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The Landscape Analysis and Internal Assessment workstreams, part of the Discovery phase of the Ohio State University Advancement Planning Framework project, were designed to inform Edelman Consulting and Ohio State University’s understanding of the external landscape in which Advancement resides. This analysis includes the identification of key trends affecting Advancement and the exploration of best practices and innovative approaches to university Advancement functions by universities and other institutions.

In addition, this phase of work was designed to gain an understanding of the current state of branding activities taking place across Ohio State University, specifically with regards to communications and marketing assets and campaigns.

The following report is a compilation of our findings from the landscape analysis and internal assessment. The report is broken down into the following sections:

**LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS**
Analysis of the overall landscape as it relates to Advancement. This includes:
- Advancement Trends
- Case Studies

**CAMPAIGN ASSESSMENT**
Assessment of historical campaigns at the Ohio State. This includes:
- Qualitative Assessment
- Measurement Framework

**BRAND ASSET INVENTORY**
Inventory of a selection of Ohio State marketing and communications assets
LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS
ADVANCEMENT TRENDS
Landscape Analysis: Advancement Trends

OBJECTIVES
The Advancement trends portion of the landscape analysis offers a baseline understanding of the environment in which Advancement exists as well as the trends affecting Advancement today.

The purpose of this section of the report is to inform Ohio State’s Advancement committee about emerging Advancement trends and tactical issues to be addressed.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
We used primary and secondary research to identify trends impacting Advancement.

RESEARCH TYPE
Interviews with Ohio State leaders in Development and Alumni relations helped us create a foundation for understanding Ohio State’s Advancement environment.

Collection and analysis of journals, articles, reports, etc. informed our point of view of the Advancement landscape and trends impacting Advancement.
Emerging Advancement trends

- The Diversification of Fundraising
- An Evolving Global Footprint
- Growth of Reputation Risk
- Impact Through Experience
- Cross-Unit Activities + Engagement
- The Importance of Digital Engagement
“WE’RE NOT CULTIVATING [SMALL AND MID-TIER DONORS] RIGHT NOW.

WE’RE NOT ENGAGING THEM AND THEY’RE NOT FEELING A PART OF OHIO STATE.”

– FOUNDATION LEADER
In the face of rapid declines in traditional sources of funding, institutions structured primarily toward large donors risk being unable to diversify their funding bases or optimize the way in which they target different audiences.

- Economic turbulence and **government funding reductions** necessitate more aggressive fundraising
  - Federal stimulus funding to state budgets runs out in 2012
  - State university tuition increases (e.g., UC Berkeley) are often met with passionate opposition

- **Institutions that are focused on large donors face a challenging landscape**
  - Increased competition for a smaller pool of large donors
  - Large and mid-tier givers have been declining for the last 15 years
  - Declines in alumni participation and mid-tier giving are the result of lack of attention to the relationship pipeline

- **Small donors are an increasingly valuable constituency for both short and long-term fundraising goals**
  - Cultivated as future mid-tier or large givers
  - Power in the ability to easily access small givers en masse through low-effort and investment tactics (e.g. microdonations tactics employed by the Obama campaign, Red Cross text-to-donate campaigns for Haiti and Japan)

- Advancement is increasingly focused on flexibility and matching engagement strategies to behaviors and needs of the individual in order to capture new potential donor segments
“[WE] HEAR ABOUT ACTIVITIES AT THE INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM OFFICES THROUGH PRESS RELEASES.”

– FOUNDATION LEADER
Advancement’s global role lags behind opportunity

There is an increasing divergence between universities’ global activities and those of their Advancement organizations.

- Global footprint of universities has increased significantly
  - Creation of international facilities, campuses and programs (e.g., NYU’s Abu Dhabi campus)
  - Expansion of Alumni networks overseas (e.g., University of Wisconsin’s Japanese alumni office)
  - Growth in international research collaboration

- International presence has become a driver of revenue and reputational excellence
  - Stimulation of ideas and intellectual property
  - Reputation and prestige
  - New opportunities for partnership and collaboration
  - Global network for the university community

- The future of global Advancement efforts presents both opportunities and challenges
  - International students = international alumni = international relationships
  - Traditional Advancement silos are difficult and expensive to scale
  - ROI is unproven
  - New opportunities for creative, integrated engagement models
"ADVANCEMENT PLAYS A CRUCIAL ROLE [IN DRIVING CHANGE IN THE OFTEN RISK- AVERSE ENVIRONMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION.]

- PRESIDENT GORDON GEE
Unprecedented brand exposure heightens risks to Advancement goals

Institutions now have to respond to more complex and critical issues with a level of speed and transparency they have generally not faced before. The associated reputational risk has an impact on university brand, engagement and fundraising.

• The risk to brands has increased exponentially due to the convergence of:
  • A greater number of stakeholders
  • More empowered stakeholders
  • More access to public information
  • Instant digital dialogue on issues that affect reputation

• Rising costs and student debt and unemployment are triggering questions about the value of a college degree, undermining the traditional value of higher education and its brands
  • Universities risk losing students to less expensive alternative forms of education (e.g. skill certification, Khan Academy)
  • Perceived ROI of the over $100 billion in college loans taken out annually in the United States

• Reputation has tangible effects on the financial stability of a brand
  • The week after charges were filed against Penn State’s Jerry Sandusky, PSU’s merchandise sales were 40% lower than the same week in the previous year
  • The crisis has the potential to depress donations and interfere with Penn State’s $2-billion capital campaign, which needs to raise $600-million by June 2014 to reach its goal

• Organizations are generally more prepared for physical crisis than reputational risk. The 24/7 cycle of news now means entire reputations can transform within days

• Many institutions are conducting organizational and communication audits to assess their ability to respond to this new landscape
“IF YOU’RE GOING TO RUN A CAMPAIGN THAT REALLY RESONATES WITH ALUMS,...

...IT SHOULD HAVE AN ASPECT THAT’S MEASURABLE IN TERMS OF IMPACT THAT THE ALUMS UNDERSTAND FOR THEMSELVES AS PAST STUDENTS.

IF IT’S NOT GOING TO DO THAT, IT SHOULD HAVE AN ASPECT WHERE THE ALUMS CAN SEE THE IMPACT OF THEIR DONATION ON THE EXPERIENCE OF THE STUDENT.”

– FOUNDATION LEADER
The table stakes for donor engagement are increasing

Regardless of mode or extent of engagement, stakeholders want to ensure the impact of their involvement is measurable.

