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RESPONSE TO RESOLUTION ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
At the Faculty Senate meeting on October 13, I was asked by three senators—Rudy Pasic, Tom Flynn, Chris Bartone—to address issues raised by the resolution on collective bargaining. In response to their request, I met with the three senators and Sergio Lopez, Chair of Faculty Senate. At the meeting, I asked for suggestions on how I might best address their concerns in my report on November 10.

Our meeting followed on the heels of another meeting with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on the same issue. Attendees were Geoff Buckley, Sergio Lopez, David Thomas, and Jeremy Webster. Both meetings were productive and the advice I received shaped how I will approach responding to the resolution and the concerns expressed by Rudy, Tom, and Chris.

The consensus of the senators was that the resolution was best addressed in my written report. My time on Monday night, they advised, should be used to discuss strategies for finding ways to improve the coordination and communication between my office and Faculty Senate.

I am heartened by the candor and the collegial spirit in which our discussions took place. In my conversation with Rudy, Tom, Chris, and Sergio each individual had a different understanding of what constitutes shared governance. But they agreed that to govern well, one must listen well and all of us must understand our responsibilities in making informed decisions. I want to be a better listener and help to contribute to an atmosphere in which substantive discussions can proceed productively. Each of the senators offered suggestions to these ends that I look forward to sharing on Monday evening.

Approach to Responding to the Resolution
Because much of the resolution consists of generalizations responding point by point with specific information is difficult. It is also challenging for me, as Executive Vice President and Provost, to address each element because of the 21 issues put forward I have primary jurisdiction over 4 (curriculum; Q2S budget; Q2S curriculum; signing of Faculty Senate resolutions). The resolution also mentions faculty grievances which is a responsibility that I share only with the President. In some of the other areas covered by the resolution I have a voice, but I do not have sole authority to make
decisions on issues relating to administrative hiring and salaries; initiatives that do not originate from my office; health care; and any issue involving the Board of Trustees.

One of the suggestions that I heard from Chris, Rudy, Sergio, and Tom was that it might help to clarify the range of my responsibility as Executive Vice President and Provost. As a result of the May 7, 2007 reorganization of the institution, the President directed me to assume full ownership and direction of enrollment management; student success; the transfer process; the enhancement of our academic research, scholarship, and creative activity; creating greater institutional diversity; and full responsibility of the academic plan. It is these matters, plus oversight of the traditional academic enterprise, where I lead and where I should be held accountable. But even in these realms it must be understood that my authority is delegated from the Board of Trustees via the President. Their input and direction matter and must be considered.

Aspects of the Resolution Relating to EVPP Four Areas of Primary Jurisdiction and One Area of Shared Jurisdiction

1. Resolution Language: “An attempt by Lifelong and Distance Learning to circumvent the University Curriculum Council by offering a number of Ohio University courses on-line, despite the fact that these courses had not been approved as on-line course offerings as required by UCC, a clear violation of the faculty’s ‘primary jurisdiction over curriculum.’”

Response: I am not sure of the basis for the resolution’s claim. To my knowledge, Lifelong and Distance Learning did not violate UCC policy in offering Ohio University courses online. David Thomas, Vice Chair of Faculty Senate and Chair of UCC, established in spring quarter an Online Study Group composed primarily of faculty to review the online curriculum process. The Online Study Group produced a report confirming that once an academic course or program has been approved by UCC, it may be offered via traditional mode, online, or other distance learning delivery modes so long as it fulfills the same objectives and learning outcomes included in the original materials reviewed by UCC. None of the courses offered by Lifelong and Distance Learning deviated from the original materials reviewed by UCC and all were therefore eligible to be offered online.

2. Resolution Language: “Continued shockingly low estimates by the Provost of the cost of changing the academic calendar from quarters to semesters which take no account of the thousands of man-hours of faculty time required to revise the entire curriculum and demonstrate an administrative view that faculty time is both limitless and worthless.”

