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Project goals and methodology

Goals per Provost Sabah Randhawa:

Investigate and recommend changes for achieving savings while providing high levels of service in communications, media, and marketing services.

• Report on current status of functions at OSU
• Inform on best practices in similar organizations for structuring these functions, and compare OSU
• Recommend changes to reduce costs and improve effectiveness
• Project cost/benefits and pros/cons of recommended changes

Project methodology:

• Project conducted May 11-29, 2009
• Coordinated through Office of Finance and Administration (primary contact: Nancy Heiligman, Associate Vice President)
• Review of organizational documents (org. charts, etc.) and data (including online survey of communications and marketing practices conducted in Spring 2008 by University Advancement)
• Email questionnaire re: pertinent resource and staffing allocations sent to all Colleges and divisions with external relations and/or media, marketing, and communications functions [questionnaire appended]
• Telephone interviews with Deans and staff leads in Colleges and divisions as above seeking perspectives about more efficient, effective organization and practices [discussion guide appended; interviewee list follows]
Project goals and methodology

Caveats

• Please note that data collected for this project should not serve as the authoritative basis for action due to a number of factors
  • Surveys were not completed by all units to which they were issued; in addition, a number of units submitted incomplete surveys
  • Questions may have been interpreted variably by respondents. For example, while the survey asked about event planning costs, it appears that some respondents reported actual event costs (such as facility rental, etc). Limited project resources and a condensed timeline precluded follow up.
  • Some institutional data provided was described as inexact
  • A number of calculations were made using averages (for salaries, etc.)
Interviewees

Dan Arp, Dean, Honors College
Wayne Kradjan, Dean, College of Pharmacy
Megan Hoffart, Director of Alumni & Student Relations, College of Pharmacy
Patty Beaumont, Exec. Assistant to the Dean, College of Pharmacy
Michael Henthorne, Director, Memorial Union
Mark Abbott, Dean, College of Atmospheric & Oceanic Sciences
Sherman Bloomer, Dean, College of Science
John Greydanus, Director, Outreach & Media Services
Ron Adams, Dean, College of Engineering
Hal Salwasser, Dean, College of Forestry
Larry Rodgers, Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Michael Oriard, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Todd Stansbury, Associate Athletic Director, Operations
Matt Arend, Asst. Director Athletics--Business
Molly Brown, Senior Director of Strategic Communications, OSU Foundation
Tammy Bray, Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences
Cyril Clarke, Dean, College of Veterinary Medicine
Interviewees, continued.

Sam Stern, Dean, College of Education
Kavinda Arthenayake, Director, University Conference Services and Special Events
Luanne Lawrence, Vice President, University Advancement
Jeff Todd, Director, Alumni Relations
Bill Boggess, Interim Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences
Betsy Hartley, Director of Marketing and External Relations, College of Agricultural Sciences
Lonnie Morris, Exec. Assistant to the Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences
Loretta Austin, Asst. Exec. Associate Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences
Gwil Evans, Ag Sciences Communications
Michele Sandlin, Director, Admissions
Dave King, Assoc. Provost for Outreach & Engagement
Scott Reed, Director of Extension Services
Ilene Kleinsorge, Dean, College of Business
Thuy Tran, Director of Communications & Marketing, College of Business
Tom Scheuermann, Director, University Housing & Dining Services
Eric Hansen, Associate Director University Housing & Dining Services
Larry Pribyl, Assistant Director—Broadcast Communications, News and Communication Services
Premises and Best Practices
Considerations guiding project

• OSU’s model should implement best practices proven to work in public Research I universities

• OSU leadership (Executive Cabinet) has authorized and committed to an integrated marketing program (referred to on campus as “IMC”) that designates messages and strategic priorities for institutional marketing and communications, and that requires collaboration between the University-level marketing and external relations functions and OSU’s diverse academic and non-academic units. The premise of the integrated marketing approach is that all parts of OSU will benefit from a universal stakeholder understanding of the University’s collective purpose and importance, and that more integrated and sophisticated communications from across the institution will inspire greater confidence that the University is an effective and healthy enterprise.