- Donors expect a deeper level of engagement
  - Donors expect a sustained ability to interact, which is greatly enabled by digital access
  - Donors expect their gift to have a measurable impact
  - Donors expect to be involved in the cause by way of increased level of quick touch points
- Donors want to be a part of the donation experience (e.g., introductions to the scholarship students they have supported)

Donors expect their donation to provide them with an “experience” of the cause they are giving to (e.g., meeting the students whose scholarship fund received a donation)

Donors expect to see a measurable impact from their donation (e.g., how many students received scholarships from their donation)

Donors expect acknowledgement of their gift (e.g., personal thanks or representation on list of university donors)
“ALL OF THOSE THINGS ARE LINKED AND SHOULD BE PART OF A MAJOR GIFT PROGRAM.”

- FOUNDATION LEADER
The necessity for integration is no longer a question

While most institutions recognize the importance of an integrated Advancement model, very few, if any, have achieved it. Overall, institutions are slowly removing barriers to integration.

- Silos developed as streamlined and focused ways of achieving alumni and donor goals now stand in the way of a holistic approach to building Advancement relationships
  - Difficulties sharing data to efficiently understand and target individuals
  - Lack of coordinated messaging or over-solicitation can result in messaging fatigue
  - Fragmented relationships = lost opportunities

- People expect to be targeted for things that resonate with them
  - Certain segments are increasingly likely to support causes that matter to them in multiple modes (e.g., donating, providing content, promoting)

- An integrated Advancement Model is increasingly valuable to:
  - Promote a cohesive university brand and educating donors and alumni about campus priorities
  - Conserve resources by creating strong relationships between Advancement groups
  - Avoid over-solicitation by understanding ROI for each form of engagement (e.g., receipt of a school publication, attendance of an event, being a member of a board) and allowing comprehensive tracking
“NEW MEDIA CROSS ALL OF THESE BOUNDARIES TO BRING PEOPLE TOGETHER TO PROMOTE OSU.”

– COMMUNICATIONS LEADER
People want and expect to be engaged online. This channel shift is transforming the way Advancement sees its role and resources.

- Changing expectations of how people engage with organizations
  - Alumni and donors expect to find engagement online, but unit websites and social media are often not integrated with Advancement channels or goals
  - Greater expectation that institutions have access to more integrated data on potential donors and, therefore, should understand their preferences and how to engage with them on a personal level
  - 2011 is the first year that the majority of donors gave online, even if they were solicited via traditional mail

- No longer limited to Millennials and students, rather all demographics
  - The fastest growing demographic on Facebook is Women over 55 years old
  - Communications technology preferences continue to shift among donors of all ages with 69% now preferring electronic over print communication even among donors aged 65-74

- Universities are no longer the only starting point for their own digital communication; many unofficial social media pages and networks have sprung up independently by alumni themselves, or corporations like LinkedIn Classmates

- Digital remains a tactical Advancement function, rather than a strategic engagement tool
  - Social media roles are not structured to be aligned to Advancement goals
  - Focus on tactical development of websites and tools or gathering of information
  - Social media remains a largely untapped tool for building affinity and loyalty for higher education brands
LANDSCAPE ANALYSIS
CASE STUDIES
Landscape Analysis: Case Studies

OBJECTIVES

The case study section of the landscape analysis identifies best practices in and innovative approaches to Advancement and the functions that support Advancement: branding, engagement and fundraising.

Because the purpose of this study was to identify best practices and innovative approaches, we did not limit the study only to include only institutions of higher education; we also included non-profit organizations and corporations that can be considered comparable to Ohio State University.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

We used both primary and secondary research to identify and explore case studies from which to glean learnings and best practices.

RESEARCH TYPE

Interviews with experts involved with case study initiatives helped us gather unique perspective on

- Why the organization undertook a specific endeavor
- How the endeavor was operationalized
- Key factors that contributed to success

Collection and analysis of journals, articles, reports, etc. informed interview questions and supplemented the information gathered from interviews.
Case study overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION</th>
<th>CASE TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADVANCEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuck</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>CASE TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayo Clinic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Electric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview

ADVANCEMENT

Full integration of Advancement requires University-wide commitment

BRAND

Inspirational brand values drive all brand experiences
Brand strength is dependent upon unified execution

ENGAGEMENT

Empowered employees are powerful brand stewards
Lifecycle of engagement is a continuum from prospective student to alumni

FUNDRAISING

Empowered and trusted units drive achievement of shared vision
In 1998, Stanford integrated its Alumni Association as a division of the University, a transition that led to great operational efficiency and alignment of Development goals.

Context

- Stanford’s Alumni Association was independent from the University
- Surveys to alumni revealed that they perceived the integration of the Alumni Association into the University as a means for alumni to get more consideration from the University’s administration and Board of Trustees

Integration of Alumni Association

- Alumni Association folded into the University as a division
- Created new reporting structure whereby the President of the Alumni Association, the VP of Development and the VP of Public Affairs all reported to the University President, allowing the Alumni Association and Development to remain independent from one another
- Placed the Alumni Association and Development in shared facility
- Placed the Alumni Association Board in direct connection to the university’s Board of Trustees through ex officio positions
- Created a database to merge Development’s fundraising data with the Alumni Association’s fundraising and engagement information

New Alumni Association funding model

- Increased funding to the Alumni Association from the University to reduce dependence on membership dues and create more robust alumni engagement programs
- Provided funding to the Alumni Association for exchanging current services it received for those incorporated in the services they would share with Development (e.g. executive education training)
Case Study: Stanford University

GOALS AND INCENTIVES MUST BE REDEFINED BY SHARED VISION

RESULTS

• Greater investment in engagement activities
• Alumni perception that alumni engagement was improved
• Alumni perception that integration led to university being more receptive to and supportive of alumni issues
• Alumni Association budget went from 90% self-funding to 60% self-funding as a result of surge of university funding
• Alumni Association reduced fundraising programs and competition with other university groups, allowing them to prioritize alumni engagement
• Single database created to track both fundraising and engagement activities
• Efficiencies gained in shared services

How does Ohio State compare to Stanford’s commitment to full integration of its Alumni Association?

✔ Integrate Alumni Association into University
✔ Create new reporting structure for Advancement groups

☐ Place Alumni Association and Development in shared facility

☐ Give Alumni Association Board connection to Board of Trustees

✔ Increase funding from University to Alumni Association to reduce dependence on membership dues

☐ Joint database between Alumni Association and Development

KEY TAKEAWAYS FOR OHIO STATE

• Opportunity exists to reduce Alumni Association competition with Development by altering funding model
• Placing Development and the Alumni Association in a shared facility fosters collaboration
• Integration of the Alumni Association presents an opportunity to unify data and create a comprehensive database of fundraising and engagement activity
Case Study: University of Washington

FULL INTEGRATION OF ADVANCEMENT REQUIRES UNIVERSITY-WIDE COMMITMENT

The University of Washington successfully integrates alumni relations, marketing/communications and development through shared vision, collaboration and accountability.

