universities in the country has attracted support and highlighted our commitment to enhance excellence at The Ohio State University. However, the task of defining what we mean by top ten remains.

There are a number of fundamental areas of inquiry that currently and traditionally determine which universities are among the leaders. Building on our strengths in these areas will be critical to our future, but to simply attempt to mimic the institutions currently in the top ten based upon traditional reputational ranking will relegate Ohio State to a catch up position where we will become less and less responsive to the emerging needs of our society and to the strengths of our own institution. Therefore, we must also identify new areas of significance for the future and position Ohio State to be a major player in those areas. The University needs to be able to document more clearly how and why these activities will make a difference to the people of Ohio.

The place to begin is with the University's mission statement. It was adopted in December 1992 after extensive campus-wide discussion and commits us to "the attainment of international distinction in education, scholarship and public service". Although these are worthy goals, they do not by themselves offer sufficient guidance to assist in day to day policy decisions or in allocating scarce resources.

The University's functional mission statement was developed in March 1994 in an effort to translate the mission into operational goals. However, the University Trustees and others felt the aspiration of moving to the top half of the Big Ten universities by the turn of the Century was not ambitious enough, so the goal of moving into the Top Ten Public's was developed in January of 1997.

Meanwhile, the University's academic planning process did produce additional material that helped define the University's aspirations. In his October 1, 1994 address to the University Senate, President Gee charged the University community to focus on the goal of enhancing the quality of the education and experience of our students. This in turn produced a focus on three principal objectives that guided planning efforts and resource decisions over the next five years. These three principal objectives were:

1. To continue to improve the quality of our academic programs.
2. To continue to improve the quality of the student experience inside and outside the classroom.
3. To continue to strengthen the University's management of its resources, including increasing and diversifying its revenue base.

Additional academic planning activities at both the university and college levels have also produced a great deal of information to assist us in defining aspirations. These include the activities of the Committee on the Undergraduate Experience, the Council on Enrollment and Student Progress, the advisory committees on Budget Restructuring, the Research Commission, the President's Outreach and Engagement Council, the benchmarking initiatives, as well as the continuing work of the Council of Deans and the various committees of the University Senate.
And most recently, on July 10 of this year you shared with the campus your initial thoughts on four areas that you deem most vital to the achievement of our high aspirations for Ohio State:

1. Strengthen our efforts to elevate the quality of Ohio State's undergraduate experience.
2. Develop academic programs of the highest quality through selective investments in research and graduate programs.
3. Establish commitment to diversity throughout the university community.
4. Expand the scope of the land-grant mission and address the important social, cultural and economic issues of today and tomorrow.

We believe the mission statement as focused and refined by various efforts across campus over the last six years provides the basis for defining our aspirations in a way that will help us identify what we mean by Top Ten in a manner that is consistent with our mission and our values.

We have clearly expressed our commitment to focus on improving the quality of the student experience, the quality and status of our academic programs and the effectiveness of our outreach and engagement efforts. Progress in each of these dimensions will surely be enhanced by creating a diverse campus with a genuine sense of community. We are also aware of the need to manage and generate the resources needed to achieve those objectives. We have yet to articulate the accomplishments and associated measures that would correspond to top ten ranking in terms of our values for the institution, fulfillment of our students' educational aspirations and meeting the expectations of the people of Ohio. And, we have not articulated the extent to which we are willing to depart from traditional bases for defining top ten.

In moving to this next step of defining what we mean by top ten, we want to highlight the observation made by the Research Commission on this same topic:

"A serious effort to join the Top 10 will not be sustained by simply seeking to enhance our reputation. This is not what motivates faculty members, nor should it serve as our principal inspiration. It will be the desire to excel in research, teaching and outreach, to enhance our faculty, to attract the state's and country's best undergraduate students and many of the world's best graduate students, to work in an outstanding, supportive and diverse environment, and to see the fruits of our labor benefit our fellow citizens that will move us ahead toward achieving this ambitious goal."

Our effort to define what we mean by top ten in the months ahead, to establish challenging goals and to develop measures to assess our success along the way, should be viewed as part of a broader effort to pursue a fact based decision-making management approach at Ohio State. In that regard, it is important to remember that identifying and measuring the institutional characteristics that we will associate with reaching the top ten is only a first step. Getting there and developing the process to manage necessary changes are separate and more substantial challenges.