• “Marketing communications” refers to the distribution of messages through a wide variety of channels intended to promote the University (and its parts) and affect perceptions and behaviors among stakeholders. While broadly construed every interaction with stakeholders can be defined as a “marketing touchpoint,” in this project we define the scope more narrowly as:
  1. Communications efforts specifically intended to promote and enhance the reputation, assigned value, and visibility of OSU and its sub-parts
  2. Communications in support of stakeholder interactions intended to drive enrollment, philanthropy, corporate investment, technology transfer, product sales, and other transactions
  3. Analysis, market research, and planning activities necessary to ensure that these communications will be effective
Considerations guiding project

There is a large body of activity at OSU that it is challenging to neatly fit either inside or outside of this definition of “marketing communications,” and that this project has also been asked to consider, including:

1. **Event planning.** For the purposes of this project, we consider the “concepting,” communications, and promotional aspects of events to fall into the category of marketing communications, even as logistical planning (not in the category) is in practice often conducted simultaneously by the same staff.

2. **Media services.** Many media including websites, videography, photography, social media, and broadcasting are used both for marketing communications and other purposes. At OSU primary uses other than marketing communications include instruction (including public education), research, and documentation. The technology and professional expertise (both creative and technical) employed in this media is expensive and relatively rare; in a resource-strained environment it should not be unnecessarily duplicated.

3. **“Constituent relations.”** The management of constituent relations (with alumni, prospective undergraduate students, etc.) is not a formal focus of this project, but it should be noted that many of the unit staff whose responsibilities are reported to include marketing communications also list constituent relations in their roles. And the marketing and communications priorities listed by units most often include relationship-building with these audiences. As OSU has divisions specifically charged with overseeing these relationships, a similar project investigating how to optimize constituent relations (for effectiveness and cost-efficiency) might be considered.
Premises based on best practices in higher education

• The professionalization of marketing communications functions is necessary for OSU to meet its integrated marketing objectives. The science and craft of marketing communications functions – including copywriting, web and print design and production, graphic design, media buying, market research, branding, project management and others – demand technical expertise and training, experience, and knowledge of the competitive environment.

• Centralization of marketing communications functions (with some exceptions) in a single University-level department leads to greater effectiveness and efficiency for a number of reasons, including:
  • Ability to create top quality marketing communications as the development of any communication tool and of an effective integrated marketing program requires collaboration between professionals combining functional expertise.
  • Vesting of responsibility for and deployment of integrated marketing strategy in a consolidated body [see the Integrated Marketing Plan, section G, for a detailed discussion]
  • Consistency of messaging and other branding elements representing the university
  • Vice President level management and maintenance of leading standards in hiring and training marketing communications professionals, and guarantee of quality output
  • Opportunity to maximize the “reach” of any individual professional (ensuring full utilization) and related ability to “right-size” staff capacity based on institution-wide needs

• Vital knowledge, expertise, and accountability informing marketing communications must be maintained at the unit level. Unit-level staff have ongoing and intimate knowledge of unit strategic and business needs and goals, unit-specific audiences and their concerns, faculty research and accomplishments, the market for specific programs, and numerous other factors informing marketing communications for their units and the University as a whole. A centralized marketing communications structure cannot operate absent unit-level liaisons.
The “Agency” Model

• The Agency Model is implemented at leading public R-1 universities, and is the model to which most institutions in the category are transitioning. Exemplars include:
  • Georgia Tech Communications and Marketing (http://www.gatech.edu/comm)
  • University of Washington – UW Marketing (http://www.washington.edu/externalaffairs/uwmarketing/index.html)
  • University of Maryland – University Marketing and Communications (http://www.urhome.umd.edu/marketing)

• Characteristics of the Agency Model:
  • Central university marketing and communications operation serves as full-service agency for all units (academic, philanthropy, and administrative); also lead institutional communications – including president’s office – and university brand marketing initiative.
  • Functions include: creative services (creative strategy, design, copywriting, production for print and online media), strategy (market research, media and marketing planning), online media development, photography and videography, events planning, media relations and public affairs.
  • Individual staff members – “marketing directors” serve as liaisons between agency and major campus Colleges and divisions, representing and coordinating full-spectrum of agency services for division, and developing in-depth knowledge about divisional needs and “content.” Note: marketing directors generally housed in College or division, but with “dotted line” accountability to central agency.
Key Interview Findings
Interviewees identified opportunities to achieve efficiencies in marketing, communications, and events

*Implementation of the IMC:*
- Many expressed support for the IMC and believed it would help reduce marketing costs and raise the quality of marketing materials. Several noted that the templates and other items in the "brand toolkit" would be helpful.