**Context**

- Advancement at Washington began in 2001, when Connie Kravas was hired to serve as the new VP of Development and Alumni Relations
- Since joining the University of Washington, Connie has worked to integrate Communications into the Advancement model, creating a holistic Advancement group that leads and provides support for Advancement initiatives across campus

**Leadership drives organization culture**

- Leadership is passionate about the integrated Advancement and projects this message outward
- Leadership is equally committed to high end major gift fundraising and broadbased engagement
- Leadership has introduced new roles to demonstrate and actualize the importance of an integrated model:
  - Chief Advancement Officer (CAO): Reports directly to both the Dean of an individual college as well as to the AVP of Constituency Programs, a dedicated Advancement position that oversees the Advancement programs of over 23 colleges, schools and units
  - Constituent Relations Officers (CRO) serves as an alumni relations and development representative in each unit

**Processes and integration support organization structure**

- Monthly meetings between leadership, CAOs and CROs enable regular communication
- Annual Advancement plans require individual units to think about how they are impacted by Advancement and how their efforts can support Advancement
- Advancement Services Division provides centralized support for all Advancement functions, including Advancement initiatives instigated by individual colleges and schools; support includes information management, IT and data processing, reporting, management of annual giving, etc.
- Better collaboration ensures aligned messaging
**Case Study: University of Washington**

**FULL INTEGRATION OF ADVANCEMENT REQUIRES UNIVERSITY-WIDE COMMITMENT**

**RESULTS**

- Alignment and integration between units and overall Advancement office
- Increased alumni participation rates from 10% to 18%
- Consistently high ranking on CAE’s analysis of private giving to higher education (#16 in total amount raised in 2010)

**INTEGRATED ADVANCEMENT STRUCTURE**

- VP, University Advancement
- AVP, UW Medicine Development
- AVP, Advancement Services
- AVP, UW Marketing
- AVP, Individual Giving Programs
- Director, Finance and Administration
- Exec Director of UWAA and AVP of Alumni Relations
- AVP Constituency Programs
- Director Constituent Relations
- Chief Advancement Officer
- Constituent Relations Officers

**KEY TAKEAWAYS FOR OHIO STATE**

- Strong leadership and vision helps drive the culture of integrated Advancement
- Appropriate structures, such as the development of the CAO and CRO model, enable clear integration between Advancement across the university
- Incentives and processes, such as Annual Advancement Planning and Advancement Services, are necessary to support integrated Advancement
Case Study: Tuck School of Business

LIFECYCLE OF ENGAGEMENT IS A CONTINUUM FROM PROSPECTIVE TO ALUMNI

The Tuck School of Business at Dartmouth University is a gold standard of brand engagement and fundraising because it engages prospective students, current students, and alumni through a comprehensive relationship lifecycle.

CONTEXT

- Tuck School of Business found itself at inflection point where its alumni giving rate would could remain at around 50% or soar to 70% in the next new years
- In order to improve the giving rate, Tuck identified student and alumni engagement as crucial growth areas

IMPLEMENTATION

Access to applicants
- Applicants can connect to alumni even before acceptance
- Accepted students and their families can connect to network of students and alumni
- Alumni call accepted students, welcoming them to the community and describing the benefits of the Tuck experience

Student engagement
- Students are indoctrinated into the “Tuck community,” which builds deep loyalty and sense of responsibility in furthering the brand. Tuck students have the opportunity to be involved with the following activities:
  - Annual Giving Student Advisory Board, which allows current students to work with Development to develop fundraising strategy, spread the culture of philanthropy among classmates, and create fundraising events for peers
  - Tuck’s Legacy Forum, which empowers students to take part in the definition of Tuck’s legacy three times per year through school-wide forums
  - Class gift, during which students raise money to donate a class gift to the school upon graduation, forcing students to think about the future of the school and how to make contributions to further the school’s legacy

Alumni volunteerism
- Alumni have multiple options for volunteerism (e.g., class agents, assistant agents, reunion giving year leads, regional representatives, and corporate volunteers)
- Volunteers are provided with the skills and resources needed to act on behalf of the school
- Alumni are engaged in a personalized manner using MyTuck, an online dashboard allowing alumni to provide their interests so that messaging is aligned to those topics that are resonant to them, preventing oversolicitation
Case Study: Tuck School of Business
LIFECYCLE OF ENGAGEMENT IS A CONTINUUM FROM PROSPECTIVE TO ALUMNI

RESULTS

- Tuck Annual Giving had a 70.5% giving rate in 2011, whereas the average giving rate among top 20 business schools is 20%
- Approximately 90% of alumni give regularly, if not annually
- 600 volunteers worked on behalf of Tuck Annual Giving to raise money from peers

KEY TAKEAWAYS FOR OHIO STATE

- Creation of Annual Giving Student Advisory Board creates fundraising stewards of current students, who will both engage current students in fundraising and be likely to continue commitment past graduation
- Being part of a community and joint legacy is compelling messaging
- Personal connection is valued by alumni and can be created using large volunteer groups
- Providing alumni with the tools be effective in fundraising and engagement – including messaging and tips – bolsters efficacy
- Tools for alumni to designate their interests are effective in reducing over-solicitation and improving resonance of messaging

ENGAGEMENT LIFECYCLE

Applicants invited to speak with alumni
Accepted students welcomed to the “community”
First Day: Speech on responsibilities of each individual to the Tuck community
Election of Annual Giving Student Advisory Board
Forum 1: Tuck’s Legacy
Forum 2: Tuck’s Legacy
Forum 3: Tuck’s Legacy
Election of Annual Giving Student Advisory Board
Forum 4: Tuck’s Legacy
Forum 5: Tuck’s Legacy
Forum 6: Tuck’s Legacy
Class Gift to Tuck
Election of class agents and assistant agents

RESULTS

• Tuck Annual Giving had a 70.5% giving rate in 2011, whereas the average giving rate among top 20 business schools is 20%
• Approximately 90% of alumni give regularly, if not annually
• 600 volunteers worked on behalf of Tuck Annual Giving to raise money from peers

ENGAGEMENT LIFECYCLE

Applicants invited to speak with alumni
Accepted students welcomed to the “community”
First Day: Speech on responsibilities of each individual to the Tuck community
Election of Annual Giving Student Advisory Board
Forum 1: Tuck’s Legacy
Forum 2: Tuck’s Legacy
Forum 3: Tuck’s Legacy
Election of Annual Giving Student Advisory Board
Forum 4: Tuck’s Legacy
Forum 5: Tuck’s Legacy
Forum 6: Tuck’s Legacy
Class Gift to Tuck
Election of class agents and assistant agents
Case Study: University of Cambridge

EMPOWERED AND TRUSTED UNITS DRIVE ACHIEVEMENT OF SHARED VISION

The Cambridge 800th Anniversary Campaign is an example of how an organization with a strong brand but no presupposed giving structure, culture or processes managed its first fundraising program.

CONTEXT

After deciding on the need to diversify sources of funding, The University of Cambridge embarked on its first ever major fundraising campaign privately in 2001 and then publically in 2005.