Response: The budget for the quarters to semester conversion now stands at $2,324,000. That estimate should not be viewed as a reflection of my view of faculty time. There is no question that faculty will need to invest significant time in the conversion process. Over the course of the years that I have been a dean and a provost, I have witnessed the effort required by faculty in schools and departments that have redesigned their curriculum. Revision of curriculum is by every measure a substantial undertaking.

The Q2S budget should not be a litmus test of how faculty time is viewed or valued, but it is a reflection of the following:

- That the core principle of the conversion is that students who are enrolled during the transition will not be disadvantaged in any way. To that end, advising is critical and support will be provided to ensure that faculty do not find themselves with a heavier burden when it comes to advising.
- That our proposed budget accords with what we found after reviewing the expenditures of institutions that have successfully completed semester conversions.
- That the deans feel strongly that compensation for faculty should be reserved for those who will be given new responsibilities relating to the conversion beyond those of that are inherent in being a tenured or tenure-track faculty member.
- That the four-year timeline under which the conversion will operate should allow faculty the opportunity to spread the work that they must do for their individual courses over several years. This does not eliminate the
need for faculty to invest time, but it does allow for a greater balancing with the other responsibilities that faculty must pursue.

- That the deans and I recognize that during the time in which the transition takes place “extramural” demands on faculty time must be scaled back. We need to be focused and our focus must be the transition to semesters.
- That the resource needs of faculty in other areas such as research and creative activity require a conservative budget for the conversion. The funding to be expended on the Q2S process will be in the form of one-time monies, but one-time funding has been used to good effect in supporting many faculty and academic projects. The larger the Q2S budget, the smaller the pool of resources that will be available to pursue other matters valued by faculty.

3. **Resolution Language**: “A growing fear that faculty control of the curriculum will be lost to administrative mandate regarding how the curriculum will be converted during the quarter-to-semester calendar transition.”

**Response**: Faculty involvement on the Q2S Transition Team is extensive. Eight faculty members are on the Q2S Transition Team including 4 out of the 5 members of the Executive Staff as well as the chair of the Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee of Faculty Senate. The minutes of each meeting are posted at [http://www.ohio.edu/provost/Q2S-Meeting-Minutes.cfm](http://www.ohio.edu/provost/Q2S-Meeting-Minutes.cfm). Changes to the Q2S “Assumptions, Constraints, and Principles” document have been made based on recommendations of the transition team. Those changes are clearly noted in the document that is posted at [http://www.ohio.edu/provost/q2s.cfm](http://www.ohio.edu/provost/q2s.cfm)

In addition, members of EPSA, UCC, and the Q2S team (the UCC Semester Transition Process and General Education Task Force) have been meeting once a week to work on curriculum conversion and general education issues. During finals week, 100 faculty designated by their department or school as being key participants in the conversion process will be meeting with members of the Q2S Transition Team to begin developing the process of curriculum conversion in the colleges.

In the Q2S process, we have worked hard to involve faculty and privilege transparency. I hope that our commitment to involvement and transparency will help allay faculty fears about the transition to semesters. Much work remains to be done, but I am appreciative of the collegiality and focus that have been exhibited by all members of the transition team during fall quarter.

4. **Resolution Language**: “A history of faculty grievances with findings by the President and Provost that tend to favor the administration with no option for legally-binding arbitration.”

**Response**: According to the Faculty Handbook, grievances fall under the purview of the Professional Relations Committee. The process surrounding grievances requires written submission of the complaint to the departmental chairperson or division coordinator, then to the dean of the campus or college, and finally to the provost. If the faculty member disagrees with my decision, he or she has the right to have his or her case reviewed before the Professional Relations Committee. The Professional Relations Committee submits its recommendations directly to the President.

In the 4 ½ years that I have been provost, there have been four grievances (1 from Athens and 3 from the regional campuses) brought before the Professional Relations Committee. In the four cases, I handled each of the requests independently working to give due consideration to all sides. Grievances are difficult matters and each presents its own unique set of circumstances. To imply that I decided the grievances with an eye to always disadvantaging the faculty member is false and not borne out by my actions.