*Stronger coordination between Colleges and UA:*
- Establishing College-level contacts to serve as liaisons to UA could streamline communication and project management

*Better sharing and coordination of marketing-related resources:*
- Streamlining video services
  - May be opportunity to create stronger relationship between UA and Media Services, and locate College-level videographers at UA
- Creating shared photography resources (e.g., develop a photography database, and establish a pool of photographers that know OSU well)
- Better coordinating and sharing market research led by Colleges and divisions
Interviewees’ amenability to centralization of marketing activity varied based on current access to marketing resources

Colleges with relatively small marketing budgets and staff welcomed centralization:
- Many of these Colleges already rely on UA for the majority of their needs
- Some felt they would get the additional marketing help they need in a centralized, agency structure

Several Colleges with relatively large marketing budgets and staff did *not* welcome centralization:
- These Colleges are self-sufficient and have marketing staff that have intimate knowledge of their Colleges
- Some expressed belief that centralization would not achieve any efficiencies
Interviewees discussed advantages and potential disadvantages of centralization

- Overall support for centralization:
  - Participants praised University Advancement’s talent and commitment and felt they would be well-served by this team
  - Current institution-level units such as the OSU Foundation felt that the identification of a single “marketing director” at the college level (which would likely come with centralization,) would enable stronger communication between the Colleges and the institution-level units
  - Believe that centralization will lead to greater consistency of message

- Overall concerns about centralization included:
  - Potential for long turnaround time if central agency not staffed appropriately
  - Need for centralized marketing staff to have intimate understanding of College
  - Potential for larger Colleges and divisions to consistently take priority over smaller Colleges and divisions

- Note that most participants did not view the “thematic areas” as a useful organizing principle for marketing staffing and services, largely because a number of Colleges fall under multiple thematic areas
Key Survey Findings
Key survey findings and implications

• There does not appear to be a strong relationship between the size of any unit’s marketing enterprise (as measured by dedicated staff and budget), and other factors suggesting unit scale such as development expenses, faculty size and College enrollment, research expenses, or operating budget. *This suggests that budgets and staffing may not currently be allocated appropriately. A centralized marketing enterprise can help reallocate resources according to need.*

• Colleges have very different staffing and budget situations; some are almost entirely reliant on UA for marketing needs, while others are largely self-sufficient. As noted above, there does not seem to be a clear logic for allowing a culture of “haves” and “have nots.” *The “transition plans” for each unit will likely need be very different, should OSU decide to centralize.*

• On average, marketing budgets are 1 percent of the “initial budgets” for the Colleges. The relatively small size of the marketing budget related to the overall budget is likely part of the reason some interviewees had little top-of-mind awareness of marketing spending. *A marketing director at each College should be the “shepherd” of the marketing budget, along with the Dean, and should be charged with accurately tracking expenditures.*

• Event planning, publications, and printing represent the largest proportion of budget expenditures. *This suggests that event planning, graphic design, writing, and production will be key central functions (should OSU decide to centralize marketing/comm/events activity).*
Key survey findings and implications (con’t)

• OSU units are not currently outsourcing a significant amount of activities to outside vendors, in relation to the overall marketing/comm/events budgets. However, outsourcing that does occur often is a product of UA’s inadequate capacity to take on and complete work in a timely manner. This suggests the need to build appropriate central capacity in functions – such as writing and graphic design – that are most in demand.