The school had little experience with major fundraising campaigns and alumni engagement; the Cambridge University Development Office was established in 1988 and the Cambridge Alumni Relations Office was not established until 2009.

IMPLEMENTATION

De-centralized power model

- Cambridge trusted and empowered the University community, Colleges and volunteer groups to develop and manage independent events and communications
  - University community includes central development and alumni relations, schools, faculties and departments
  - Colleges include the 31 university colleges
  - Volunteer groups include the Campaign Board, the Campaign Council, US Major Gifts Committee, Hong Kong Fundraising Committee and Cambridge in America

Emphasized various ways to give

- Colleges and the University actively encouraged alumni and friends to consider making provision for future support in their wills
- Colleges took the lead in developing participation through regular giving programs

Developed meaningful purpose

- Campaign themes included: student support, outstanding academics, the freedom to discover, and collections and heritage
- Themes were developed in collaboration with Colleges and alumni in the campaign planning process to ensure they would both resonate with potential donors and have meaningful impact on Colleges
- Built campaign around key milestone event: Cambridge’s 800 year anniversary
Case Study: University of Cambridge

EMPOWERED AND TRUSTED UNITS DRIVE ACHIEVEMENT OF SHARED VISION

• Launched the campaign privately in 2001 and publically in 2005 with the goal of raising £1 by 2012; reached the £1 mark in 2010
• Total campaign raised £1.17 (US$2 billion) and concluded on November 18, 2011
• First university outside of the United States to achieve £1 billion milestone
• Attracted broad support from alumni and friends globally; 54,000 alumni (more than ¼ of total) contributed at least once to a College and more than 8,000 contributed at least once to the University

RESULTS

KEY TAKEAWAYS FOR OHIO STATE

• Trusting, empowering and working in collaboration with sub units and volunteers around the world is an effective way to communicate campaign goals with constituencies and maximize available resources
• Constituent groups that are not historically used to the culture of philanthropy can still act as a significant sources of fundraising dollars
• A campaign around a goal with a meaningful message that resonates both with colleges and alums will encourage colleges to promote the campaign and alums to donate to it
Case Study: Mayo Clinic

CLEAR AND INSPIRATIONAL BRAND VALUES DRIVE ALL BRAND EXPERIENCES

By articulating clear values, Mayo Clinic has created a brand and experience that provides a sense of being a part of something greater than oneself. Today, Mayo Clinic is seen as one of the strongest service brands in the US.

CONTEXT

• Mayo Clinic was founded in Rochester, Minnesota, in 1889
• Mayo had a one-person marketing staff from 1986-1992 and did not have a dedicated brand team until 1997

Brand values

• Two core values guide business decisions and approaches to patient care: (1) the needs of the patient come first and (2) teamwork

Brand experience

• Physicians play a major role in delivering Mayo’s brand experience
  • Mayo hires physicians that reflect its brand values and vision; physicians understand they are the Mayo brand, are true brand evangelists, work under Mayo’s core values and ensure patient experience reflects brand values
  • Physicians’ compensation is salary-based – instead of fee-for-service – which removes any economic impediment to physician collaboration and teamwork
• Strategic brand extensions strengthen the brand and expose it to broader audiences. Those brand extensions include:
  • Geographic expansion
  • Mayo Medical Laboratories
  • Health information providers

Brand protection

• Mayo Clinic maintains tight brand control over its central clinic brand as well as strategic brand extensions
• Mayo Clinic brand is registered and protected internationally
Case Study: Mayo Clinic
CLEAR AND INSPIRATIONAL BRAND VALUES DRIVE ALL BRAND EXPERIENCES

"Mayo Clinic is a huge complex organization, but to the individual patient, Mayo at its best becomes a small intimate personal work organization."

- Leonard L. Berry, Marketing Professor at Texas A&M

"[I am a] better employee at Mayo Clinic... [I] don’t want to let Mayo Clinic down [by doing anything less than my best]."

- Admissions Clerk, Scottsdale Clinic

RESULTS

- Over 1/3 of people surveyed in the US personally know someone who had received medical treatment from Mayo Clinic
- 95% of Mayo Clinic patients report they voluntarily say good things about the clinic to others and respondents indicate they speak to between 44 and 47 persons about the clinic
- Preference for Mayo Clinic is almost three times greater than for the 2nd ranked institution

KEY TAKEAWAYS FOR OHIO STATE

- The development of clear inspirational brand values that resonate with faculty and staff can inspire them to embody these values
- A significant or impactful brand experience will facilitate word of mouth marketing
- As the brand grows, it is important to exert central control over how it will be used
Case Study: General Electric

BRAND STRENGTH IS DEPENDENT UPON UNIFIED EXECUTION

GE successfully refreshed its brand identity by aligning all of its sub-brands to its greater corporate brand strategy.

CONTEXT

- GE was aware that its brand was too heavily tied to its appliance heritage, rather than the cutting-edge technology it had developed
- GE felt it needed to focus its brand strategy so that it could be repositioned as an innovation leader in industries on the brink of major growth

IMPLEMENTATION

Top-down brand development

- Use annual surveys of trends shaping business landscape to refocus company on innovation and develop corporate brand strategy
- Trends inform annual company-wide “innovation projects,” which are created by senior leadership to inspire innovative activities in the business units
- Trend analysis in the past has pointed to major growths in innovation in environmental growth and sustainability, as well as in healthcare, out of which the Ecomagination and Healthymagination campaign concepts were born

Aligning units to business goals

- GE convenes leaders of each unit annually to:
  - Review trend identification data
  - Craft goals to ensure each unit aligns to strategic direction
- Disruptive goals are set that cannot be achieved if units do not make strategic changes, creating a necessity to evolve
- Innovation projects are reviewed by the chairman monthly, ensuring units are continuously committed
Case Study: General Electric

BRAND STRENGTH IS DEPENDENT UPON UNIFIED EXECUTION

- GE’s perception as being an innovative brand soared because of *Ecomagination* campaign; in 2004 it was unranked on *Business Week’s Most Innovative Companies* list, but in 2005, the year the campaign launched, it was ranked 4th
- “Ecomagination” represented innovation in a sector where skepticism once occurred about GE’s potential for involvement, giving it greater license to operate in the industry
- The success of *Ecomagination* and *Healthymagination* have led to GE’s new positioning of *Moving, Building, Powering, Curing*, which encompasses its full portfolio of brands

**KEY TAKEAWAYS FOR OHIO STATE**

- Unit goals must be aligned to those of the master brand
- Performance must be continuously measured to ensure alignment is maintained
- Discussions about central brand strategy with units fosters buy-in
Case Study: IBM

EMPOWERED EMPLOYEES ARE POWERFUL BRAND STEWARDS

IBM engages employees internally in corporate strategy and product development, as well as externally, where they serve as the face of IBM.

