

PRESIDENT  
EMERITUS



OREGON  
STATE  
UNIVERSITY

Autzen House  
811 SW Jefferson  
Corvallis, Oregon  
97333-4506

541-737-3542

Fax

541-737-4380

April 14, 2004

Dr. W. Randy Smith, Vice Provost  
Office of Academic Affairs  
The Ohio State University  
203 Bricker Hall  
190 North Oval Mall  
Columbus OH 43210-1358

Dear Randy,

Here is my report on the Outreach and Engagement Initiative at The Ohio State University. Because I was not able to visit your campus at the time of the external review team's visit, my report is based only on the written materials you provided to me and on a number of phone conversations with past and present OSU administrators, on and off campus. A list of the individuals with whom I spoke is included in the report.

The report is essentially in three sections: a general overview of outreach and engagement, a reaction to the September 2003 report of the internal review committee, and my suggestions and recommendations for the future of outreach and engagement at Ohio State.

Please contact me if you have questions concerning the report or if further amplification or clarification of some points is needed. As I mentioned to you earlier, I would welcome the opportunity to visit The Ohio State University at some time in the future, should that be appropriate.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'John'.

John V. Byrne  
President Emeritus  
Oregon State University

Outreach and Engagement:  
Possible Defining Characteristics of  
The Ohio State University of the Future

A Report by John V. Byrne,  
President Emeritus, Oregon State University

April 2004

Foreword

This report is about outreach and engagement at The Ohio State University in 2004. It is based on written materials provided by the personnel of the Office of Academic Affairs of The Ohio State University and on conversations, primarily by telephone, with present and former Ohio State administrators. (1)

---

(1) Conversations concerning outreach and engagement were conducted with the following:

Karen Holbrook, President, The Ohio State University

Ed Ray, former OSU Provost

Richard Sisson, former OSU Provost

Bobby Moser, Vice President for Outreach and Engagement and Vice President for Agricultural Administration

Keith Smith, Director, OSU Extension Services

Gifford Weary, Chair, Internal Review Committee

Karen Bruns, Leader, Office of Outreach and Engagement

Richard L. Stoddard, Assistant Vice President for Government Relations

Tony Basil, Director, Continuing Education

---

The report includes: comments about outreach and engagement in higher education in general and at The Ohio State University; reaction to the September 2003 report of the internal review committee; and recommendations and suggestions for the future development of outreach and engagement at The Ohio State University.

The assumptions that serve as a basis for this report are:

1. Ohio State is serious about making outreach and engagement a major element of its mission and is prepared to consider and to implement modifications to its administrative structure and functions. If necessary, it is prepared to break from long standing academic traditions.
2. Outreach and engagement will be built on existing strengths of The Ohio State University.
3. Significant new funding for outreach and engagement probably will not be available.
4. Consideration of the values and strengths of the existing culture and the traditions of Ohio State will determine the manner in which reforms are implemented.

Outreach and Engagement

Virtually all public universities in America have adopted some form of outreach or engagement as part of their recognized missions. Outreach has been a fundamental part of America's public university activities for a century or more; engagement involving partnerships with elements of society is relatively new. Although the concept of engagement predates the existence of the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land grant Universities, the Commission's report "Returning to our Roots: The Engaged Institution" has stimulated increased engagement activity throughout the nation. In writing about engagement, the Kellogg Commission envisioned "partnerships, two-way streets defined by mutual respect among the parties for what each brings to the table." At the urging of the Kellogg Commission new journals and organizations focused on the role of the university in establishing new partnerships with the public have served to alter the missions of many leading universities, including The Ohio State University. The "scholarship of engagement" was recognized and described by Ernest Boyer in 1996 and educational associations such as the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) have established committees to review and monitor engagement as a scholarly activity practiced at public universities. In an effort to stimulate and legitimize engagement as a faculty activity, a clearing house for engagement has been established at the University of Georgia, and efforts have been made to define the scholarship of engagement. ([www.scholarshipofengagement.com](http://www.scholarshipofengagement.com))

The Kellogg Commission recognized the importance of engagement with society as an important university activity and noted its importance in stimulating learning both on and off campus and its importance to the creation of new knowledge and applications of knowledge. Further, the commission assessed the evolving mission of public universities to be one in which learning, discovery, and engagement are integrated. Ohio State University presidents played an important role in Kellogg Commission activities during the 1990s and The Ohio State University is now among the leaders in the movement to include engagement, along with outreach, as part of its mission.