5. **Resolution Language**: “The stonewalling of the Faculty Senate by the Provost who approved only one of the last nine Senate resolutions requiring her signature dating from April 16, 2007 through May 12, 2008.”
Response: In his research on the signing of faculty resolutions, Marty Tuck, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, categorized the resolutions by academic year. Ken Brown, the author of the resolution, chooses to group them on a different basis. Regardless of how my “batting average” is counted, the point that I tried to make in my first Faculty Senate report of fall quarter still stands—a simple counting of unsigned resolutions does not do justice to the complexity of the resolution process.

I included most of the information below on the signing of Faculty Senate Resolutions in my September 8, 2008 report to Faculty Senate, but I would like to clarify a point that seems to have been muddied by the discussion of Ken’s resolution. I fully recognize that Faculty Senate has the ability and in some cases the obligation to pass advocacy resolutions. I have never questioned this element of faculty governance, but it is important to recognize that advocacy resolutions, by their very nature, are often more difficult for me to sign. In my four years as Provost, I have signed all but two resolutions relating to curriculum and academic policies. When it comes to the primary jurisdiction of Faculty Senate, my record is one of strong support.

The research reflected in the report on resolution signing was conducted by Marty Tuck, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, (tuck@ohio.edu). The Executive Vice President and Provost’s statements regarding resolutions that were not signed are available at http://www.ohio.edu/facultysenate/

SIGNING OF FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTIONS
I heard a number of complaints over the summer about my “batting average” on Faculty Senate resolutions and asked Associate Provost Marty Tuck to conduct some analysis of the record.

Marty’s analysis found two types of Faculty Senate resolutions:

- Resolutions focused on curriculum and academic policies which the Faculty Handbook characterizes as the “primary jurisdiction” of Faculty Senate.
- Resolutions that address issues across the university in accord with the advocacy role of Faculty Senate in which it articulates “faculty views on all other University policies and practices.”

Marty reviewed the distribution of the two types of resolutions during the four years that I have served as Provost and organized the information into resolution types which are displayed in charts on the next page.
The charts illustrate that Faculty Senate has been shifting focus from its primary jurisdiction to its advocacy role. The shift is consistent with an institution undergoing significant changes. But the shift has implications when it comes to my track record of signing resolutions.

In my four years as Provost, I have signed all but two resolutions relating to curriculum and academic policies. When it comes to the primary jurisdiction of Faculty Senate, my record is one of strong support.

Advocacy resolutions, by their very nature, are often more difficult for me to sign. Over the past four years, I have decided not to sign advocacy resolution for three reasons:

- I could not sign as I lacked the ability to make the commitment called for in the resolution (e.g. the resolution calling for the appointment of a faculty trustee to the Board of Trustees).
- I could not sign as my consent was not sufficient to make a commitment to bind parts of the university beyond the purview of the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost (e.g. the moratorium on the establishment of new university committees).
- I did not sign as I believed that it was not in the best interests of the university to do so (e.g. removing market calculations from the distribution of the FY 09 portion of the FYVOIP investment in faculty salaries particularly when the recommendation to include market came from a representative committee).

In terms of the first two categories, it is worth noting that in most instances Faculty Senate Executive Committee discusses resolutions with me before they come to floor. Consequently Faculty Senate knows in advance whether I have the authority to act on a resolution. Passing a resolution knowing that I cannot sign it as a political gesture is one thing, but calculating it as part of a “batting average” is not appropriate.

When it comes to the third category, I act fully within the scope of my authority. I believe that my track record on these resolutions reflects principled decision making. In response to a resolution that I signed in January 2007, I agreed to respond within 60 days of a resolution’s passage, and, if I declined to sign, to provide a written response outlining my reasons for not signing. It holds me accountable for responding to Faculty Senate in ways that past provosts never were. Since the beginning of 2007 I have provided written responses detailing my reasons for not signing a resolution. My responses can be viewed on the Faculty Senate Web site.

In circumstances where I can sign an advocacy resolution, my decision not to sign it should not be interpreted as a disavowal of Faculty Senate. In the end, it is my responsibility to balance the advocacy of Faculty Senate with my understanding institutional matters at the macro level for all constituent groups.