**CONTEXT**

- IBM was aware that the breadth of its company could disenfranchise employees who felt they were unable to influence or have a voice in corporate strategy
- IBM acknowledged the importance of web and social media presence and that its employees’ interactions with their customers shaped their brand, and as such wanted to promote their knowledge and expertise effectively

**IMPLEMENTATION**

**Empowering employees**

- Launched “Jams” (72-hour online brainstorming sessions open to all employees and eventually some clients) as venue for employees to share opinions and expertise on the following topics:
  - Values: IBM values and the way in which IBM should evolve to drive a fitting legacy for the company
  - World: Horizontal cross-functional and geographic company issues
  - Innovation: Innovation of products and services (to select most promising innovations in the company)
- Created “Next 5 in 5” program to give employees an outlet to influence corporate strategy by highlighting what “hot button” issues it should address in the future
- Created multiple internal forums for information-sharing so that employees could provide guidance for one another

**Employees as the face of IBM**

- Communicates publicly as a company through employee social media pages, rather than corporate pages
- Early promoter of employee use of internet in 1995 and social media in 2005; promotes all employee blogs on its site
- Social computing guidelines exist, but IBM finds its employees are “self-policing”
Case Study: IBM

EMPOWERED EMPLOYEES ARE POWERFUL BRAND STEWARDS

Our brand is largely shaped by the interactions that [employees] have with customers... We want the IBMers in aggregate to be the corporate blog and the corporate Twitter ID.

- Adam Christensen
Social media communications, IBM

RESULTS

- InnovationJam is one of the largest online brainstorming sessions ever, annually bringing together more than 150,000 people from 104 countries, including IBM employees, family members, universities, business partners and clients from 67 companies
- 10 products were selected from InnovationJam’s crowdsourcing, and funded $100 million by IBM
- Internal IBM Wiki draws over 1 million views every day

KEY TAKEAWAYS FOR OHIO STATE

- Engaging staff in a dialogue on values and legacy imparts a feeling of community that drives engagement
- Staff and employee social media presence can be an effective marketing and messaging channel for the brand
- Crowdsourcing faculty and staff for ideas on corporate strategy can provide innovative solutions, while generating buy-in and a sense of empowerment and involvement
- Internal knowledge-sharing tools can provide employees with increased efficiency and foster an environment of sharing and education of peers
CAMPAIGN ASSESSMENT
QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT
Campaign Assessment: Qualitative Assessment

OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the campaign assessment was to review the performance of previous campaigns at OSU in order to surface learnings and levers of success for each initiative, as well as key themes that span across initiatives. This analysis was intended to identify:

- Messages that resonate with target audiences
- Tactics that encourage and inspire action from current and potential donors
- Qualities/features of a campaign that impact its success

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A combination of qualitative and quantitative research and analysis helped to identify themes across Advancement.

RESEARCH TYPE

Interviews with leaders in the Foundation and the Alumni Association provided insight into
- Relationship management of current and potential donors
- The current approach to planning, executing, tracking and measuring outreach

Collection and analysis of campaign metrics available within the university supplemented and informed primary research
Campaign assessment findings

Three themes surfaced in our qualitative campaign assessment:

- STRUCTURAL CONSTRAINTS ON ADVANCEMENT
- INCONSISTENT BRAND EXPERIENCES
- EVOLVING BRAND PERCEPTIONS
Opportunities exist to improve Advancement activities

While OSU generally achieves financial campaign goals, potential fundraising and engagement opportunities remain largely untapped due to structural constraints.

1. **DONOR AND ALUMNI HISTORICAL DATA**
   Structure of currently available data inhibits teams’ ability to target potential donors and maximize relationships with OSU.

2. **STEWARSHIP AND DONOR CULTIVATION RESOURCES**
   Shortage of full range of Advancement resources (e.g., volunteers and staff) hinders donor cultivation and loyalty.

3. **COLLABORATIVE CAMPAIGN EFFORTS**
   Historical campaigns have not reached their full potential as a result of units operating independently.

**HAGGARTY HALL CAMPAIGN**
Fundraising campaign was launched without performing feasibility testing. As a result, adequate funding through targeted donors was not produced. Planners noted the potential for outreach to a broader audience with interest in the hall, but the necessary data to identify and jointly target them did not exist.

"Even if we knew who our potential donors were, we don’t have the volunteers or staff to reach them."
- FOUNDATION LEADER

"We have 500,000 living alumni and we don’t have the capacity to touch them in a way that’s meaningful to them."
- ALUMNI ASSOCIATION LEADER

**COLLEGE OF MEDICINE 50TH REUNION**
The reunion weekend, planned by the Alumni Association and attended by high-net-worth and retired alums, had fundraising potential but focused on alumni relations without development involvement.
Brand experience varies by donor and by lifecycle stage

Target audiences encounter a range of requests, relationships, messages and brand experiences across their interactions with the university.

1. **INDIVIDUAL EXPERIENCE**
   - Across university audiences – alumni, student, patients, etc. – individuals within groups experience distinct brands and messaging.

2. **SOLICITATION EXPERIENCE**
   - Alignment of solicitation messages, themes and collateral vary by venue, donor potential and the driving unit of the campaign.

3. **DONOR RECOGNITION EXPERIENCE**
   - Donor recognition varies depending on the unit with which a gift is associated.

**ALUMNI ASSOCIATION CLUBS**

**“BUT FOR OHIO STATE” MESSAGING AT OHIO STADIUM**

The “But for Ohio State” message was disseminated at Ohio Stadium this past football season. For high-potential donors, the message experience at multiple touch points – in the football program, in brochures, on large banners – displayed the “But for Ohio State” logo and was streamlined and consistent in tone and quality. Low-level donors encountered a much more disjointed message experience; some hand-outs distributed during games did not even contain the “But for Ohio State” logo.

“If I give $1M to Ohio State, the recognition and stewardship I receive is dependent on the silo I give to... I don’t have a million dollar pin that distinguishes me as a million dollar donor to Ohio State.”

- FOUNDATION LEADER
Variations in alumni brand perceptions influence interactions and experiences

The OSU brand is viewed differently across audiences, geographies and generations. Shifting dialogues reflect stakeholder context and community, and influence brand perceptions.

1. GEOGRAPHIC VARIATION

Brand perceptions, engagement and interest are seen as varying by proximity to Columbus within target audiences – alumni, students, patients, referring physicians, etc.

“I think our reputation, the further away you get [from campus], is better. You’re not as barraged with negative media and messaging in California as you are here in Central Ohio or Cleveland or Cincinnati.”

- FOUNDATION LEADER

2. PAST AND CURRENT PERCEPTIONS

Perceptions of brand alignment relative to historic promise as well as stakeholder and community relationships are changing.

“We’re not your parents’ Ohio State.”

