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ROLL CALL

All nine Trustees were present – Chairman R. Gregory Browning, C. Daniel DeLawder, Scott P. Borgemenke, Norman E. “Ned” Dewire, Gene T. Harris, C. Robert Kidder, M. Marnette Perry, Larry L. Schey, and C. David Snyder.

Student Trustees Micah Mitchell and Lydia R. Gerthoffer were present as were National Trustees J. Michael Lawrie and Charles R. Stuckey.

Also attending the session were President Roderick J. McDavis and Board Secretary Alan H. Geiger.

This was the first meeting for Trustee Borgemenke. Mr. Borgemenke’s term officially began May 13, 2006 and ends May 12, 2015. He replaces Robert D. Walter.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING of June 23, 2006

(Previously distributed)

Dr. Dewire moved approval of the previously distributed minutes. Mr. Snyder seconded the motion. All agreed.

The minutes from the Audit, Finance, Facilities and Investment Committee Meeting of September 8, 2006 and the minutes from the Executive Session of the Executive Committee Meeting of October 3, 2006 are included but were not acted upon.

COMMUNICATIONS, PETITIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Secretary Geiger stated one electronic communication had been forwarded to Chairman Browning.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Secretary Geiger stated there were none to report.
Present: C. Daniel DeLawder, C. Robert Kidder, Micah Mitchell, President McDavis and J. Michael Lawrie (by phone)

OPEN SESSION:

ACTION ITEMS - NONE

FOR INFORMATION:

Discussion/Goals for meeting today:
- SB 6 Ratio Analysis
- Moody's Rating process
- Purchasing Card Program changes
- Develop program and/or strategies to assess the financial control environment and action needed
- Ensure Board awareness and understanding of SB 6; review impact of debt, benchmarking of other institutions, strengths and weaknesses of our balance sheet

SENATE BILL 6

I. Background
- Originated as a result of financial difficulties at Central State University
- Establishes
  - Definitions for terms used in the rule
  - Criteria for determining fiscal watch status and termination of same, as well as an appointment of a conservator
- Requires:
  - State universities and colleges to submit fiscal year financial statements in accordance with GAP practices, have audited year-end reports prepared, submit quarterly reports to the BOR
  - Notification if the audit discloses substantive findings
  - BOR to perform a ratio analysis on each annual audit
  - Governance authority to develop a financial stability plan and termination of same

II. Reporting Requirements
- Reporting is based on annually audited Financials
- Three Ratios:
o Primary Reserve Ratio (50%) – provides a snapshot of the financial strength and flexibility of the University by showing how long the institution can function using its expendable reserves without relying on additional net assets to be generated

o Net Income Ratio (20%) – compares the change in total net assets to total revenues; the ratio indicates to what extent a current year surplus or deficit exits

o Viability Ratio (30%) – measures the availability of expendable net assets to cover long-term obligations/debt and provides management information on the ability to meet debt obligations. A need exists to produce positive net income, which in turn improves expendable net assets, which improves both the primary reserve and viability ratios. Initiatives that increase expendable net assets are vital to enable the University to issue debt in order to implement Vision Ohio and the facilities master plan. The “trend” in scores has been downward with all Ohio public institutions

o The combination of the three (3) above ratios create the Composite Score Calculation (SB 6 score) according to the weight factor unless the analysis cannot be performed at which time the score of 1.75 is assigned

III. Fiscal Watch Criteria

Causes:
• Composite ratio of 1.75 or less
• Reportable events such as weaknesses in internal control and lack of approvals
• Substantive Audit Finding(s) such as discrepancies in the bank statement and the university balance sheet

Actions to be taken:
• Board must adopt OBOR approved plan within 90 days
• Consult with the Auditor of State
• Adopt a process for monthly review and approval of revenue and expenditures, and
• Employees must assist and provide information as requested

Termination of Fiscal Watch by OBOR occurs when:
• Ratio of 2.40 is achieved (1.75 score going in/2.40 coming out)
• All conditions leading to the watch are resolved

IV. Ohio University Specific Data

FY 05 Composite Score = 3.20 (FY 06 score will be calculated later this fall after submission of audited financial statements)

A. Ratio Calculations

• Primary Reserve Ratio is obtained by dividing the expendable net assets by the total operating expenses (FY 04 & FY 05 score was 3; $9.6 M additional reserves would have resulted in a score of 4)
• Net Income Ratio is obtained by dividing change in total net assets by total revenues (FY04 & FY 05 scores were 5 & 4 respectively)
impacts this ratio is depreciation which will be explored more fully at future meetings

- **Viability Ratio** is obtained by dividing the expendable net assets by the long term debt (FY 04 & FY05 score was 2 & 3 respectively). The University Courtyard debt was not included due to “off balance sheet accounting”; however, it is considered by the rating agencies to be “on credit”
- Ohio University ratio calculation table is specifically for FY02-05 because GASB 34 and 35 were implemented then. The table indicates the importance of producing positive net income each year, which emphasizes the need for balanced budgets, good budget management, and financial controls
- Questions: What can we control, where are we currently, how much more debt can be incurred and can we fund a strategic plan? We need a 5-year financial plan.