• Marketing and communications activity is intertwined with other activities occurring at the unit level, particularly constituent relations/“friend-raising.” The marketing/comm/events staff audit indicates that there are a number of “hybrid positions” that combine marketing with event planning and/or constituent relations, and survey participants also had difficulty distinguishing between constituent relations and marketing in budget reporting. If OSU decides to centralize marketing activity and staff, it must be cognizant of these hybrid roles; interview participants emphasized that some staff with “marketing” responsibility have also built fruitful, long-term relationships with constituents.
Survey data caveats

• Survey findings are based on incomplete OSU reporting
  • The Colleges of Liberal Arts and Veterinary Medicine did not return surveys in time for inclusion
  • The OSU Foundation and Alumni Association did not provide marketing expenditures or staff descriptions; Athletics, Engineering, and Conference Services did not provide staff descriptions; a number of other units also declined to address portions of the survey (refer to resource grid in Appendix for additional information)
• Note that, while the survey asked about event planning costs, it appears that some respondents reported actual event costs (such as facility rental, etc)
Survey findings: Staffing

- Total of 38 FTE staff at the College and division level designated as marketing, communications, and event planning (as self-reported by units to date)

- Total 51.5 FTE staff at the institution level (OSUF, OSUAA, UA) designated as marketing, communications, and event planning (LHI estimate based on organizational charts)

- The size, capabilities, and focus of marketing/communications/events staff varies amongst units.
  - Marketing directors and associates are the most common positions, and responsibilities for this position often include a range of functions, such as marketing planning, project management, and writing for publications. If OSU centralizes and makes primary marketing functions available centrally, marketing director roles can take on a more focused, strategic nature.

- Colleges have very different staffing situations; some are almost entirely reliant on University Advancement for marketing needs; others have several unit-based staff members covering a spectrum of marketing/communications/media/events functions

- Non-academic units also represent a range of marketing staffing compositions
Survey findings: Staffing practices

**College staffing**
- Colleges’ staffing ranges from 0-5 staff with significant marketing/communications/event responsibility
- Colleges do *not* have a range of devoted positions for specific marketing functions, with the exception of Business, Forestry, and Engineering *
- Several Colleges with limited marketing staff rely on executive assistants to help with marketing and event planning activity
- A number of hybrid positions exist within the Colleges, which involve alumni and student relations, external relations, and marketing and communications responsibility

**Non-academic unit staffing**
Divisions have 1-20 staff with significant marketing/communications/event responsibility
- Several divisions employ students, which are not included in this count
- Extension, OSUAA, and Housing and Dining all have marketing staffing that allow them to be largely self-sufficient
- Most of these divisions have a director-level “marketing and communications” position, which may also include external relations

*Do not yet have specific staff descriptions for Engineering*
### Survey findings: Reported staffing at College/division level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff function</th>
<th>Approximate FTE represented</th>
<th>Specific titles included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graphic designers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outreach design specialist; outreach design leader; graphic designer; Graphic Designer (70% Design/production) (Note: 1 FTE is related to design for public education materials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communication/publication coordinator (50% writing); communications and marketing manager for programs (80% writing); communications and marketing specialist (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web developers and/or designers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lead Web Developer/Designer; Communication/pub coordinator; Promotion and Assessment Specialist; webmaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event planners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Events coordinator; Events and public relations manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-video production and distribution and classroom support</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Videographer/instructor (Forestry); 10 positions in Media Services (NOTE: Media Services positions not self-reported)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia production</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Multimedi producer/senior instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing associates/directors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Activities most commonly performed: mkt/comm writing, mkt planning, and information gathering ) Dir. Marketing and advancement; Marketing and assessment; Extension marketing leader; Director of Marketing and Communications; Asst Dir Mkt and Comm; Dir Communications and Outreach; Assoc Dir of UHDS for Mkt Assessment, Communications, and Diversity; Asst Dir for Mkt, Assessment, Communications, and Diversity; Dining marketing project manager; communications and marketing specialist; Dir of communications and marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent relations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alumni/student relations; Associate director of admissions, marketing, and communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications—public education emphasis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Public affairs communication specialist; public service communication specialist; outreach design specialist; outreach design leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey findings: Reported staffing at institutional level (OSUF, OSUAA, UA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff function</th>
<th>Approximate FTE for OSUF and OSUAA</th>
<th>Apprx FTE for UA</th>
<th>Specific titles included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing associates/directors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Director of mkt, alumni association; mkt coordinator; Dir Mkt and Creative Services (OSUF); Assoc Campaign Dir (OSUF, .5 for mkt); Dir Mkt (UA); Mkt Specialist (UA); Dir Comm and Outreach .5 (Cascades)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic designers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Graphic designer (x2, OSUF); Art Director (UA); Graphic Designer 3 (x3, UA); Design Intern .5 (UA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Asst editor, alumni relations; editor of Oregon Stater; Mkt writer (UA); Presidential writer, (OSUF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Production asst (UA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dir Research Comm and Editor (UA); Research writer (UA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web developers and/or designers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Web developer (OSUF); Multimedia GTA (UA); Web Graphics Intern (.5, UA) Web Graphic Designer (UA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web production</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Production asst (UA);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web PM/ oversight</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dir Web Comm (UA); Asst Dir (UA); Web comm coord (UA); Program Rep (UA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web writer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Editorial Intern (UA); Web Writer (UA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event planners</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alumni event planners (3 positions, adding up to 1 FTE for event planning); Dir, Donor Relations and Special Events (.5FTE for events); Dir, Special Events (OSUF); Assoc Dir, Special Events (OSUF); Asst Dir, Special Events (OSUF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videographer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia production</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Relations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>UA: Asst VP; Asst Dir, Asst Dir, Science News Writer; News Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent relations</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>Dir, Donor Rel (OSUF); Asst Dir, Donor Rel (OSUF); Dir, Donor Relations and Special Events (OSUF, .5); Dir Communications and Outreach .5 (OSU Cascades)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Asst Dir of Alumni Programs (x2); VP UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that this is based on incomplete reporting and includes interpretation on LHI’s part*
Survey findings: Marketing, communications, and events non-staff budgets