In the future, I hope that we set aside “batting averages” in favor of substantive discussions about how all of us, myself included, can understand issues more fully and make better decisions.

---

1 There are some curriculum and academic policy matters that have been in abeyance for awhile—academic honor code, undergraduate advising, online syllabi database, proposal from Chairs & Directors’ Council on the Early Retirement Program, and faculty classification. Faculty Senate Executive Committee is aware of these issues and I look forward to working with them on resolving them.
FULBRIGHT SUCCESS

I am pleased to point to our continuing remarkable success in the Fulbright Program. The Fulbright Program which was established in 1946 provides opportunities for post-graduate and faculty fellowships in 155 countries. Sponsored by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the United States Department of State, student and faculty Fulbright fellowships are among the most sought after nationally competitive academic awards.

Being successful in one of the Fulbright competitions requires a significant amount of work on the part of the applicant and, in the case of students, from faculty who agree to support the student in their bid for a fellowship. At Ohio University, we also are fortunate to have the exceptional talents of Beth Clodfelter, Director of U.S. Fulbright Programs and Liaison for International Partnerships. Students and faculty have praised her dedicated work on Fulbright applications, and she is a key reason that we are first in the state when it comes to student Fulbrights and tied for 21st among research universities. As the update included below suggests, this academic year may bring us more reasons to be proud of our students, their faculty mentors, and the work done by Beth.

This year we also have cause to celebrate the success of our faculty in receiving Fulbright Awards. Out of all of the universities in the nation, Ohio University is tied for 7th place in the number of its faculty who were Fulbright recipients.

2008-2009 FULBRIGHT Awardees—STUDENTS AND FACULTY
Our 12 2008-09 Fulbright U.S. Student Program awardees earned Ohio University a tie for 21st place among research institutions (one other awardee declined her opportunity so is not included in our institutional total). Rating information for a large number of research universities, as well as for bachelor’s and other kinds of institutions, is available from http://us.fulbrightonline.org/news_story.php?id=215

Thanks to the success of our 12 awardees, Ohio University is first among all higher education institutions in the state of Ohio in terms of the number of 2008-09 U.S. Fulbright U.S. Student Program award recipients. Kenyon College is second with eight, followed by Oberlin College with six, the University of Cincinnati with four, and Ohio State, the College of Wooster and Denison University with three each.

The five faculty members who received 2008-09 Fulbright U.S. Scholar awards not only set a new record for OU faculty Fulbright awards, they enabled Ohio University to tie for 7th place nationally. We are behind only the University of Washington (9), Georgetown University (8), University of Arizona (6), UC Berkeley (6), University of Georgia (6) and Penn State University (6) in the number of faculty members who received Fulbright awards. Our five faculty awardees have enabled Ohio University to lead the state of Ohio in 2008-09 Fulbright U.S. Scholar awards as well, followed by Bowling Green (4) and Case Western Reserve (3).

2009-2010 FULBRIGHT APPLICATIONS—STUDENTS
Twenty-two Ohio University applicants have submitted applications for the 2009-10 Fulbright U.S. Student Program competition. Based on feedback from the faculty campus interview panels, these applicants form another very strong group of OU Fulbright candidates. Ninety-two faculty and staff members from a wide variety of departments generously contributed to the application and interview processes formally and still more served as mentors or assisted the students behind the scenes. This level of campus-wide support is beneficial to the candidates on many levels and helps to make the Fulbright application process itself a meaningful educational experience.

The applicants, who include twenty students and two alumnae, represent the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business, College of Fine Arts, College of Osteopathic Medicine, Honors Tutorial College, Scripps College of
Communication, University College and the Center for International Studies. Through their majors and degree programs, they represent the most diverse group of academic departments yet for an OU Fulbright applicant cohort.

Though the Fulbright program is too competitive to ever make predictions about the number of awards these applicants might earn, the quality of these students’ applications will reflect very positively on Ohio University as an academic institution. In late January or early February we should learn how many OU applicants have been recommended to the second round of competition. Final decisions will arrive, country by country, sometime between March and June.