- FOUNDATION LEADER

“A continual message that I hear from our constituency is that they’re very concerned that selective admissions will deprive students who desire a college education of getting a college education at Ohio State, and many of them share that they don’t think they would get in today.”

- FOUNDATION LEADER
CAMPAIGN ASSESSMENT
MEASUREMENT FRAMEWORK
The key objective of the Campaign Assessment was to analyze previous campaigns at the Ohio State in order to identify key levers for success. This includes specific campaign messages, tactics, and campaign qualities and features.

Initial data collection and in-depth interviews uncovered the fact that the information needed to complete this analysis is not currently available at the Ohio State. Data exists in separate silos with varying levels of depth, breadth and consistency of data collection.

Ohio State has the ability to capture key data points in order to make in-depth campaign analysis possible in the future. Following is a framework for how Ohio State can progress from its current state to an organization with robust data collection and analysis capabilities.

Qualitative research was used to identify the current state of data as it exists at Ohio State and across Advancement. Internal Edelman expertise was used to develop the baseline measurement framework.

Interviews with leaders in the Foundation and the Alumni Association provided insight into
- The objective of data collection within each Advancement function
- The breadth and depth with which data is captured
### Approach to Advancement data collection varies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Alumni Association</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide internal and external communications services</td>
<td>Engage alumni with the university</td>
<td>Raise funds for the university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Alumni Association</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track internal and external communications, i.e. which central publications are distributed when and to whom</td>
<td>Track alumni participation in and satisfaction with Alumni Association events</td>
<td>Track key stakeholder data that is important for optimizing donations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Data</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Alumni Association</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Captured</td>
<td>Mailing lists</td>
<td>Information on events, who attended which event; event feedback, etc.</td>
<td>Information on interests as a student; participation in alumni events, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not captured</td>
<td>Information on who gets which materials at which times, from across the units</td>
<td>Information around specific alumni donation activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observations
- Communications can not currently analyze data at an individual level (e.g., who receives and responds to a specific combination of communications)
- Data gathered in Development and the Alumni Association lacks consistency
- Data does not connect across silos
  - Not all problems will addressed by Blackbaud, as some units exist outside of its scope (i.e. Wexner Center patron database, WOSU membership, and athletics)
Q: HOW MANY CAMPAIGNS ARE YOU CURRENTLY RUNNING AT OHIO STATE?

A#1: "One"

A#2: "Thirty-two"

*Answers were given simultaneously by two experts in the same room.
Creating a consistent performance measurement framework

**MEASUREMENTS**

In order to measure overall performance of any larger-scale initiative, a measurement framework needs to be established which defines:

- What are the overall goals?
- What are the metrics at the unit-level, which roll up to the overall goals?
- What are the activity measures that roll up to unit metrics?
- What are the standard methods that will be used to measure each activity?

**BEST PRACTICES**

In order for the measurement framework to be effective, it requires:

- **Actionable** and achievable measures
- **Agreement and commitment** from the organization
- Employees must have significant degree of **control and influence** over the achievement of the measure
- Measures must be **linked to recognition or reward system**
- **Clear accountabilities and responsibilities** to specific roles/positions (e.g., the employee has to understand it’s part of their job description)
- **Establish a baseline** against which progress will be tracked

---

**MEASUREMENT TIERS**

- **UNIVERSITY-LEVEL** (e.g., Scorecard)
- **UNIT-LEVEL** (e.g., Metrics)
- **ACTIVITY-LEVEL** (e.g., Measures)
Measurement types require varying capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INPUTS</td>
<td>The things you do within the organization and the audience-facing work product of Advancement efforts</td>
<td>Junior level internal staff tasked with regular reporting and given access to data and activities across units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTPUTS</td>
<td>How key stakeholders respond to Advancement efforts</td>
<td>Media monitoring tools and analysts to review monitoring data – could be outsourced or managed in-house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS (SOFT AND HARD)</td>
<td>SOFT: How Advancement efforts impact attitudes and opinions of key stakeholders</td>
<td>SOFT: Market research department, consistent surveys, single POC research consultant, education and training plan to deploy findings and implications across units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HARD: How Advancement efforts change the behavior of key stakeholders</td>
<td>HARD: Statisticians, database staff with time to prioritize analysis requests, single database with integrated information, research consultants able to jointly analyze survey and business data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEASUREMENT TYPE DESCRIBES THE NATURE OF A MEASURE

The measurement should capture information on:

- The things you do
- The results of your activities in terms of changes in perception
- The results of your activities in terms of changes in behavior
## Advancement goals align to measurement types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRAND AWARENESS</th>
<th>ADVANCEMENT GOAL</th>
<th>TYPE OF MEASURE</th>
<th>SAMPLE METRICS</th>
<th>POTENTIAL TOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand number of national leaders who award high marks to Ohio State</td>
<td>Results (Soft) Outputs</td>
<td>Awareness Favorability</td>
<td>Survey Research IDIs Media Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip the number of advocates and ambassadors</td>
<td>Outputs and Results (Soft)</td>
<td>Attendees and Sign-ups Reported Advocacy</td>
<td>Advocacy Tallying individuals recruited to be ambassadors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Ohioans with strong connection</td>
<td>Results (Soft) Perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey Research Focus Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase number of annual donors</td>
<td>Outputs Results (Hard)</td>
<td>Number of Donors</td>
<td>Donor Database</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn very satisfied ratings for opportunities to be or stay involved</td>
<td>Results (Soft) Satisfaction Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey Research Focus Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly increases in number of volunteers</td>
<td>Outputs Number of Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advancement Database</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become #1 public university in total private support by 2020</td>
<td>Results (Hard) Financials</td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance Sheet and Income Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise $2.5 billion from a comprehensive fundraising campaign</td>
<td>Results (Hard) Financials</td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance Sheet and Income Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next step is to break down the goals into manageable metrics and measures

University Goal
• Yearly increases in the number of volunteers

Required unit-level metrics:
• Number of events offered where volunteers are requested
• Number of volunteers attended per quarter
• Number of net-new volunteers per quarter

Required activity-level measurements:
• Number of initiatives sent to interested volunteers
• Number of interested volunteers identified
• Number of events planned
• Number of volunteers attended per event
• Number of net-new volunteers per event
Considerations for implementation of Advancement goals

**ORGANIZATION**

Having a decentralized organization makes data collection difficult. Has there been consideration to make it mandatory for units to capture specific data points?

**CULTURE**

Unit-wide understanding of the Advancement goals is unclear and communication of the metrics that units need to manage around the goals has not been sufficient. How can you communicate the importance of capturing data to connect data across different units?