**B. Comparable Ratio Calculations**
- Ohio benchmark comparisons were selected because of A1 ratings (Miami & UC) and size (Kent) -- Kent is not currently rated. Note: SB 6 scores are purely quantitative; rating agencies focus on both quantitative and qualitative factors
- Questions: What are other institutions consistently doing to consistently improve their ratios? Ohio University is just beginning to research these answers
- Ohio University needs long-term strategies to increase expendable net assets

**V. Summary**
- Ohio University is in compliance with SB 6 reporting requirements
- Our composite score rank is at the bottom because of the lower amount of expendable net assets
- We have “capacity” for additional debt
- Ohio must rely more on its own resources based on state funding experience
- Develop financial strategies and multi-year plans to strengthen our financial position
- Use debt for strategic purposes

Goals:
- Develop and gather financial statements of peer institutions from previous years
- Analyze and determine best practices to emulate
- Determine financial strategy baseline to go forward and fit decisions into that strategy

**Moody’s Investors Service**

**Campus Visits & Discussions**
- Meet with the management team (CFO, President, Chair of Finance Committee, VP Admissions and Development, and CIO) due to changes in high-level management positions to gain understanding and key variables of the University
- Discuss several topics regarding enrollment and student demand, operations, the state funding environment, financial resource growth (fundraising & capital
campaign), governance/management, debt and capital, specific projects for which bonds are to be sold, litigation (IT breach), and other special issues

- Tour the campus and/or facilities, with a visit to the site of a major capital project

**Key Data and Ratio**

- An Aa3 rating is one category better than Ohio's rating of A1 – peers include Auburn, Clemson and UConn; OU is below medians in every case
- A1 rating includes large universities such as CSU, SUNY, and special purpose institutions; OU is very close to the median
- A2 rating includes Ohio institutions such as BGSU, Akron, UT, Wright State and Youngstown State; OU is above the median only in viability

**Individual Ratios**

- Total Enrollment FTE – measures student population
- Total Direct Debt – measures direct legal obligations
- Expendable Resources to Direct Debt – measures coverage of direct debt by expendable financial resources (comparable to SB 6 Viability Ratio)
- Expendable Resources to Operations – measures coverage of annual operating expenses by expendable financial resources (comparable to SB 6 Primary Reserve Ratio)
- Average Operating Margin – three year average of annual operating surplus divided by three year average of total revenues (comparable to SB 6 Net Income Ratio)
- State Appropriations – measures reliance on state support
- A1 vs. A2 – rating downgrade without bond insurance may increase interest costs (OU has insurance)
- Ohio University could be A2 instead of A1 by quantitative measures. Qualitative measures pull Ohio up to an A1 rating

**P-CARD CHANGES**

- Program is a “cost savings device” not a “control device” for convenience when traveling to avoid cash advances and reimbursements and for efficiency when making purchases
- Changes were instituted to reduce monthly and overall transaction limits to reflect the cardholder usage profile
- Additional audit procedures will be implemented to reduce the risk of fraudulent practices
- Educational tools required to complete position duties are being developed by Human Resources and Professional Development as a first step
Minutes of the Executive Session of the Executive Committee of the Ohio University Board of Trustees

Tuesday, October 3, 2006
Cutler Hall Conference Room, Ohio University
3:35 PM

The Executive Committee began in open session and a resolution to convene in executive session was introduced by Trustee Chairman Gregory Browning. On a motion by Trustee Daniel DeLawder with a second by Trustee Marnette Perry, members, on a roll call vote, agreed to meet in executive session as permitted by the Ohio Revised Code, Section 121.22(G)(1) to consider personnel matters concerning the Department of Athletics.

Trustees voting in favor by roll call were R. Gregory Browning, C. Daniel DeLawder, M. Marnette Perry, and Larry L. Schey.

Those attending the session included President Roderick J. McDavis, Athletics Director Kirby Hocutt, Executive Director of Communications and Marketing Joseph Brennan, and Board Secretary Alan Geiger.

The purpose of the session was to understand the responsibility and roles of personnel in the Athletics Department relating to the operations and discipline of those within the Department. Director Hocutt reviewed the Department's expectations, those of the coaches, and policies in peer institutions. The recurring themes were the issues of discretion and whether policies should be revised and clarified. President McDavis asked, and Director Hocutt agreed, to bring forward to the Student Life, Human Resources and Athletics Committee of the Board, at its October 18th meeting, revisions to existing policies and procedures affecting student athletes, coaches, and staff. In the interim, all personnel and disciplinary matters involving coaches, staff, and student athletes shall be handled by the Director of Athletics.

On a motion by Mr. DeLawder, with a second by Ms. Perry, trustees, on a roll call vote, moved from executive session to open session. A statement summarizing the session from President Mc Davis and Trustee Chairman Browning was provided to all present. Members of the media were then invited to ask questions regarding the session and other matters involving student athlete discipline.

The executive session adjourned at 6:10 PM.
COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Quality Committee
The committee recommended ten resolutions for approval and received 5 reports.

Audit, Finance, Facilities, and Investment Committee
The committee recommended approval of seven resolutions and received Internal Audit’s Annual Report, including the year-end financial report, and the Treasurer’s Report.

Student Life, Human Resources and Athletics Committee
The committee recommended one resolution for approval and received reports on the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) Survey, high risk drinking, financial aid and scholarships, and ERIP and health benefits as well as an update on student athletes’ behavior.

Executive Committee
No resolutions were presented for approval. No reports were made.
Executive Session  
Friday, October 20, 2006, 7:30 a.m.  
Lindley Room, Ohio University Inn, Athens

Chairman Browning presented the motion necessary for executive session. Mr. Snyder moved, with a second by Mr. Dewire, the following:

The Ohio University Board of Trustees and its committees resolve to hold executive sessions to consider personnel matters as permitted by Section 121.22(G)(1), real estate matters under Section 121.22(G)(2), and litigation or threat thereof under Section 121.22(G)(3), of the Ohio Revised Code and for meeting with the Internal Auditor as permitted by the Code on this the 20th day of October 2006.