Size of non-staff budgets in Colleges varies widely:
• Reported marketing and event budget range: $5,500 to $155,000
• Marketing activity (including publications, advertising, media relations, printing and mailing, photography, and market research) ranges from 65% to 79% of total budget
• Event activity ranges from 19% to 35% of total budget

Other divisions:
• Reported marketing and event budget range: $60,000 to $70,000; Athletics is an outlier with an $840,000 budget (a large percentage of which goes to media relations)
• Marketing activity, as defined above, ranges from 65% to 85% of total budget
• Event activity ranges from 15% to 35% of total budget

Note: Figures do not include OSUAA, OSUF, or UA budgets
Survey findings: Marketing, communications, and events non-staff budgets

“Events” account for the largest percentage of the total mkt/comm/events budgets, followed by publications and printing/mailing. *This suggests key need for central capacity in event planning, graphic design, writing, and production (should OSU centralize)*

An aggregate of $775,533 is being spent across OSU on non-staff budgets for marketing, communications, and events
Percentage breakout of communications/marketing/events budgets

- **Total** ($775,533)
  - Events: 27%
  - Publications: 21%
  - Printing and mailing: 14%
  - Advertising: 17%
  - Market research: 7%
  - Photography: 5%

- **Colleges** ($594,733)
  - Events: 33%
  - Publications: 18%
  - Printing and mailing: 19%
  - Advertising: 13%
  - Market research: 7%

- **Other units** ($180,800)
  - Events: 37%
  - Publications: 28%
  - Printing and mailing: 11%
  - Advertising: 15%
  - Market research: 10%
Survey findings: Outsourcing practices for marketing and communications

Advertising/media; brochure production; market/constituent research; and graphic design are the four largest areas of outsourcing activity, and make up 80% of the $374,880 spent on outsourcing at the Colleges and divisions. (Does not include OSUAA, OSUF, and UA expenditures.)