Therefore, we begin our effort to define the University's aspirations by trying to link the three elements of the University's mission and the goals and values that have emerged from our academic planning process.
A. Scholarship

Scholarship, which is the creation and dissemination of new knowledge, is most directly related to the University's activities and aspirations regarding research. The June 1, 1998 draft report of the Research Commission defines an aspiration to place Ohio State University in the top ten public universities through a combination of the following:

1. Build an excellent faculty and attract the best students.
2. Plan for and provide a competitive research infrastructure.
3. Facilitate and stimulate interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary activity.
4. Position OSU for success with a broad range of outside constituencies.
5. Generate resources of a magnitude that will approach what is required to fund the investments listed above.

The report proposes as the key to achieving this vision, the unit and university wide reputational rankings developed by the National Research Commission, U.S. News and World Report and others.

We support the Research Commission's observation that aspirations for success in this area must be broad based. Still, in order to be successful, it will be necessary to focus resources which will result in some areas achieving this aspiration before others.

The use of these rankings as a measurement tool is discussed at greater length in the next section. What we propose here is that the reputational rankings form our base measure of aspirations, but that OSU also develop its own distinctive competencies as well.

Ohio State's large student population, the collection of so many disciplines in a single thriving metropolitan area and the relative youth of our faculty provide us with a unique opportunity to leverage resources and excel in aspects of the academic experience that are likely to be even more important in the future. These include the following:

- Interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research - The close proximity of a comprehensive medical complex with other university disciplines, for example provides tremendous collaborative opportunities for OSU.

- Faculty development - The Research Commission's work pointed out that OSU has a relatively young faculty. OSU needs to take advantage of this faculty profile by developing distinctive competencies in faculty development.

- Involvement of undergraduate and graduate students in research - Although we know this occurs on a regular basis at the departmental and individual faculty levels, it has not been a subject that has received much attention centrally. OSU has one of the largest undergraduate populations in the country. We want to recruit and retain the best faculty and students and upgrade our research efforts. Therefore, by accepting the challenge of being one of the top institutions in the country in encouraging undergraduate involvement in research and measuring the effectiveness of that effort, we leverage assets unique to Ohio State in a way that advances all of our key
academic goals. As a companion piece, the Research Commission established that we are not a leader in involving graduate students in sponsored research. We believe that improvement in this area is critical.

- Partnerships - Evolving initiatives such as the campus collaborative and the Science and Technology Campus offer OSU important opportunities for distinctive success in linking its research efforts to the needs and characteristics of the surrounding urban community.

B. Education

By education we mean teaching and learning. While OSU’s academic reputation will be driven in large part by excellence in scholarship, Ohio State must also be prepared to excel at engaging its students in the teaching and learning of that knowledge. Fortunately, over the last four years the work of the Committee on the Undergraduate Experience (and G-CUE and I-CUE) and the Council on Enrollment and Student Progress has produced a great deal of useful information about what it would mean to be a top ten institution in educating our thousands of students.

The work of CESP has highlighted the need for the University to improve recruitment, retention and graduation of our students, particularly our undergraduate students in order to move to the next level.

In its initial report in 1995, the Committee on the Undergraduate Experience highlighted three characteristics of the student environment that we feel form the basis of moving to higher aspirations in the way we treat our students. These included meeting basic needs (including social involvement), improving the academic experience and reducing the "run around" and valuing the individual.

Once again our unique characteristics as a university with a large student body, and a land grant mission in a thriving metropolitan area provide us with some unique opportunities to leverage distinctive competencies. These include:

- Diversity - This is an important part of the student experience. Traditionally, this has been measured by headcounts of various categories of historically underrepresented groups. Although these counts are a useful benchmark, they say little about the quality of the experience that a diverse environment brings to the student experience. We need to develop the use of climate surveys and other tools to help us diagnose problems and document progress in this important area of the learning environment. Part of the mission of The Ohio State University is to provide the people of Ohio access to the highest possible quality learning experience. Access and opportunity are directly reflected by the diversity of the population of the university community and the extent to which there is a sense of community at Ohio State.