On a roll call vote Dr. Browning, Mr. DeLawder, Mr. Borgemenke, Dr. Dewire, Dr. Harris, Mr. Kidder, Ms. Perry, Mr. Schey, and Mr. Snyder voted aye.

Also attending all or parts of the session were President Roderick J. McDavis, Student Trustees Mitchell and Gerthoffer, National Trustees Lawrie and Stuckey, Vice President for Finance and Administration William Decatur, and Board Secretary Alan Geiger.

Collective Bargaining

Mr. Decatur generally reviewed the current AFSCME Local 1699 contract and discussed parameters for the upcoming contract negotiations. Negotiations are to begin December 2006, and Trustees authorized President McDavis and Vice President Decatur to proceed with the parameters as discussed.

Personnel Matters and Litigation

Issues related to personnel matters, plagiarism, and litigation were reviewed and discussed.

Real Estate Matters

No discussion was held.

The session concluded at 10:10 a.m.
ACADEMIC QUALITY COMMITTEE
Ohio University Board of Trustees
October 19, 2006

Membership Present: Lydia Gerthoffer, Larry Schey, Charles Stuckey, Scott Borgemenke

Provost Krendl welcomed new trustee Scott Borgemenke to the Academic Quality Committee.

Reports:

Provost Krendl shared the good news that Ohio University is among top institutions in Fulbright awards, ranking 14th in the country. We had the highest award acceptance rate of the top 20 institutions.

General Education:
- A review of the general education program was initiated last spring by the General Education Committee co-chaired by Professor David Ingram and Associate Provost Michael Williford. An assessment-driven review strategy was identified with measurable outcomes and validity testing. This process will be useful to improve teaching and learning. Several measures will be used to obtain data including work samples, surveys and personal student interviews.
- The Ohio Board of Regents (as well as the Board of Trustees) has requested a review of general education. Four subcommittees are working on Tier I and II topics. Remaining Tiers will be examined in Winter Quarter with a final report by June 2007.

The Ohio Board of Regents has instituted a new state-wide project to review assessment objectives to tie in with the budget cycle. Our report will profile best practices in teaching and learning, review learning objectives in academic programs, and provide continuous improvement engagement.

IT Report: The 20-point plan is underway. Candidates for the Chief Information Officer position have been interviewed and a decision can be made soon.

Interdisciplinary Activities: One of the recommendations from Vision OHIO called for promotion of interdisciplinary programs. The Interdisciplinary Implementation Team recommended creation of an Interdisciplinary Council to serve as an advocate for ongoing initiatives. We have several successful interdisciplinary programs, initiated and operated by faculty.
Provost Krendl focused on an internal success story, the George V. Voinovich Center, directed by Professor Mark Weinberg who reported that the Center provides students with valuable opportunities to work with professional staff, create businesses and wealth in the region, work with local governments, and partner in projects to improve and sustain the environment. The Center:

- Fosters collaboration across disciplines.
- Has increased funding from $4 ML to $5.5 ML.
- Is a distinctive education model, graduates are competitive in global economy
- Has MBA students involved in consultations with businesses throughout region.
- Partners with Adena Ventures, Edison Biotech, and the Colleges of Arts & Sciences, Business, Engineering and others.

The University of North Carolina is an aspirational model for OHIO; we anticipate making structural changes in the Center to increase distinctiveness and promote further integration with academic programming. Provost Krendl suggested holding a special meeting of the Academic Quality Committee to further discuss the Voinovich Center for Leadership and Public Affairs.

For Action:

1. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EMERITUS STATUS—ADMINISTRATORS

RESOLUTION 2006:
WHEREAS, the following individuals have rendered dedication and outstanding service to Ohio University, and
WHEREAS, their colleagues and supervisors have recommended action to recognize their services,
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that emeritus/emerita status be awarded to the following individuals upon their retirement.

- Gary B. North, Vice President for Finance and Administration, 15 years of service
- Don Stout, Director, Office of University Publications, 30 years of service
- R. Budd Werner, Executive-in-Residence, Office of the Dean, College of Business, 10 years of service
- Elizabeth Westenbarger, Assistant Director, Procurement Services, 16 years of service

Motion: Trustee Stuckey
Second: Trustee Gerthoffer
Resolution passed with one abstention by Trustee Borgemenke
2. UNIVERSITY OUTREACH AND REGIONAL CAMPUSES ASSOCIATE OF APPLIED SCIENCE IN HEALTH TECHNOLOGIES

Discussion:
- No other competitive programs in region; expected to bring in students we would not have had access to; providing a new program with demonstrated need and job opportunity; service as well as educational mission; expect nine thousand new jobs in the next 10 years in this field.
- Budget is revenue positive
- Courses have possible transfer potential state-wide; could be applicable to Kent State University with whom we have a cooperative agreement to offer programs jointly across the eastern half of the state.

RESOLUTION 2006:
WHEREAS, University Outreach and Regional Campuses has proposed the creation of an Associate of Applied Science in Health Technologies, and
WHEREAS, the development of this degree has the support of the vice president, deans and faculty of the unit, President McDavis, Provost Krendl, and the University Curriculum Council, and
WHEREAS, this degree will provide a unique completion opportunity for allied health workers in need of an associate degree, and
WHEREAS, the program is designed to integrate students' technical skills with general academic skills in order to allow them the opportunity to advance in their chosen professions, and
WHEREAS, the citizens of the regions which this program will serve will benefit greatly from the opportunities this program will present,
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University approves offering the Associate of Applied Science in Health Technologies.