**SYSTEMS**

The Development office does a good job in collecting financial data. However, some Advancement goals require the capture and measurement of non-financial information (e.g. volunteers and satisfaction ratings). Who will capture these data points and who will be able to access and analyze this information?
### Progression of Measurement Capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand Awareness</th>
<th>Sample Measurement Types</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walk</strong> Begin with the basics of data collection and analysis</td>
<td><strong>Sample Measurement Types</strong></td>
<td><strong>Run</strong> As experience grows, abilities and capabilities increase</td>
<td><strong>Fly</strong> Building on prior experience enables advanced capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic surveys</td>
<td>Annual surveys</td>
<td>Annual surveys</td>
<td>Analysis to identify successful initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No media analysis</td>
<td>Annual media analysis</td>
<td>Monthly media analysis</td>
<td>Micro targeting of efforts based on analytics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central tracking system</td>
<td>Central database</td>
<td>Consolidated database</td>
<td>Consolidated database and analysis of financial impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No focus groups</td>
<td>Periodic focus groups</td>
<td>Regular focus groups</td>
<td>Continuous optimization of efforts based on results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active database querying</td>
<td>Database experimentation</td>
<td>Database optimization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic surveys</td>
<td>Annual surveys</td>
<td>Annual surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No focus groups</td>
<td>Periodic focus groups</td>
<td>Targeted focus groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central tracking</td>
<td>Consolidated database</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. **WALK** Begin with the basics of data collection and analysis.
2. **RUN** As experience grows, abilities and capabilities increase.
3. **FLY** Building on prior experience enables advanced capabilities.

---

**ILLUSTRATIVE**
Brand Asset Inventory

OBJECTIVES

The brand asset inventory was designed to assess the range of current brand collateral and heritage assets from key units across Ohio State University to identify variations and themes in messaging and branding, including content and visual identity. This included an analysis of:

- Marketing and communications strategies (e.g., slogans, taglines)
- Marketing materials, brochures, pamphlets, mailings, etc.
- Logos and visual identifiers
- Digital brand assets

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A combination of qualitative and quantitative research and analysis helped to identify the current state of brand assets across key units as well as significant brand themes that carry across these assets.

RESEARCH TYPE

Interviews with marketing and communications leadership from key units across OSU provided insight into:

- Existing marketing, communications and brand strategies
- The range of brand collateral across campus
- The range of marketing materials per unit

Inventory and analysis of brand collateral provided a holistic view of the range collateral and how the university is represented across units.

Inventory of digital and social media assets provided a holistic view of how the OSU brand lives online via the umbrella and unit brands.
Inventory methodology

The Brand Asset Inventory includes both physical marketing materials and digital assets (including official websites and social media channels).

Physical assets were gathered from primary sources of our Landscape Analysis workstream. These interviewees represented and provided us with materials from the following units:

- OSU (overall)
- Athletics
- College of Arts and Sciences
- College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences
- College of Public Health
- Fisher College of Business
- Health Sciences Department

Digital assets include official websites and social media channels. These websites and social medial channels were identified through:

- Analysis of official central and unit websites
- Internal Edelman Consulting research
- Research performed by Mindset Digital

HOW ASSETS WERE INVENTORIED

Each asset was inventoried using 30 fields that described:

- Originator
- Audience
- Purpose
- Constituencies represented
- Photographic imagery
- Tonality of language
- Alignment with OSU brand standards

UNIT REPRESENTATION IN BRAND ASSETS

OSU (master brand) 71%
Units 29%

LIMITATIONS

Because brand assets were solicited from some, but not all OSU units, this should not be considered an overall assessment of University assets.
Units assessed for the brand asset inventory
Key takeaways

**CONTENT CONSISTENCY**
- Land grant status is inconsistently defined
- Divergent target audiences of units account for some visual and tonal differences in assets

**VISUAL CONSISTENCY**
- Style and design quality of collateral varies across the University
- Inconsistency in usage and placement of logo, creates inconsistent brand experience
- Units drive alignment with the Ohio State parent brand through the creation of internal brand standards
- Assets within units are often at odds with the unit’s own brand guidelines or Ohio State’s brand experience
- Digital collateral varies in its alignment to Ohio State brand standards

**SOCIAL MEDIA**
- Social media usage varies greatly by unit
- Popularity on Facebook and Twitter are not indications of engagement levels or online influence
- Ohio State has internal assets, including personnel and units, that have high social media visibility
Land-grant status is inconsistently defined

A minority of brand asset inventory materials mentioned Ohio State’s land grant status. Even among that small number, the mission associated with land-grant status was inconsistently defined.

"[Dean Bobby Moser] in the spirit of the land-grant university, makes a difference in people's lives."
- CFAES’s Continuum Magazine

"They support Ohio State's land grant mission of a quality education."
- Charitable Gift Annuity Ad

"Land-grant colleges are more important today than ever before. Your support helps others learn more…"
- Invitation to join the Alumni Association

"As a land-grant university, Ohio State has a physical presence throughout the state, with campus research centers throughout the state and extension offices in each of Ohio's 88 counties."
- http://www.osu.edu/visitors/aboutohiostate.php

"Our faculty track emerging infectious diseases, identify strategies for optimal health, and partner with nonprofit and government agencies to protect the public's health.

Through these many activities, the College of Public Health helps Ohio State fulfill its land-grant mission of outreach and public service."
- COPH’s Re-dedication of Cunz Hall

The most easily accessible definition of the implications of land-grant status online is on “Ohioline,” a news and information site for CFAES and OSU Extension:

"...the land grant system encompasses three major missions: objective or unbiased research (done by the Experiment Stations), non-formal education and information dissemination (carried out by the Extension Services), and classroom or college instruction (taught at each land grant campus)."
- http://ohioline.osu.edu/lines/lgrant.html
Divergent target audiences account for some visual and tonal differences in collateral.

Units target various stakeholders and audiences, sometimes overlapping, depending on content, channel and objective. No common tracking system or process aligns interactions to broadly targeted or niche audiences.

FAES
Target: Ohio community

Health Sciences
Target: Healthcare Professionals

Public Health
Target: Ohio community

FAES
Target: Farmers

Health Sciences
Target: Patients
Variance of style in collateral
Design quality varies across publications and channels

While the content of OSU publications, brochures and pamphlets are of a high caliber, design quality often varies.

Two publications distributed by the College of Arts and Sciences

Two publications distributed by the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences
Logo inconsistency minimizes ties to central brand

Lack of consistent usage of the Ohio State logo in assets both in terms of (a) whether the logo is used and (b) where it is represented, creates inconsistent brand experiences and may weaken associations with the overall Ohio State master brand.

Some groups typically use the Ohio State logo, but have instances of materials where it is omitted. These groups include:
- OSU Foundation
- College of Arts & Sciences
- College of Food and Agricultural Sciences

Other groups, have created unique logos that they choose to represent instead of the Ohio State logo. These groups include:
- Athletics
- President’s Club
- Oval Society
- Alumni Association

Position on materials where logo is featured most prominently:
- Front: 52%
- Back: 26%
- Inside: 2%
- Not Represented: 20%
Unit alignment with parent brand is driven by internal brand standards

OSU provides general guidelines for the overarching parent brand. Some units have developed their own brand standards documents that translate OSU visual guidelines into more comprehensive guidelines for individual units.