Aggregated outsourcing activity*

*Includes all responses received by 5/27/09. Does not include OSUF, OSUAA, UA responses
Survey findings: Reasons given for outsourcing marketing and communications activity to suppliers outside the University

- Expertise of supplier not available at University
- Turnaround time at University Advancement too long
- Sudden unit-level staff shortage due to illness or other personal issue
- Outsourcing less expensive than University Advancement
- Long-term relationship with outside supplier
  - Participants suggested that relationships that have been cultivated over years lead to efficiencies (e.g., supplier understands history, culture, and design needs)
  - Some noted that these relationships were formed before University Advancement acquired its current expertise
Survey findings: Outsourcing practices for events

Only 5 participants report outsourcing event planning

Most common reasons for outsourcing event planning to suppliers outside the University include:
• Creative assistance from vendor
• Vendor ability to staff event
• Vendor ability to coordinate other vendors used for event, to achieve cost savings
• Expertise of vendor in specific types of conferences

Outsourcing expenditures:
• Individual responding units reported range between $4,500 to $40,000
• Over $46,500 aggregate event outsourcing expenditure*

Event planning staffing:
• While some Colleges have dedicated event planners, others rely on help from administrative assistants and/or marketers, who may or may not have a strong understanding of event planning "best practices"

* Note that only three participants reported outsourcing expenditures
Recommendations
Recommendation 1: Construct University Advancement as OSU’s Full-Service Marketing Communications Agency

- Enhanced functions should include (benchmarked against R-1 exemplars):
  - Advertising and print purchasing.
  - Marketing strategy and planning/market research management
  - Expanded videography capacity (for enriched websites, social media, as well as promotional video)
  - Expanded event planning capacity

- Staffing needs (per UA self-assessment) to meet current work load demand from integrated marketing initiative and campus clients approximately 8 FTE
  - 1 FTE Events Planner and .5FTE Project Coordinator/Receptionist
  - 1 FTE Corporate Communications Manager (to support corporate outreach effort in IM plan)
  - 1 FTE Marketing Copywriter
  - 1 FTE Graphic Designer
  - 3 FTE Web Specialists: online video; web strategy; web development
  - 1 FTE Marketing Strategist/IMC Director

**Cost Implications:** Incremental staff salary load increases depending on availability of staff transfer from units. UA overhead will be offset by additional fees per service.
Recommendation 2: Authorize UA as OSU’s “Sole Source” Agency for Marketing Communications

- All units to work with UA on development and production of all marketing communications, including utilization of outside vendors as necessary (due to lack of capacity, specialist expertise demanded, etc.).

- Each unit allocated 15 hours per week of UA marketing communications and event planning services at $35 per hour rate

- Additional demand to be negotiated through UA

Cost Implications: Reduction in costs based on lower price provision by UA (compared to other internal and external vendors).
Recommendation 3: Migrate Staff Capacity in Marketing Communications and Event Planning Functions from Units to UA As Possible

- As possible and needed, redeploy current unit-based staff professionals in marketing communications functions to UA
  - Must correlate with specific marketing communications and events planning functions needed
  - Ensure as possible content knowledge developed by these staff while in their original units is appropriately deployed back to unit (and other units with need for related expertise)
- Eliminate surplus FTE

Cost Implications: Potential FTE reduction to be calculated
Estimated Funds Saved by Enacting Recommendations 1-3*

Current median annual mkt/comm/events budget per College/division, including staff salaries ($195,000)
- Mkt/comm/events budget need per College/division under new model, including staff salaries ($114,450)

= Estimated savings per College/division ($80,550)

Estimated savings for 18 Colleges/divisions** ($1,449,900)
- Salary expenditures required for additional UA staffing under new model ($655,200)

Potential overall savings: $794,700

*See model and assumptions for calculations on following slide
** Colleges and divisions include 11 Colleges, Honors College, E-campus, Expt Station/Extension, Housing/Dining, Memorial Union, Conference Services, and Admissions
Estimated Funds Saved By Enacting Recommendations 1-3 (con’t)

Estimated savings based on the following:

Assumptions made:
• Each College or division will have a marketing director with a salary of approx $70,000, located at the unit level
• Each College or division will require an average of 15 hours of marketing work a week over a 52 week year (vacations not accounted for) from University Advancement, in addition to the full-time marketing director listed above
• Cost of marketing staff located in UA’s central agency will be $35 per/hour (reflective of current UA pricing)

Estimate of current median annual mkt/comm/events budget
• Note: One uniform estimate is used to represent each College or division, based on median measurements of an $80,000 mkt/comm./events budget and a median mkt/comm./events staff of 2
• Assumed staff salaries per unit: 1 mid-level employee at $45,000 annual salary, and 1 senior-level employee at $70,000 annual salary