Motion: Trustee Borgemenke
Second: Trustee Stuckey
Resolution passed

3. COLLEGE OF BUSINESS CERTIFICATE IN FINANCIAL PLANNING

Discussion: This program enables students to pursue training and certification as financial planners in areas such as retirement and estate planning taught by adjunct faculty who are professionals in the field. Licensure can only be obtained through a self-study program in our area at present. Kent State University and Ohio State University have competitive programs.
RESOLUTION 2006:
WHEREAS, the College of Business has proposed the creation of a certificate program in Financial Planning, and
WHEREAS, the development of the degree has the support of the dean and faculty of the College and the University Curriculum Council, and
WHEREAS, many College of Business graduates pursue careers in financial planning, and
WHEREAS, the Certificate in Financial Planning will allow students to pursue the credential of Certified Financial Planner™ designation awarded by the CFP® Board, pursue careers in comprehensive financial planning, and significantly augment their marketability to potential employers, and
WHEREAS, the College of Business currently offers courses in most of the areas needed,
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University approves offering the Certificate in Financial Planning.

Motion: Trustee Stuckey
Second: Trustee Borgemenke
Resolution passed

4. COLLEGE OF BUSINESS SALES CERTIFICATE WITH A TECHNICAL FOCUS

Discussion: This is a very successful, interdisciplinary, unique program which fulfills a real need.

RESOLUTION 2006:
WHEREAS, the College of Business Sales Centre has proposed the creation of a Sales Certificate with a Technical Focus, and
WHEREAS, the development of this certificate has the support of the dean and faculty of the College of Business as well as the Russ College of Engineering and Technology, and the University Curriculum Council, and
WHEREAS, this certificate will be a strong addition to the five current certificates offered through the Centre, and
WHEREAS, the certificate meets a timely need in the business community, especially with manufacturing firms and industrial suppliers, and
WHEREAS, the College of Business and the Russ College of Engineering and Technology currently offer courses in the areas needed,
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University approves offering the Sales Certificate with a Technical Focus.
5. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OHIO CENTER FOR ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTIONARY STUDIES

Discussion: Dean Ogles reported that a recent national survey indicated Ohio University was underrepresented and lacked an institutional identity in this field. This Center is designed to rectify this situation and has significant faculty interest. A loose affiliation of 42 faculty and 45 graduate students involved in the program will benefit from a Center which is expected to attract both new faculty and research funding.

RESOLUTION 2006:
WHEREAS, a need exists for a center at Ohio University that performs ecological and evolutionary research that also has a bearing on success in the environmental sciences.
WHEREAS, the establishment of the center will enhance interdisciplinary undergraduate and graduate programs that will enhance the prominence of Ohio University as an institution of research and learning, and
WHEREAS, the initiative satisfies the requirements of the university's strategic plan and the strategic plan of the College of Arts and Sciences,
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University establishes the Ohio Center for Ecology and Evolutionary Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Motion: Trustee Borgemenke
Second: Trustee Stuckey
Resolution passed

6. MAJOR AND DEGREE PROGRAM REVIEWS

Discussion:
- David Thomas, Faculty Senator and Chair of the University Curriculum Council, set an aggressive agenda to get programs through the required review process.
  - A new process timetable has been developed with clear deadlines to expedite reviews and maintain quality.
  - The UCC process is now digitized to permit faster and accurate communication. Trustee Stuckey suggested a collaborative software tool to share information.
  - A website allows faculty and staff access to information.
Ongoing evaluation mechanisms related to Responsibility-Centered Budgeting are under consideration.
A training workshop was held for people involved in the evaluation process.
The Ohio General Assembly and North Central (accreditation) both require program reviews.

RESOLUTION 2006:
WHEREAS, the continuous review of academic programs is essential to the maintenance of quality within an educational institution, and
WHEREAS, Ohio University has had for many years a rigorous program of internal review, and
WHEREAS, Section 67 of Am. Sub. H.B. 694 requires the college and university Board of Trustees “shall during the 1981-83 biennium initiate on-going processes for the review and evaluation of all programs of instruction presently conducted by the institutions for which they are responsible.”
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University accepts the 2005-2006 reviews for the following:

- Environmental Engineering and Technology (EVT) and Hazardous Materials Technology (HMT)
- Hearing, Speech and Language Sciences
- Computer Science Technology (CTCH)
- Individual Interdisciplinary program (IIP)

Motion: Trustee Stuckey
Second: Trustee Borgemenke
Resolution Passed

7. NAMING OF THE RALPH AND LUCI SCHHEY SALES CENTRE AT OHIO UNIVERSITY

Discussion: Professor Hartung stated that it is most fitting that the individuals that challenged the institution to create this center have been willing to name it. Trustee Schey added that the Center has had a great team moving this Sales Centre forward; it now has six programs and 150 candidates and is expected to grow to 250. Schey thanked Hartung for his work with the Centre.

WHEREAS, Ralph and Luci Schey first inspired the creation of The Sales Centre at Ohio University within the College of Business to enhance sales education, and
WHEREAS, Ralph and Luci Schey were honored with the first Lifetime Friend of The Sales Centre award and Ralph was a founding member of the Professional Sales Advisory Board at The Sales Centre, and
WHEREAS, Ralph and Luci Schey have supported Ohio University through their generous service...Ralph was a member of the Board of Trustees and both are emeriti trustees of the Ohio University Foundation Board...and through their generous financial commitments to Ohio University and to The Sales Centre.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Sales Centre at Ohio University be named The Ralph and Luci Schey Sales Centre at Ohio University.

Motion: Trustee Stuckey
Second: Trustee Borgemenke
Resolution passed

8. Appointment to Regional Coordination Councils

RESOLUTION:

BE IT RESOLVED BY the Board of Trustees of Ohio University that the following person be appointed to membership on the Coordinating Council at the Regional Campus of Ohio University Southern.