INTERNATIONAL CENTER

The strength of our international academic heritage plays a role in our Fulbright success. It also put us in good stead in recruiting and retaining international undergraduate, graduate students, and faculty. But in order to continue to preserve and build our strength as an institution known for its international pursuits, we need to continue to improve our ability to serve the members of our community who come to Ohio University from other nations to study or work. To that end, one of the goals of the Five Year Vision Ohio Implementation Plan was to create an international center to provide one-stop assistance for international students and faculty, and for domestic students seeking assistance with international academic opportunities.

Due to the generosity of our dedicated alumni Robert and Margaret Walter and the Sigma Chi Fraternity, the former Sigma Chi fraternity house located at 15 Park Place will become the center for international assistance envisioned by the Five Year Plan. Details about the Walters’ gift and the support of the Sigma Chi Fraternity can be found in an Outlook story published on November 3.

ENROLLMENT/RETENTION/RECRUITMENT UPDATES
Goals and results of AY 2007-2008 enrollment/retention/recruitment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased Applications</td>
<td>We received a record 11,406 applications, up 1,026 from this time last year, an 8 percent increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Selectivity</td>
<td>Selectivity increased. Seventy-eight percent of the applicants were admitted, down from 82 percent last year, 85 percent in 2006, and 89 percent in 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet Enrollment Target for New Students</td>
<td>The freshman class was 3,985 in number. The transfer class was 518 in number. Together, the freshman/transfer enrollment met the new student target of 4,503.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Freshmen Class Improved</td>
<td>The quality of the freshman class is up from last year. The average high school GPA 3.37 this year, compared to 3.34 last year. The average ACT Composite is 23.7 compared to 23.6 last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Diversity of Freshmen Class</td>
<td>The diversity of the freshman class increased from last year. Nonresident freshmen increased by two percent. International freshmen increased 22 percent. Multicultural freshmen increased about 17 percent. Students from Appalachian counties increased four percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve First-Year Retention</td>
<td>The first-year retention rate increased two percent from 78 percent last year to 80 percent this year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Colleges with Largest Increases and Decreases in Freshmen Enrollment
Colleges that increased freshmen enrollment the most are Engineering (256 last year to 299 this year), Fine Arts (186 last year to 203 this year), and Business (384 last year to 393 this year). Colleges that decreased the most were Arts and Sciences (932 to 864) and University College (1,001 to 988). The decrease in enrollment in University was planned as it set out to encourage freshmen not to begin their careers “undecided” but rather to choose an academic home from the outset.

Total Enrollment on Athens and Regional Campuses
Total Athens campus undergraduate enrollment is up 73 from last year. Athens graduate enrollment is up 54 from last year. The regional campus enrollment is up about 500 from last year.

Fall 2009 Admissions Update
The current freshmen enrollment target is 4,150. This includes students for the Athens Campus Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing (B.S.N.), which will begin in Fall 2009.

As of November 7:
- There were 3,810 freshman applications, up 251 from this time last year.
- There were 122 transfer student applications, up 74 from this time last year. The current transfer target is 462.
- There were 245 graduate applications, down 62 from this time last year.
- The quality of the freshman applications is up from last year at this time. The average high school GPA is 3.38 for next year, and the average ACT Composite is 23.8 for next year.

MAJOR STRATEGIC INITIATIVES UPDATES

Five Year Vision Ohio Implementation Plan (FYVOIP)
The deadline for fall quarter FYVOIP submissions has passed. The Vision Ohio Steering Committee (VOSC) received 18 submissions. 10 submissions included a request for funding. The funding requests add up to about $2 million in base requests and $77,000 in one-time requests.

As VOSC is in the process of considering the submissions, it might be useful to review the role that VOSC plays. "Upon completion of the review, VOSC will make a recommendation as to whether to endorse the request. Endorsed proposals seeking funding will be collated and sent to Budget Planning Council (BPC) for budgetary feedback. VOSC recommendations and BPC feedback will be reviewed by the Deans and Executive Staff group. The President, the Executive Vice President and Provost, and the Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration will make the final decision on requests."