Current median annual mkt/comm./events budget (including staff) per College or division: $195,000
Estimated Funds Saved by Enacting Recommendations 1-3
(con’t)

Estimated savings based on the following:

**Estimate of annual marketing budget needed per year, per College or division**

Cost of marketing staff time needed per year is $27,000 per College/division, not including marketing director salary (780 hrs staff time per year * $35 per/hour)

Budgets for printing, mailing, and advertising will remain at the unit level, as these cannot be translated into staff time hours. Estimated annual budget for these items per College or division is $17,150, based on medians of respondents.

Assumed marketing director salary of $70,000 per year

*Total annual marketing budget needed per year, per College or division: $114,450*

**Estimate of additional staff expenditures required in UA under new model**

14,040 staff hours required annually for all units

Assuming each staff person will serve units for 30 hours per week, and serve central needs for 10 hours per week, 9 additional staff are needed centrally

Annual salary will be $72,800 per year (assuming a pay rate of $35 per/hr)

*Funds UA requires for additional staff time/positions under new centralized model: $655,200*
Recommendation 4: Authorize UA as Media Placement and Printing Purchaser for all OSU units

• OSU can maximize the amount of advertising space available to campus units, and lower costs, through volume discounts negotiated with outlets.

• Current aggregate advertising costs are $130,863

Cost Implications: Cost savings of at least $19,600 (based on 15% media purchase discount of current advertising scale) plus those on volume discount of printing services – to be passed back to units or distributed
Recommendation 5: Consolidate access to videography staff and equipment as appropriate

- UA reports increasing demand for videography and video-enhanced media (though this is not yet represented in unit-based reporting per surveys) as use of social media and rich websites becomes dominant

- Media Services, Forestry, and Extension currently housing videographers; in some departments/cases these are supplementing departmental revenues with client fee-for-service videography

- Cost of videography equipment (cameras, computers, production and editing) significant and should not be shared as possible

- Note that Lipman Hearne was not able to access full information about this function due to limited unit reporting

Cost Implications: Avoidance of additional staff hiring and equipment
Recommendation 6: Designate a Marketing Director in Each Primary Unit reporting to Dean or Division Head

Position will:

- Serve as liaison to University Advancement
- Fulfill the project management function, on the College or unit side, of projects developed through UA
- Develop unit marketing plan with specific budget.
- Bring OSU level strategic communications direction to the College or unit and to infuse unit communications with University messages
- Meet annually or bi-annually with the UA VP and Dean of the College or divisional lead to identify communications priorities for the upcoming year, review strategic marketing initiatives, and identify opportunities for including OSU messages in unit publications
- Write content about unit topics for select communications vehicles
- Update unit website content
- Meet periodically – perhaps monthly – with the UA leadership team to monitor progress on unit projects and identify opportunities for communications synergies
- Bring College or unit messages, stories, and priorities to the attention of UA, so that University-level projects can incorporate the initiatives and achievements of the units
- Function as an internal marketing and communications consultant to the unit, providing advice and aid to other staff

Cost Implications: Incremental costs depending on current staffing in units
Recommendation 7: Eliminate Marketing Director and other “Generalist” Positions Reporting to Individuals Below Dean or Divisional Head

Support should not be necessary at that level if other recommendations are implemented

**Cost Implications:** Aids with potential FTE reduction
Recommendation 8: Audit Individual Unit Marketing Communications Portfolios In Line with Best Practices

UA and College/Divisional marketing lead to inventory all communications activities in the unit and eliminate those that do not meet best practices or strategic goals of unit marketing plan. [Example: proliferation of print and online newsletters.]

Cost Implications: Potential reduction in staff time and costs
Recommendation 9: Encourage Auxiliary Units (Athletics, OSUF, OSUAA) to Utilize UA “Agency”

It is often the case that public university foundations and other auxiliaries commission the university’s agency to produce marketing communications. The duplication of functions in these entities – while they may have “independent budgets” – does not make sense from a cost efficiency and strategic marketing perspective (in line with the IMC).

**Cost Implications:** Potential reduction in staff time and costs
End