At Ohio State, beginning with meetings in 1996, the development of outreach and engagement has been an orderly one, with one result being the creation of an "Office of Outreach and Engagement" in December 2000, under the direction of a vice president. Efforts to increase the effectiveness of outreach and engagement, to enhance the awareness of their importance, and to include more faculty, staff, and administrators led to the review in 2003 by an internal review committee and to the creation of a team of external reviewers in 2004. This external reviewer's comments on the report of the internal committee follows.

Comments Regarding the Report of the Internal Review Committee: "A Program Review of The Ohio State University Outreach and Engagement Initiative", September 2003

The report of the internal review committee served several important purposes: (1) it reviewed the background and development of outreach and engagement at Ohio State during the 1990s; (2) it identified five major issues to be addressed as Ohio State continues to develop its outreach and engagement activities; and (3) it presented several recommendations for the further development of outreach and engagement. The committee recognized that "outreach and engagement" is neither a fourth mission of the university, nor is it a substitution for service. The first issue noted by the committee concerns the identity of outreach and engagement. This is not surprising. Outreach as a one-way extension of knowledge from the university has been a characteristic of the land grant university for about

a century; engagement (equal partnering) with elements of society is relatively new. Because engagement at Ohio State is in a formative stage, it may take time and effort for many faculty and staff to understand the dimensions and characteristics of partnering with external groups. Identifying outreach, and engagement, as part of agriculture and extension is normal considering the long and strong ties of agriculture and outreach by extension personnel during the development of land grant universities. Further, having the Vice President for Agricultural Administration, Bobby Moser, also serve as the Vice President for Outreach and Engagement highlights the notion that outreach and engagement at Ohio State may be simply a new form of “extension” tied to agriculture. As the climate for engagement on and off the university campus matures, these perceptions will change as well.

The second issue addressed by the committee included a number of program elements: the need for an inventory of all outreach and engagement activities occurring throughout the university; the need for an evaluation of the effectiveness of the small grants program and the Roads Scholar tour; the possible continuation of the three main cross-cutting initiatives (P-12, economic development, and health and safety); and the impact or effectiveness of various outreach and engagement activities. My advice: do the inventory, continue the small grants program and the Roads Scholar tour and stay the course on the three initiatives. It is still too early in the development of these programs to evaluate their lasting importance to the outreach and engagement efforts of the university.

The third issue the committee identified pertained to the scope of activities that could be linked directly to the Office of Outreach and Engagement: continuing education, distance education, service learning, and technology transfer. The committee questioned how these activities might be developed as part of the university’s outreach and engagement effort, and what their reporting relationship to the Office of Outreach and Engagement should be. This issue of governance involves other major departments and offices of the university, so a decision on reporting structure, clearly stated, needs to be made. Because of the outreach dimensions of these activities, some type of reporting, direct or dual, should be implemented as soon as possible as part of the orderly development of outreach and engagement. The public and the campus community should be informed of these reporting relationships.

Funding, the fourth issue, always seems to be a problem, particularly during a period of reduced budgets. The issue is: what level of sustainable base funding is needed for staff and basic programs? Whatever the base budget may be, it is important that it be augmented by grants, contracts, pay-for-service fees, and individual and corporate donations.

In issue five the committee focused on the need for assessment of outreach and engagement activities. An “assessment system” should be developed for outreach and engagement efforts. The Ohio State Extension Service, which is continually evaluating extension effectiveness, should be able to help with the development of such a system.

I would add a sixth issue to those identified in the report. If faculty are to adopt outreach and engagement as a part of the university mission and are to become actively involved, they will need incentives and rewards. Promotion/tenure guidelines should recognize the importance of outreach and engagement as a valid faculty activity for advancement in rank and for the granting of indefinite tenure.