- Involvement in Research - This is discussed in the previous section.

- Involvement in Outreach and Engagement - This is discussed in the next section.
• Learning Environment - OSU, because of its size and location, is in a position to offer students distinctive learning opportunities in a number of areas including learning technologies, housing alternatives, academic advising and career planning.

• Assessment - Assessment of what students learn at Ohio State and what happens to them once they graduate is a critical area. Some professional programs already use post-graduate assessment surveys. We need to do the same for graduates of our undergraduate and advanced Arts and Sciences programs. This is still a relatively new field, but one which can be expected to grow in importance in the years ahead. It was also an area highlighted for improvement in the most recent accreditation review. The Ohio State University's goal should be top ten status in the post-graduation success of our students and to get there we will need to develop effective programs and reliable performance measures.

C. Outreach and Engagement

Outreach and engagement is an aspect of Ohio State University's mission and it is an extremely important element of our value to the people of Ohio, which in turn influences our ability to garner additional financial support. One of our goals in outreach and engagement is to establish and have recognized by the people of Ohio that Ohio State University plays an important role in their lives.

The President's Council for Outreach and Engagement has already identified meaningful and mutually beneficial collaboration with partners in education, business, public and social service. Our aspiration should be to build on these efforts with programs such as OSU Cares and the Campus Collaborative to set an example in an emerging field of increasing importance.

OSU's aspirations should be to leverage its size, its land grant status and its research capabilities into a position that makes it a nationally recognized leader in outreach and engagement, with an emphasis on distinctive competencies in the following:

• Agriculture
• Medicine and the Health Sciences
• Education, particularly teacher training
• Student participation in community service and leadership
• Economic and community development

D. Access

Access has always been an important part of the Ohio State University's land grant tradition. Historically access has been associated with OSU's open admissions policy. However the growth over the last twenty years of a strong network of open access community colleges and Ohio State University's move to a more selective admissions policy provides an opportunity to reexamine the sense in which Ohio State should provide access. Although a consensus has not emerged university wide, there are University activities which are likely to play a more important role in providing access to the University as time goes on. These are:
Outreach and Engagement - This includes the historic mission of University activities such as Cooperative Extension and Technology Transfer to make research produced by the University more accessible to Ohio's people.

Diversity - OSU's commitment to diversity means that Ohio State must follow through to make a top flight education available to a wide range of people from different backgrounds including ethnic minorities, students from other countries and non-traditional students such as part-time and transfer students, as well as students with disabilities.

Lifelong learning - this includes access to the resources of the university through distance education and other means that enhance education throughout a student's lifetime.

Financial - Although the State of Ohio has not supported its public universities financially to the same level as many other states, that does not mean Ohio State should not be concerned with removing financial barriers. Ohio State University must continue to strive to provide high value for the tuition dollar and be aggressive in providing financial aid.
II. STRATEGIC CHOICES

While high aspirations are a necessary condition to achieving excellence, they are not sufficient by themselves. Choices need to be made among a number of worthy activities that may benefit the institution, so that those most critical can be fully supported.

In their review of benchmark institutions, the OSU Research Commission concluded that where excellence existed it is broad based. For example, universities that are highly ranked in research also attract the best graduate and undergraduate students and are highly ranked in teaching and service.

The Commission also pointed out that although top ten institutions have built reputations in specific areas (for example Michigan in the social sciences and Illinois in the engineering disciplines), other disciplines at those institutions are also highly ranked.

The Commission concluded that in order to move into the Top Ten "we probably need to move four or five disciplines that are currently in the second or third quartile (of the NRC benchmarks) into the first quartile. We need to move a significant number of disciplines in the third and fourth quartile up to the second quartile and we need to move a large fraction of the disciplines in the fourth quartile up to the third quartile. Although focusing resources must be an important element of OSU's strategy, the focus cannot be overly narrow if our goal is the Top Ten".