Sandra L. Carroll For a three-year term beginning November 1, 2006, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2009, replacing vice Patricia Schultz, whose term expired.

Motion: Trustee Stuckey
Second: Trustee Borgemenke
Resolution Passed

9. REVIEW OF CENTERS AND INSTITUTES

Discussion:

RESOLUTION 2006:

WHEREAS, the continued review of academic programs is essential to the maintenance of quality within an education institution, and
WHEREAS, Ohio University has had for many years a rigorous program of internal review, and
WHEREAS, Section 67 of House Bill 694 provides for the review and evaluation of all programs of instruction conducted by state institutions, and
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University accepts the 2006 Reviews of Centers and Institutes, which recommend that the following centers and institutes be continued or discontinued.

- Institute of Quantitative Biology—Continue
• WOUB Center for Public Media—Continue
• Center for Advanced Software Systems Integration—Continue
• Avionics Engineering Center—Continue
• Institute for Corrosion and Multiphase Technology—Continue
• Child Development Center—Continue
• Tropical and Geographical Disease Institute—Continue

• Center for eBusiness—Discontinue,
  o This program was established when this was a hot topic;
  o did not generate the interested as expected;
  o not worthy to sustain.
• Institute for Telecommunication Studies—Discontinue
  o Dean Shepherd reported that this program has outlived its time;
  o Served one school well for a period of time;
  o Centers are now more central and interdisciplinary than this program was
designed to be.
  o Dean Shepherd does not believe elimination will have much impact or
  negative consequences.

Motion: Trustee Stuckey
Second: Trustee Borgemenke
Resolution Passed

10. ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ACADEMIC HONESTY HEARING COMMITTEE AND PROCEDURES

Discussion:
• Allows use of policy on academic misconduct to apply to graduate students.
• The cases go back 20 years; process also applies to circumstances under which a degree
can be revoked.
• There is not a lot of history regarding academic honesty at other universities; not much
case law. Degree revocations occurred at Kent State in 1985 and the University of
Michigan in 1987 which led to litigation that set current standards.
• The College of Engineering has established a Research Integrity Committee for case
review.
• Academic Honesty was widely discussed by over 100 university faculty, administrators
and students during the Day of Discourse (Sept. 28, 2006). Discussion included not
just how to deal with these specific cases but how to raise awareness on the issues to
certify that faculty and students understand what academic integrity is. This exercise is
an opportunity to install academic integrity in our processes and to communicate its
centrality to our core principles.
• Schey mentioned that this also matters to those who earned their degrees fairly.
• The Committee is currently sampling the whole corpus of theses and dissertations to guarantee that we have identified problems.
• Burns assured the committee that great care is being taken to put us on firm ground should lawsuits arise.

RESOLUTION 2006:
WHEREAS, Ohio University is facing the issue of alleged plagiarism and academic misconduct in the Russ College of Engineering and Technology by a few of its former graduate students, and
WHEREAS, the Ohio University Board of Trustees wants to adopt policies and procedures to address dealing with former graduate's academic honesty issues, and
WHEREAS, the Ohio University Board of Trustees clearly expects academic honesty to be a critical part of Ohio University and affirms its belief that academic integrity is a core value of the University,
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees adopts the Ohio University Student Code of Conduct Section 3.A.I Academic honesty Rule as applicable to former students who have graduated from Ohio University; and also adopts the Ohio University Academic Honesty Hearing Committee Procedures for Former Graduate Students, and authorizes the President to amend these procedures as necessary, and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the President, upon the recommendation of the Academic Honesty Hearing Committee to the Provost, in accordance with the adopted procedures, may upon further recommendation of the Provost, revoke a former graduate student's degree.

Motion: Trustee Schey
Second: Trustee Stuckey
Resolution Passed with one abstention by Trustee Borgemenke due to lack of previous experience with this issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Janice Roché
Assistant to the Provost
Committee Chairman Schey reviewed matters before the committee and thanked those making presentations. On a personal note, he thanked Trustees for their consideration in naming the Sales Centre in honor of Ralph and Luci Schey. He noted the growth of interest and activity in the Centre and the centrality of sales to much that our recent graduates do.

Mr. Schey's commentary focused on the matter of academic honesty and the resolution before Trustees outlining a process to consider matters of alleged plagiarism and possible degree revocation. He noted in strong language that academic dishonesty devalues the degrees of all and lessens the good reputation of the University.

Provost Krendl echoed Mr. Schey's concerns and outlined a series of steps being taken to stress the importance of the core value of honesty in all we do. These included a day of discourse, discussion of an honor code as well as a further review of the resolution before the Trustees.

Committee Chairman Schey presented and reviewed resolutions before the Committee. He asked for and received an agreement to approve the resolutions by consensus. Dr. Dewire moved approval of the following resolutions. Mr. Lawrie seconded the motion and approval was unanimous.

Resolution 2006 — 2065 — Administrator Emeritus/Emerita Awards
Resolution 2006 — 2066 — University Outreach and Regional Campuses Associate of Applied Science Degree in Health Technologies
Resolution 2006 — 2067 — College of Business Certificate in Financial Planning
Resolution 2006 — 2068 — College of Business Sales Certificate with a Technical Focus
Resolution 2006 — 2069 — Establishment of the Ohio Center for Ecology and Evolutionary Studies
Resolution 2006 — 2070 — Major and Degree Program Reviews
   Environmental Engineering and Technology and Hazardous Materials Technology
   Hearing, Speech, and Language Sciences
   Computer Science Technology
   Individual Interdisciplinary Program
Resolution 2006 – 2071 - Naming of the Sales Centre to The Ralph and Luci Schey Sales Centre at Ohio University
Resolution 2006 – 2072 - Appointment to Regional Coordinating Councils
Resolution 2006 – 2073 - Review of Centers and Institutes
  Institute for Quantitative Biology
  WOUB Center for Public Media
  Center for Advanced Software Systems Integration
  Avionics Engineering Center
  Institute for Corrosion and Multiphase Technology
  Child Development Center
  Tropical and Geographical Disease Institute
  Center for eBusiness
  Institute for Telecommunication Studies
Resolution 2006 – 2074 - Establishment of an Academic Honesty Hearing Committee and Procedures
ADMINISTRATOR EMERITUS/EMERITA AWARDS