The Recommendations of the Internal Review Committee are all well-reasoned and sound. I agree with

all of them. My own recommendations and suggestions related to the nature of the office, its leadership, inclusion of and alignment with certain activities, and funding are presented in the following section. The report is excellent. The committee under Dr. Weary's leadership is commended for the service they and their report provide to The Ohio State University.

### Recommendations and Suggestions

Outreach and engagement are important elements of Ohio State's mission as a public university to serve the people of Ohio, the nation, and the world. As the challenges and opportunities confronting society continue to increase, university outreach and engagement will become increasingly important. A climate for and of outreach and engagement must exist throughout the university, on the regional campuses as well as on the main campus. The following recommendations and suggestions are provided to assist the leadership of The Ohio State University in developing the most effective outreach and engagement efforts possible at this time with the available resources of people, time, and money.

#### Leadership

The leadership for outreach and engagement should be a vice president who reports directly to the president. Because outreach and engagement involve all the missions of the university - learning, discovery and service to society - the leadership for outreach and engagement should be at the highest level of the university. The Vice President for Outreach and Engagement should be a key member of the president's cabinet and should have as his/her sole responsibility the development and maintenance of the most effective program of outreach and engagement possible. Developing the climate for and of outreach and engagement throughout the university should be the responsibility of the vice president and the staff of the Office of Outreach and Engagement.

At present, the leader of outreach and engagement is a vice president. To downgrade the position from vice president to a lower position, such as a vice provost, could send a signal to stakeholders on and off campus that outreach and engagement are no longer considered of primary importance. Further, the activities of the leader of outreach and engagement will, to a large extent, be outside the university. Many of the people engaged off campus have no idea what a provost does, much less what a vice provost does. On the other hand, most people recognize the importance attached to the role of vice president. However, if the decision is made to assign this responsibility to a vice provost rather than to a vice president, that vice provost should meet with the president's cabinet on a regular and frequent basis.

#### Direct and Dual Reporting Structure

It is important that a number of university departments and programs report directly to this office; some should have a dual reporting relationship to this office and the unit to which they are presently assigned. For others, some other type of alignment with the Office of Outreach and Engagement may be appropriate. Those units which should report directly or have a dual reporting relationship are as follows:

- Continuing Education (direct report)
- Outreach and Engagement Services (direct report)

- Extension (dual report with Agriculture)
- Academic Programs, including Distance Learning, Service Learning (dual report with provost's office)
- Technology Transfer (dual report with Research)
- Centers and Institutes that provide service to society (dual report with Research or Academic Affairs)

Continuing Education is an entrepreneurial activity that delivers programs as needed and desired by a consumers in the community. It is already a strong element of outreach and needs a "champion" at the highest level of the university to whom it should report.

The Office of Outreach and Engagement should provide a number of services to both the university and to the society the university serves. This office should continue to monitor the "small grant" program, which serves to stimulate engagement activities throughout the campus. In addition, the office should continue to be responsible for continuing the Roads Scholar tour. Each year the office should organize and hold a major university-wide workshop focusing on some aspect of outreach or engagement. Representatives from the regional campuses and from the user community should be invited to the workshop. This would help stimulate a climate for engagement. The office should be responsible for the development of an inventory of current outreach and engagement activities and of a system of assessment by which the effectiveness of outreach and engagement can be measured. In general, the Office of Outreach and Engagement has the responsibility of promoting and maintaining an environment of outreach and engagement at Ohio State. It should also be responsible for providing training sessions through which capacity for outreach and engagement can be developed at the academic department level. In addition, periodically the staff should address the role and involvement of the faculty and staff of the regional campuses in outreach and engagement efforts.

Extension is presently working effectively to develop strong partnerships with departments not traditionally aligned with extension. The use of extension specialists in departments, particularly in the Arts and Sciences, serves well in expanding the outreach services extension provides. It could be disruptive and counter-productive to change extension's reporting relationship with agriculture at this time and such a move does not seem necessary.

Those programs that are based on normal faculty and teaching activities, such as distance learning and service learning should remain under the provost. However, because they also constitute a special form of outreach, they should have a dual reporting relationship to the Vice President and the Office of Outreach and Engagement.