We agree with this general conclusion, yet it still leaves open the question of how this balance is to be attained. Although the Universities of Michigan and Illinois are relatively strong across the board, they are not uniformly strong in all areas. For example, material collected by the Commission shows that at the University of Michigan, 11 of 16 top quartile programs are in the Arts, Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences. At the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, on the other hand, six of its eight top quartile programs are in Engineering, Math and the Physical Sciences. We believe that in order to be successful in moving to the next level, the University will need to successfully address four strategic challenges:

1. How can we focus enough resources to allow dramatic improvements in key areas while allowing the remainder of the University to improve, but at a more gradual pace?
2. How can we close the performance gap with benchmark institutions in selected areas while exploiting our comparative advantage in areas that are likely to be important in the future?
3. How can we more clearly integrate University-wide goals with the goals of the various colleges and departments so that they are mutually reinforcing?
4. How can we do this consistently and effectively over a sustained period of time in a changing environment?

We believe the next step is to identify those colleges, schools or departments that should be expected to lead the way in this effort. The first step was taken by the Provost in his December 1995 address to the University Senate. In that speech, the Provost identified the Arts and Sciences colleges as a distinctive element of the academic core, both as individual colleges and as an identifiable group, as well as the colleges of Engineering, Medicine, Business and
Law. He also acknowledged the special public service role performed by colleges such as Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and Education.

Since that time, the University has benefited from a year long discussion of institutional strategic indicators, a two year discussion of budget restructuring, four rounds of academic enrichment, a year long review by the Research Commission, and a first step in the selective investment process. This broader institutional goal has been operationalized, in part, by the proposal of Ten in the Top Ten and 20 in the Top 20 by 2010.

We believe it is now time to move forward to the next phase. There needs to be a continuing effort to identify key departments or programs within the Arts and Sciences that should be targeted for investment, to define explicit expectations about the six professional colleges previously listed and to more explicitly define expectations regarding other colleges, schools and departments that have made and will continue to make positive and significant contributions to the University, but that may not be specifically targeted for the first rounds of enhancements. And again, the profiles of leading universities reflect strength not simply in a few disciplines, but in a broad array of allied, supporting and related disciplines. Where excellence exists, it is broad based. This articulation needs to involve the University's entire leadership and needs to be completed in the next academic year.

As part of the benchmarking exercise, Resource Planning and Institutional Analysis has developed comparisons that show Ohio State operates on significantly less revenue per FTE student than other top ten public institutions. This revenue gap is particularly pronounced in grants and contracts and in state support. Consequently, a great deal of attention has been focused on how revenues to the institution can be increased. While we feel this is an important element of the university's strategy, it cannot be the only one.

The university's aspirations must be driven by its academic mission, which is to provide scholarship, education and public serve to the people of Ohio. Additional resources can assist in achieving that goal, but are not an end in themselves.

A second implication is that resources are by definition limited, while aspirations are not. Therefore, no matter what the level of resources, choices will still have to be made.
III. MEASUREMENT

Measurement is not an end in itself, but if OSU wants to better itself, it would be wise to develop appropriate benchmarks. This is particularly challenging because the complexity of what we do in higher education makes measurement of the relationship between inputs and outputs very difficult.

Over the last year, our campus wide discussions of Strategic Indicators and Benchmark Institutions and the North Central Accreditation Review generated a number of themes that we feel should guide our future efforts:

- We should measure what we value, and not simply value what we can measure.
- We should focus on output measures as well as input measures. Our obligation to the people of Ohio involves value added in education and results.
- Our measures should recognize the diversity within the institution, including appropriate recognition of the different missions of the various colleges.
- We should try to measure what we think will be important in the future, not what was important in the past.
- As a public institution, we should measure what matters not only to us, but also what matters to our external stakeholders.
- We should be prepared to develop better measures in key areas where current measures are flawed or do not exist at all.
- While we move ahead to generate new measures of evaluation and assessment, we should not overlook more traditional measures.
- While measurement is important, it is not an end in itself but rather one means by which to monitor our process and assess our achievements.

A. Scholarship

OSU's challenge in becoming a top ten institution with regard to scholarship will be to compete in scholarship as currently measured, while developing analytic capability that will help us leap frog over our competitors in areas that will be important in the future.