RESOLUTION 2006 - 2065

WHEREAS, the following individuals have rendered dedicated and outstanding service to Ohio University, and

WHEREAS, their colleagues and supervisors have recommended action to recognize their service,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that emeritus/emerita status be awarded to the following individuals upon their retirement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Years of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary B. North</td>
<td>Vice President for Finance and Administration Emeritus</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Stout</td>
<td>Director of Office of University Publications, Emeritus</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Budd Werner</td>
<td>Executive-In-Residence, Emeritus, Office of the Dean, College of Business</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Westenbarger</td>
<td>Assistant Director Emerita, Procurement Services</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, University Outreach and Regional Campuses has proposed the creation of an Associate of Applied Science in Health Technologies, and

WHEREAS, the development of this degree has the support of the Vice President, Deans and Faculty of the unit, President McDavis, Provost Krendl, and the University Curriculum Council, and

WHEREAS, this degree will provide a unique completion opportunity for allied health workers in need of an associate degree, and

WHEREAS, the program is designed to integrate students' technical skills with general academic skills in order to allow them the opportunity to advance in their chosen professions, and

WHEREAS, the citizens of the regions which this program will serve will benefit greatly from the opportunities this program will present,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University approves offering the Associate of Applied Science in Health Technologies.
Date: September 25, 2006

To: Roderick McDavis, President

From: Kathy Krendl, Provost

Subject: Associate of Applied Science in Health Technology Degree

This memorandum is written to express my full support for the development of the Associate of Applied Science in Health Technology degree to be offered by University Outreach and Regional Campuses, specifically on the Chillicothe, Lancaster and Southern campuses.

The Associate of Applied Science in Health Technology degree will provide a unique completion opportunity for allied health workers in need of an associate degree. The program is designed to integrate students’ technical skills with general academic skills in order to allow the students who complete the program the opportunity to advance in their chosen health care profession. Both the need and support for this program have been fully documented in the program proposal, and I am confident that the citizens of the regions which the program will serve will benefit greatly from the opportunity this program will present.

The addition of this Associate Degree has the full support of University Outreach and Regional Campuses. I am therefore pleased to also lend my support to the development of this degree program.
September 25, 2006

Dr. Michael Taggart
Director of Workforce Development
Ohio Board of Regents
30 East Broad Street, 36th floor
Columbus, OH 43215-3414

Dear Michael:

Ohio University is pleased to submit a formal proposal for the Associate of Applied Science in Health Technology degree which will be reviewed for approval by the Ohio University Board of Trustees at their October 20, 2006 meeting. Three copies of the proposal are enclosed for your review and subsequent submission to the Ohio Board of Regents for their approval.

The Associate of Applied Science in Health Technology provides a unique completion opportunity for allied health workers in need of an associate degree. Both the need and support for this program have been fully documented, and we are confident that the citizens of the region will benefit greatly from the opportunity this program presents.

We sincerely appreciate the guidance and assistance you provided as we moved through the program development process. If you need further information, please feel free to contact my office.

Sincerely,

Kathy A. Krendl, Ph.D.
Provost

Cc: Charles Bird, V.P. University Outreach and Regional Campuses
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Signatures:

Department/School Curriculum Chair*  

Department/School Chair*  

Christine J. Woege  

College Curriculum Chair  

College Dean

Approved by:  

University Curriculum Council Program Chair  

University Curriculum Council Chair

Provost  

*Where the proposal originates within a department or school
**Interdisciplinary Certificate Programs should append memos of approval

April 2006
OHIO UNIVERSITY
University Outreach and Regional Campuses

Ohio Board of Regents
Proposal for New Associate Degree Program

ASSOCIATE OF APPLIED SCIENCE DEGREE IN HEALTH TECHNOLOGY
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PART I: NATURE OF REQUEST

OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS
Proposal for New Associate Degree Program

Title of Degree Program: Associate of Applied Science Degree in Health Technology

Name of Institution/Campus: University Outreach and Regional Campuses

Key Spokesperson: Name: Dr. Charles Bird
Title: Vice-President
Address: 206 Cutler Hall
Athens, Ohio 45701
Telephone: 740-593-2551

Proposal Date: March 31, 2006

OBR Action:

[ ] Approved
[ ] Denied
[ ] Tabled
Date: ____________________________

Signature
PART II: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

A. Describe the general purpose of this program.

This new degree program leads to an Associate of Applied Science degree in Health Technology. This degree is primarily designed for students who have completed an allied health course of study and have been certified to practice in their fields. The program integrates the students' technical skills with the general academic skills necessary to advance in their chosen career areas. Other students may enter the program and pursue the associate’s degree by completing additional allied health technical courses.

B. List program outcomes.

Graduates of this associate degree program will be better prepared to advance in their chosen career paths and may choose to continue their education by pursuing a bachelor's degree in areas such as health services administration, communication, or technical and applied studies.

The Health Services Administration degree prepares a student for entry-level management positions in all sectors of the health care industry. The student is prepared for such positions in acute, subacute, and ambulatory care facilities such as hospitals, clinics, home health agencies, managed-care organizations, health maintenance organizations, and other emerging health delivery systems.