Quarters to Semesters (Q2S)
The Q2S Transition Team finished its initial review of the “Assumptions, Constraints, and Principles” document. Discussion in the meetings of the team has been focusing on determining a calendar for the regular academic year. Minutes of the meetings are posted at http://www.ohio.edu/provost/Q2S-Meeting-Minutes.cfm

On November 6 and 7, the transition team hosted Andy Jorgensen, who directed the University of Toledo’s semester conversion. Dr. Jorgensen met with the transition team, the academic deans, the Educational Policy and Student Affairs Committee, and the UCC Semester Transition Process and General Education Task Force. He offered practical advice
and insights from his own experience. Dr. Jorgensen also reviewed the state of the Q2S transition process at Ohio University and gave high marks to the work accomplished to date.

On November 20 and 21 orientation meetings will be held for faculty who have been designated as Q2S coordinators in their schools or departments. The meetings will provide the opportunity to begin developing the college curriculum conversion process.

**University System of Ohio (USO)**

Three reports are due to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents during the current academic year.

1) The first concerns the affordability "good faith estimates" report to be submitted on November 30, 2008, which details enrollments and endowment growth, tuition changes, and student out-of-pocket costs.

2) The second is a document that will indicate how each institution will contribute to meeting the system-wide accountability measures. That report is to be submitted by each institution by November 30, 2008.

3) The third is a "centers of excellence" report due on June 30, 2009.

In an October 10th letter to the presidents of Ohio’s public universities, Chancellor Fingerhut noted that “the timing of the first two reports was strategically selected so that communications with legislators regarding affordability and performance can begin to occur well in advance of the 2010-11 budget development process.”

Craig Cornell, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, has taken the lead on constructing the “affordability” report. Mike Williford, Associate Provost for Institutional Research and Assessment, is overseeing the development of the “accountability” report. Both reports are still in the process of being completed, but because Board of Trustee approval is needed drafts will be shared with the Board of Trustees Resources Committee at its November 13 meeting and also later in the month with the Executive Committee. Formal endorsement by the entire Board will not take place until the January meeting.

**USO Centers of Excellence**

The process for determining Centers of Excellence at Ohio University is illustrated below.
In September, the Chancellor met with trustees of university governing boards across the state. Ohio University was represented by Trustee Ned Dewire. At that meeting a document on Centers of Excellence was distributed. It included the following information:

“Centers of Excellence Institutional Report
Beginning in January 2009, the Chancellor will meet with the colleges and universities to discuss each area that the school may determine to be a center of excellence. A report to the Chancellor is due at the end of June, 2009. At that time, each university will identify and establish goals for their Centers of Excellence. This report, which must be approved by the Boards of Trustees, will also specify the externally-recognized standards that will be used to measure progress. The Chancellor, in consultation with the Director of Development, will approve or seek modifications in the reports to guarantee a range of academic strength sufficient to drive the global competitiveness of Ohio’s economy.”

Task Force on Centers of Excellence in Professional and Graduate Education
The task force has posted on its web page, http://www.ohio.edu/provost/centersexcellence.cfm, three documents relating to the process of completing the review of graduate program: “Procedures for Evaluating Self-Study Documents,” “Criteria for Rating Self-Studies,” and “Response to the Feedback Received on the Self-Study Procedures and Criteria.” All 87 self-studies will be posted shortly on the Graduate College web-site.

Task force members are currently rating the 87 programs and are scheduled to finish by November 25. The task force will then enter the next phase of the ratings, which is to look for large discrepancies between raters that, if found, will require using a third rater. Once they deal with discrepancies the task force will then meet on December 18 as a committee to discuss the ratings and make statements about individual programs. The task force aims to be finished with its work by mid January.

For those who are interested in graduate reviews at other institutions, the November 7 edition of the Chronicle of Higher Education featured an article on Ohio State’s graduate evaluation process.