Technology Transfer draws its products primarily from the research efforts of faculty and students and should maintain a strong connection with the Research Office of the university. However, much of the Technology Transfer activity involves contracting, licensing, and other entrepreneurial activities off-campus, in ways similar to those entrepreneurial activities of continuing education. A dual reporting relationship to the Office of Outreach and Engagement and to the Research Office seems appropriate for Technology Transfer.

Centers and institutes currently report to either the Provost's office or to that of the Vice President for

Research. It seems logical that those centers or institutes with a primary function of service to society, i.e. outreach and engagement, should have a dual reporting relationship to outreach and engagement as well as to their present reporting office.

As the Office of Outreach and Engagement matures, other business-related programs or offices, such as the office responsible for OSU Brands, could be added or aligned with outreach and engagement. It has been suggested that the broadcast/print media should be added to the outreach and engagement office. Because they are responsible for selling the entire university and its many functions to the public, I would not have these programs report directly to Office of Outreach and Engagement but would align them in other ways with that office, as noted in the following section on advisory boards.

### Advisory Boards

In order to maintain close connections and communications within the university and with society, I recommend two advisory boards: an external advisory board and an internal Ohio State University management board (or committee). These boards would serve as advisers and as advocates for outreach and engagement.

A board of external advisors consisting of individuals from the community who are experienced in working with the university, and others who represent business or government, should meet with university leaders on a regular basis (quarterly?) to stimulate outreach and engagement of particular value to the people of Ohio.

Internally, a “board of directors”, “management committee”, or “advisory committee” should meet regularly with the leadership of the Office of Outreach and Engagement. Such a group would include: the vice provost cognizant of such academic programs that have an outreach or engagement responsibility (e.g. service learning, distance education); the director or high level administrator in the OSU Extension Service; a representative of the Research Office with cognizance of technology transfer; representatives from the regional campuses; representatives of university media; a representative of the OSU Foundation; a faculty senate representative or designee; and a student leader. This board should have responsibility for assisting the staff of the Office of Outreach and Engagement in the enhancement of outreach and engagement and for the development of a proper climate of cooperation throughout the university for the outreach and engagement effort.

### Funding

The base funding for the Office of Outreach and Engagement, for its staff, and for ongoing programs should be a continuing part of the university’s base budget. Such funding should be at the level needed to provide sustainable support for the basic staff and for a continuing program of small “seed” grants to stimulate engagement. Additional funding should be sought through external grants, contracts, fees, and donations. Fees for services provided, as is the case with continuing education, should be considered. As the program develops, private gifts from individuals and corporations can be sought through the development efforts of The Ohio State University Foundation or development office. An endowment for outreach and engagement would ensure a continuing level of support for the program. To do this, a development officer should be assigned responsibility for the Office of Outreach and Engagement as soon

as possible.

### Faculty Incentives and Rewards

The proper climate for outreach and engagement will require attention to faculty incentives and rewards. Outreach and engagement should be included as appropriate activities for promotion and the granting of indefinite tenure. Promotion and Tenure guidelines should be reviewed and modified if necessary, to ensure that outreach and engagement activities are recognized as appropriate faculty activities. External grants and private or corporate gifts can be solicited to provide faculty incentives, such as released time, funds for travel to attend professional meetings, and so on.

### Student Involvement

Involvement in outreach and engagement can be a positive learning experience and students should be included in these activities as part of the university's "learning" mission. Student outreach and engagement can take the form of service learning, internships, or international exchanges, including international internships. Student incentives for these purposes in the form of scholarships, grants-in-aid, and/or travel stipends can be provided through private gifts or included in grant and contract proposals.

### A Concluding Statement

Today, The Ohio State University is one of this nation's outstanding teaching and research universities; it is a leader among the land grant universities of America. As it helps to build a positive future for Ohio and for America, outreach and engagement will take their place alongside teaching and research as marks of excellence. The integration of its teaching, research, and engagement efforts will not only benefit the society OSU serves but will enrich the learning and knowledge capabilities of students and faculty. A strong and effective outreach and engagement effort will enhance The Ohio State University's reputation as one of the world's great progressive universities.