“ALL OF OUR FOLKS INTERACT WITH THEIR COUNTERPARTS AT THE UNIVERSITY”

BUT WE REALLY DRIVE A LOT OF OUR OWN [MARKETING AND COMMUNICATIONS] STRATEGY AND PLANS”

– COMMUNICATIONS LEADER
Collateral developed by certain units is often at odds with the brand guidelines laid out by the individual unit and/or the overall Ohio State brand experience.
Brand alignment across unit digital collateral also varies

Departments frequently diverge from typical parent or unit web standards. Working hypothesis is that variance currently occurs to greater extent (a) further from shared resources and guidelines and (b) with greater breadth of specialties.
Some units opt for distinctive digital assets

The Ohio State Athletics and Fisher College of Business have each created a distinct online presence that effectively target their unique audiences and reflect best in class design and functionality.

- The Fisher College website was built to replicate the design, usability, and communications mechanisms of peer and aspirational business schools.
- Owned by CBS Sports, the Ohio State Buckeyes site reflects the design and functionality of a best-in-class sports site.

- Fisher College site is continuously customized by examining click-through rates to distinguish areas of key interest for users.
- Athletics media reflects the types of content desired by sports fans (e.g., video and interactive media).
Social media usage varies greatly by unit

Opportunities exist to extend social media presence, but breadth of usage expands reputational risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF ACCOUNTS</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Twitter</th>
<th>YouTube</th>
<th>Flickr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Public Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher College of Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Division</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNDERUTILIZED CHANNELS**

- Visual media channels are underutilized
- Some schools have a far smaller social media footprint across all channels
- Most channels do not have a dedicated purpose (e.g., recruiting)

**RISK**

- Expanded risk exists as a result of numerous sites that are not all centrally monitored
- Numerous owners of social media channels may have varying degrees of proficiency and understanding of potential reputational issues online
- Ensuring consistency of messaging and proper utilization of channels is difficult
Although Ohio State surpasses its competitors in “Likes” on Facebook, fewer users engage in conversation on the Facebook page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Likes</th>
<th>Conversations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>407,858</td>
<td>4,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>78,237</td>
<td>2,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>97,283</td>
<td>1,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>282,854</td>
<td>7,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuck School of Business</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>127,990</td>
<td>3,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>149,299</td>
<td>3,659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are consistently more comments on each of Stanford’s posts than those of OSU.
Twitter content does not maximize engagement potential

While OSU’s official account has created more Tweets than any of its competitors, it does not lead in any major measurements of Twitter influence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Followers</th>
<th>Tweets</th>
<th>TweetLevel</th>
<th>Twitalyzer</th>
<th>Klout</th>
<th>PeerIndex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>25,112</td>
<td>6,634</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>14,134</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>6,111</td>
<td>4,030</td>
<td><strong>80.8</strong></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td><strong>62,443</strong></td>
<td>4,398</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuck School of Business</td>
<td>4,360</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>27,323</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>18,010</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>54</td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TweetLevel is a proprietary tool of Edelman, providing insight into users’ Twitter presence based on popularity, engagement, and influence scores.

Twitalyzer’s score consists of the following factors: number of followers, number of references and citations of the user, retweets, retweeting of others, and post frequency.

Klout’s K Score is a measure of the impact of opinions, links and recommendations across an individual's social graph.

PeerIndex measures online authority. It reflects the impact of online activities, and extent to which social and reputational capital exist on the web.
Unlike the majority of its comparable institutions, Ohio State’s athletics program has more followers than the school itself. Additionally, it is the only institution with a presidential Twitter following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>President</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>28,083</td>
<td>38,623</td>
<td>25,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,241</td>
<td>14,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,355</td>
<td>6,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,807</td>
<td>62,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- President Gee is the only University President on Twitter out of comparable institutions
- President Gee has more followers than the university’s twitter page
- With the exception of University of Washington and Ohio State, all other universities have a greater following than their athletics departments
- OSU’s President and Athletics organization both have larger following than the school itself
Sources: Landscape analysis


Sources: Landscape analysis


Sources: Landscape analysis


• The Chronicle of Philanthropy, Penn State’s Advice to Fund Raisers After the Sex Scandal, Jan 5, 2012


## Case study interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANFORD UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Stone</td>
<td>Former Head of the Alumni Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Manning</td>
<td>VP Stanford Alumni Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerold Pearson</td>
<td>Director of Market Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAYO CLINIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy David</td>
<td>Chair of Brand Management and Business Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Schmidt</td>
<td>Vice Chairman of Public Affairs, Edelman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla Herrera</td>
<td>Senior Account Executive, Edelman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Keating</td>
<td>Director of Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TUCK SCHOOL OF BUSINESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Jaeger</td>
<td>Assistant Dean and Director of the MBA Program Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Celone</td>
<td>Director of Tuck Annual Giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Steele</td>
<td>Executive Director, Development and Alumni Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walt Dryfoos</td>
<td>AVP Advancement Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerri Warner</td>
<td>Vice President, Corporate and Public Affairs, Edelman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IBM</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Campaign assessment interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALUMNI ASSOCIATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Bickel</td>
<td>VP, Outreach and Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Cloran</td>
<td>Senior Director, Development and Alumni Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Gurd</td>
<td>Chief Operating Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Proctor</td>
<td>Director of Alumni Communications, University Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabrina Ragan</td>
<td>Director of Annual Giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Vidmar</td>
<td>Senior Director of Development and Sponsorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd Akins</td>
<td>Senior Associate VP, Constituency Fundraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Allinger</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Booth</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprice Bragg</td>
<td>Executive Director, Office of External Relations, FCOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Hastings</td>
<td>Senior Associate VP and Campaign Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vince McGrail</td>
<td>Senior Director, University Marketing Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Meyer</td>
<td>Senior Director, Corporate and Foundation Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Mountcastle</td>
<td>Senior Associate VP, Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Yerina</td>
<td>Executive Director, Development FAES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOUNDATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## Brand asset inventory interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ted Hattemer</td>
<td>New Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Patterson</td>
<td>Internal Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Hoffman</td>
<td>Media Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Sabau</td>
<td>Associate Athletics Director, External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine O’Malley</td>
<td>Executive Director, Office of External Relations and Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth NeCamp</td>
<td>Chief Communications Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa DiNardo Brown</td>
<td>Chief Communications Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libby Eckhardt</td>
<td>Chief Communications Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Hamilton</td>
<td>Director of Marketing and Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shashi Matta</td>
<td>Professor of Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Schmiesing</td>
<td>Executive Director, Office of External Relations and Advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Steel</td>
<td>Strategic Communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>