Academic Support Unit Program Review Committee (ASUPRC) [Contributed by Gary Neiman]
The Academic Support Unit Program Review Committee (ASUPRC) is now meeting with the units to begin review this year. Attending these review sessions (November 5 and November 18) are the unit head, its planning unit head, and the ASUPRC liaison. Self studies will launch shortly with the assistance of Mark Kessler and the Center for Organizational Development and Effectiveness.

A rather robust website can be accessed through the CODE site (<http://www.ohio.edu/asupr/>) A communication plan, including a website, has been established and will be disseminated over the next few weeks. A calendar of scheduled reviews of academic support and co-curricular units from FY08 through FY15 has been established. Reviews began last year with Dining Services, the Kennedy Museum, and Campus Recreation. Reviews scheduled for this year (FY09) include Intercollegiate Athletics, University Libraries, Information Technology (Applications/Services), Counseling & Psychological Services/Student Health Services/Health Promotion; Finance and Budget; Campus Services (Printing); WellWorks; Chillicothe Regional Campus; and Admissions.

Susan Sarnoff has served as the Faculty Senate representative on the ASUPRC and will continue as a faculty liaison.
Strategic Enrollment Management

Office of Enrollment Management:

- Finalized 2007-08 award analysis - Awarded over $243 million dollars in aid from all sources (internal, external, loans, grants, work, scholarships, athletics, fee waivers) for the Athens and Regional campuses (not including College of Medicine).
- Meeting on regional campuses with enrollment staff and deans. The visits complement the assistance that has been offered several campuses as they develop or enhance their enrollment plans.
- Assisting University Outreach with development of new on-line programs.
- Chairing an RFP (Request for Proposal) committee that will set the requirements for bids to be taken on a student CRM (constituent relationship management tool). CRM software is being used at many institutions to help efficiently and effectively manage relationships with prospective students and parents. As the expected demographic decline in high school graduates begins, universities are turning to CRM software to keep pace in what will be an increasingly competitive recruiting climate. “Good CRMS allow campuses to segment markets and follow up with communications that can be tracked historically. Businesses and postsecondary institutions which focus on marketing their brand may leverage the CRM functionality to build relationships with a broad audience, carefully tailoring their message to each respective market segment.”
- Launching of the first targeted enrollment campaigns in the in Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Fine Arts, Communications and Engineering centered on student outreach connected to specific majors.

Office of Admissions:

- We are seeing strong results from our new Promise Campaign recruitment materials. Students and parents at outreaches are asking for their “gift” (the shorthand way of referring to the cleverly packed set of booklets that has replaced the standard view-book). See http://www.ohio.edu/yourpromise/ for more on the new materials. Applications are coming in strong so far and we expect that trend to continue.
- Document imaging in the Office of Admissions is now underway. This should significantly streamline our current paper-based system of student applicants. It is expected that all of the colleges will get a look at the system in January 2009.
- Increased transfer and international numbers are expected for winter and spring quarters. The Office of Admissions currently has over 280 international applications for those quarters.
- We are receiving great interest in our “Visit Your Home High School” program. This is a voluntary training session that current OU students undergo under the auspices of the Office of Admissions. The program prepares them to return to their high schools over winter break and discuss their experiences at Ohio University.

---

Office of Student Financial Aid and Scholarships:

- As a signee to the Voluntary System of Accountability, we have gone live with an on-line cost calculator at the Student Financial Aid Office website. This tool allows a student or family to determine their overall direct and indirect costs to attend Ohio University. See, http://wwsfa.chubb.ohiou.edu/html/misc/fa_costEstimation.html

Office of the Registrar:

- To meet one of the criteria of the Voluntary System of Accountability, starting winter quarter all students applying for graduation will be asked of their plans following graduation. The information received will be stored in SIS and used in to provide data for the “Future Plans” segment of the VSA College Portrait. Ohio University’s VSA College Portrait can be accessed at http://www.ohio.edu/admissions/facts.cfm (scroll down to the bottom of the page).

Kathy A. Krendl
Executive Vice President and Provost