The Bachelor of Science in Communication with a concentration in Health Communication offers a liberal ed... emphasizing the scientific and artistic bases of communication. Students choose areas of specialization and specific entry level courses in Allied Health that can lead to professional or pre-professional competence in various fields.

The Bachelor of Technical and Applied Studies is intended primarily for students who have already completed an associate's degree in a technical program. The program provides students with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary for advancement in their chosen careers. Technical skills developed within associate degree programs are integrated with professional development in areas of communication, research, culture, politics, and organizational leadership.

C. Location of the program.

Once the program is approved, students will be admitted at three Ohio University regional campuses—Chillicothe, Lancaster, and Southern.

University Outreach and Regional Campuses (UORC) will be responsible for directing the Associate of Applied Science in Health Technology degree. Admissions, advising, course scheduling, faculty assignments, and other administrative responsibilities will occur at the individual regional campuses, but will be under the direction of UORC. The UORC Curriculum Committee and the Ohio University Curriculum Council will monitor program integrity and quality.
PART III: RATIONALE AND NEED FOR PROGRAM

A. Explain the rationale for the program.

Improving the access to higher education is explicitly stated in the Board of Regent’s Master Plan for Higher Education as a core value to be emphasized. As new demands for higher levels of education are being made on the workforce, it is particularly important that we continue to improve access to higher education in the Appalachian region of Ohio.

Ohio University is aware of the need to improve access to higher education and has developed a strategic plan for the next five years. This plan, Vision Ohio, A Strategic Plan for Ohio University, articulates a vision, mission, and a set of guiding principles. As stated in this plan:

Ohio University has long recognized the unique role it has in Appalachian Ohio. We have a long tradition of working on promoting human, economic, and cultural development in Appalachia Ohio and the State.

One of the ways that Ohio University has chosen to enhance its national prominence is to better use its knowledge to assist the region and the state in addressing education, health, and economic problems. We believe that it is the responsibility of public universities to support their region and state with outreach programs that contribute to community and economic development.

...Ohio University will significantly strengthen the scope and effectiveness of our commitment to helping Appalachia Ohio in the areas of PreK-12 public education, economic development, and health issues.

...Through partnerships, provide health education to providers, patients, and allied health personnel, provide special courses such as CPR and continuing education to nurses and doctors. [Emphasis added.]

As the state of Ohio continues to transition from a manufacturing based economy to a service based economy, new career ladder options need to be in place for those citizens of the state who have chosen, are choosing, and will choose health care positions. Health care professionals need to continue learning throughout their careers, so avenues for professional growth must be provided. Currently, academic programs that recognize the technical achievements of specific health care certificates do not exist in Appalachian Ohio.

Southeast Ohio is in the same situation as other sectors of the state with respect to the difficulty of finding trained, competent supervisors in specific health care modalities like radiology. This difficulty is in part due to the lack of professional academic options and in part to increasing professional expectations. The goal of certificate completion in the past has been “task” completion competencies. The new employment expectation is broader and includes competencies in quality analysis and team project management. These skills are not taught in a certificate completion program.

A primary purpose of the Regional Campus System of Ohio University is to improve affordable access to undergraduate and graduate education for residents of Appalachian Ohio. This purpose has remained constant as Ohio University has evolved into a multi-campus institution, which continues to search for avenues to expand access to students who may benefit from alternative pathways to degree completion.
B. Cite the benefit for students, the institution, and the region or state.

Southeastern Ohio and the neighboring tri-state area have many employment opportunities for health care professionals. Requests are made constantly to the regional campuses for more health-related programming. There is a shortage of well-prepared allied health technicians in many fields. Also, in order for hospitals in our areas to achieve top ratings, they need to show that their employees are seeking further degree upgrades to associate, baccalaureate, and graduate work. This program should be particularly attractive to graduates both of Tech Prep programs and of certificate programs. It will permit students at the Chillicothe, Lancaster, and Southern Campuses and graduates of Tech Prep programs to develop and enhance skills that will enable them to advance in their employment or to continue their education. This program provides a pathway to a baccalaureate degree and further to an on-line master’s degree in Health Services Administration. Our region would be well served by better prepared students and employees who understand their skills in relation to the broader health care system and the possibilities for advancement.

C. State the specific local, state, or national needs for individuals educated by the proposed program. Describe job opportunities that are available to persons who complete the program and provide supporting data.

According to Bureau of Labor Statistics employment projections through 2012, fifteen of the 30 fastest growing occupations will be in the health field. Many of these occupations will not require a bachelor’s degree. The Ohio Job Outlook report from the Bureau of Labor Market Information indicates that the growth rate for occupations requiring an associate degree will be 21.7% for the period 2002 to 2012. Further, information from the Ohio Workforce Informer for the same period predicts significant growth in health occupations requiring an associate degree. Seven allied health occupations are projected to experience a 26.6% increase in employment opportunities during the ten-year period (Ohio Job Outlook, Sandy Newman, February 18, 2005). Approximately 9,000 new jobs in Ohio are projected for dental hygienists and radiology, medical records, medical and clinical laboratory, respiratory therapy, and cardiovascular technicians. If we are to meet these projected educational demands, we must increase the educational pathways for students in all allied health occupations.

Mina Ubbing, CEO Fairfield Medical Center, has indicated the need for employees with this type of training in her letter of support, which contains the following statement.

As a member of the Route 33 Health Care Alliance and as Chief Executive Officer at Fairfield Medical Center, I have been a strong advocate for new academic pathways in health care. I know firsthand how difficult it is to find employees (particularly supervisors) who have the technical, communication and leadership skills necessary for the complexities of the health care environment. Many of these employees cannot travel long distances for educational opportunities so the convenience of this degree option close to health care facilities is an added benefit.