Faculty have a strong tradition of assessing the quality and impact of their individual research in each discipline. At the institutional level however, evaluation is based more on funds expended and reputation rankings in national surveys. In assessing scholarship, we will need to identify the relationship between institutional factors (such as faculty development, resources and organizational best practices) and the desired outcome of high quality, high impact research.

In our consultations across campus, it has become clear that the rankings from entities such as US News and World Report and even the National Research Council have shortcomings.
For the most part, these rankings are subjective and when objective measures are used, they are often input oriented rather than output oriented. In addition, the rankings are lagging indicators based on data that is often several years old rather than leading indicators of future performance. However, these rankings are currently the most widely accepted measures of performance. While subjective, rankings such as the NRC are based on the opinions of leading scholars in the areas in which they apply and are believed to have considerable objective validity. They are widely known and influence national perceptions of quality, which influence faculty and student recruitment choices. This is the virtuous cycle referred to in the Research Commission report and it should not be ignored. If we hope to compete, we need to understand how these measures work and, as a result, how we can use them to guide our efforts to improve both Ohio State and Ohio State's standing.

Therefore we recommend the following measures for assessing OSU’s overall strength in scholarship.

- Reputation of Foundation Disciplines - establish measures of quality and impact in foundation disciplines that will help us to determine our current strengths and identify which traditionally important programs will be critical to the future of the University. Existing rankings including the NRC, U.S. News and World Report, etc. are flawed, but they have currency and must be reckoned with by Ohio State.

- Relative Market share of Federally Sponsored Research – this is one of several interesting new measures being developed by the Research Commission. This particular measure reflects external assessment of the value and impact of some key areas of research and represents a measure that can be uniformly compared between institutions.

- Citations – several measures are now available as to the citations of published research. This allows an opportunity to measure the reputation of research in areas where sponsored funding is not available, but is more quality driven than just counting the number of publications regardless of impact.

- Patents and Licenses – this is another good measure of the impact of a university’s research activities.

- New measures – as we described previously the University should seek to develop measures in areas currently not measured well but where OSU should develop distinctive competencies that are likely to grow in the future. In the area of scholarship this would include the areas mentioned earlier: interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary work in emerging fields, faculty development and community partnerships.

B. Education

The most common outcome measure of successful instruction is completion of the academic program, which in most cases is represented by graduation. And, surely, having students graduate and pursue productive careers is a primary responsibility of every university. However, the available research on graduation rates shows that the variable most commonly
associated with graduation is the preparation of the entering students (ACT levels, etc.). While this says a lot about what kind of students are attracted to a particular institution, it says very little about the institution itself in terms of adding value. *Us News and World Report* has tried to address this issue in its annual ranking of colleges and universities by including a value added score based on projected graduation rates for undergraduate students.

First and foremost, we must develop initiatives to dramatically improve our retention, graduation and the post-graduate success of our students. We think that graduation rate is a critical measure of an institution’s performance in undergraduate education. The graduation rate, though, is only a proxy for the University’s interaction with students while they are here. To understand OSU’s graduation rate we must look at not only student “potential” as measured by ACT scores, but how the institution helps or hinders students through the University. In that regard, OSU should commit itself to being among the top ten publics in organizational effectiveness and should commit itself to being a national leader in improving retention and graduation. To monitor our success in each of those areas, we will need to develop effective measures. It is particularly worth noting that our urban location permits students to step in and step out. Our graduation rates should be benchmarked against other urban universities.

Therefore we recommend as our initial university wide strategic measures first year retention rates and six year graduation rates on both an ACT adjusted and non-ACT adjusted basis.

We also need to collect student profile data to help us develop benchmarks. Readily available data should include ACT scores, percentage of students in the top 10%, top 25% of their high school class and student and faculty diversity.

Finally, we need to develop measures in emerging areas that are likely to be future areas of distinctive competency for OSU. These include the learning environment, assessment and involvement in public service in addition to involvement in research and diversity, which have already been mentioned.

C. Outreach and Engagement

There are no commonly accepted indicators of outreach and engagement, so we recommend that the Deans and the Outreach and Engagement Council be charged to work with Resource Planning and Institutional Analysis to develop both goals and measures for Ohio State that can eventually be used to compare us to other schools. Since many of our efforts have a direct local impact, these comparisons should also include other Ohio schools. To excel in outreach and engagement should be a contributing factor to having the resources to be a top ten university. Our initial efforts should focus on areas of known strengths such as agriculture, education, medicine and student involvement in community service.
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this memorandum we have tried to establish a framework for a campus wide discussion about what the university’s aspirations should be, what strategic choices need to be made and how our progress should be measured.

Aspirations

What we mean by Top Ten should be driven by a combination of the University’s aspirations, its mission and its unique characteristics.

- Scholarship – the key to raising performance to the next level is to improve our research reputation in core disciplines while allowing other units to improve as well. Distinctive competencies should be developed in faculty development, student involvement in research, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research, and public and private partnerships.

- Education – the University’s initial emphasis should be to improve retention and graduation rates, as well as to increase the diversity of its faculty and students. In particular, this includes an opportunity to develop distinctive competencies in creating a learning environment where diversity is valued, where students, including undergraduates, are engaged in scholarship and public service and where we have made tracking demonstrable success of our graduates a priority.

- Outreach and Engagement – the University needs to develop and document distinctive competencies that already exist in agriculture, health, and education as well as provide more opportunities for student-based experiences in community service and leadership.

- Access – these aspirations will also require a redefinition of the University’s accession mission to emphasize outreach and engagement (including technology transfer), diversity and the removal of financial barriers.

Strategic Choices

Although we believe the advance to the next level will need to be broad based, we believe the University will have to make strategic choices to focus resources where they can do the most good in advancing the University’s goals. We have suggested these strategic choices should begin with an identification of those colleges, schools, departments and disciplines that should be expected to lead the way to the accomplishment of University goals. At the same time, a process needs to be articulated as to how the vast majority of units can better themselves and make a distinctive contribution to the university's mission.

Measurement

We have proposed three levels of measurement as part of this effort. The first would be traditional measurement in core areas such as the research reputation of individual disciplines or departments. The second would be to develop new University-wide measures in areas
earmarked for distinctive competencies. The third would be a set of customized measures for individual colleges that would be integrated with university wide measures.

**What Happens Next**

Our purpose in presenting this memorandum is to provide a framework for a focused but spirited campus discussion about what the University means by top ten. Therefore we propose the following as next steps to advance that conversation:

Aspirations – we would like to initiate that discussion with key University groups including the Council of Deans, Faculty Council and various Senate committees this quarter, develop a revised statement Winter Quarter and a more final statement by the end of the academic year.

Strategic choices – we believe the next step should be a proposal from Academic Affairs describing the 5-6 disciplines that should receive additional central resources to advance to the top ten in the NRC rankings (and why), as well as an additional 5-6 colleges, centers or other units that would receive enhanced support to advance to the top ten of other rankings (such as *US News and World Report*). This proposal should also explain by what process other units would be expected to contribute. It should be distributed in draft form to the campus by no later than January 1999, for discussion during Winter Quarter.

Measures – we have asked University Resources Planning and Institutional Analysis to do the following four things to enhance our measurement capacity:

1. Refine the preliminary institutional-wide strategic indicators presented at the July 10 Board of Trustees meeting in draft form to make them more consistent with the core aspirations described in this memorandum. We expect this to be completed in the next 90 days.
2. Develop additional information that will assist in making the strategic choices described in this memo. This includes the relationship between different variables and rankings of individual departments and universities. We expect this to be completed by December.
3. Develop a plan to assess measurement tools for the distinctive competencies suggested in this memo (we expect this effort will take some time to complete since it covers new ground).
4. Work with the colleges to further develop the first round of suggested college-specific strategic indicators so that they are tailored to each unit but in a more standardized and integrated format. We expect this effort to take the remainder of this academic year.

All these activities should be incorporated into the Leadership Agenda for the 1998-1999 school year. And, if we are successful in meeting our goals, OSU should head into the 1999-2000 school year with a much surer sense of what it wants to be, what choices need to be made to get there and how progress will be measured.
With your permission we would like to circulate this document across campus for
discussion during Fall Quarter with the goal of establishing some degree of consensus on what
we mean by Top Ten by the end of the current school year.

c: Eric Kunz
   Alice Stewart