Those of us in leadership roles in health care know that we are in a service economy. New avenues for collaboration with academic institutions that help us develop our staff to the highest professional level are always appreciated and encouraged. As Fairfield Medical Center strives for the highest level of service possible, it is imperative that we develop and mentor our staff. This degree option is one more way that we can achieve that goal.

It is not economical or feasible to create the large number of specialized associate degree programs required to meet the present and future educational needs of southeastern Ohio. Many of the health occupations that are important to the area do not generate enough jobs to support full-time associate degree programs; therefore, another approach is needed—a program that combines traditional and alternative educational pathways in order to accommodate students whose occupationally related education and training have been obtained outside of the traditional college route.
These students, whose career interests lie in fields of concentration not offered by local colleges and universities, benefit from alternative pathways and methods to earn credit, such as credit-for-prior learning. Ohio University requests permission to plan an Associate of Applied Science in Health Technology degree that will provide degree completion and partnership opportunities in southeastern Ohio.

Letters of support for this program are presented as Attachment A.

D. Indicate any licensure or certification requirements for which this program will prepare students.

Not applicable.

E. Describe the role of consultants or advisory committees in the development of the proposed program. Include reports and recommendations of the advisory committee or consultants.

A study by Dr. Frederick Law (Meeting the Health Care Workforce Needs of Lawrence County, Ohio. Frederick Law, PhD., May 22, 2005) indicated that health care occupations in Ohio will experience rapid growth and recommended that Ohio University develop educational programs to meet the needs of the students and health care workforce in its service areas.

An Advisory Committee has been selected. The responsibilities of this committee include providing general guidance, evaluating program content and applicability, and keeping the program current with respect to the developments and needs of the health care profession. A list of the current members of the Advisory Committee is included as Attachment B.

F. Provide evidence of student interest in program as well as projections of enrollment (full-time and part-time) for each of the first three years of program.

Of the health professions majors available on Ohio University regional campuses, nursing receives the vast majority of applicants. For example, this year the nursing staff on the Chillicothe campus reviewed 713 applications for admission to the Associate Degree of Nursing program. Of those, only 64 were chosen for admission in Spring 2006 (a 91% reduction in the original 713 applicants). The nursing program is highly selective and has a limited number of enrollments. Some of the remaining 649 applicants will continue to take classes to improve the likelihood that they will be admitted into Nursing after the next review. A new Associate Degree in Health Technology will allow students the additional option of declaring a major in the field of allied health. Indications are that approximately 150-200 students may be interested in an allied health degree.

At the Lancaster Campus it is projected that approximately 30 students will begin the paramedical training program each fall. We believe that at least a third of that number would move on to the Health Technology degree. The Lancaster Campus offers the Medical Assisting associate degree and has developed a network of advisory committee members who would support the Health Technology degree as another option for students interested in health careers.

The Associate Degree Nursing Program on the Southern Campus operates with a waiting list and has for the past three years since the inception of the program. Many students at Ohio University Southern are interested in a health related course of study, and this new degree could add another career path for them. The community has suffered job related losses in both industry and health related areas. This degree would be well received in the area of retraining and education for this community.

The following page shows enrollment projections.
Proposal for New Associate Degree Program

Enrollment Projections Statement

1. Number of Students expected to Enroll in This Program: (Fall Quarter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount full-time (12 or more hours)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount part-time</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE Students (Students cr. hrs. /15)</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Recognizing that some students would have enrolled in other degree programs if this were not offered on your campus, estimate the number of the above mentioned students expected to be enrolled in your institution solely because this program is offered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount full-time (12 or more hours)</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount part-time</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE Students</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Anticipated Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-year Full-time</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-year Full-time</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. List academic programs similar to the one proposed that are offered at nearby public, private, or proprietary institutions.

There are no programs similar to the proposed health technology program within the region served by Ohio University; in addition, the three Ohio University regional campuses proposing this degree will be collaborating with institutions providing occupational education and training in allied health fields within their service areas.

H. Explain why the nearby institution could not serve your area’s students in this particular program.

The demand is great and there are no similar programs offered by nearby institutions in Ohio.
PART IV: ACADEMIC CONTROL

A. Describe the administrative structure for the program, including the department which will bear primary responsibility for the program.

The Office of University Outreach and Regional Campuses (UORC) will be responsible for directing the Associate of Applied Science in Health Technology degree. Admissions, advising, course scheduling, faculty assignments, and other administrative responsibilities will occur at the three individual regional campuses, but will be under the direction of UORC. Existing full-time faculty will teach the curriculum from related course disciplines. When this is not possible, adjunct faculty will be carefully chosen. Since the curriculum is integrated and multi-disciplinary, the majority of courses required to complete the degree are already in existence and support other programs. However, four new courses will be created specifically for students in the program.

B. Indicate any cooperative arrangements with other institutions and organizations that will be used to offer this program.

This program will be offered on three campuses: Chillicothe, Lancaster, and Southern.

C. Specify the articulation arrangements that will be in effect for the program.

This proposed degree program will offer Allied Health professions certificate holders the opportunity to enter higher education and to complete an associate degree. Credit awards for these certificates will be determined through the educational requirements established by state or national governing bodies. It is also possible for interested students to enter this degree program and complete all of the necessary requirements without a professional certificate.

Finally, this program offers a seamless 2 + 2 pathway for associate degree graduates to continue their education by pursuing a bachelor’s degree in areas such as, health services administration, communications, or technical and applied studies.
V: CURRICULUM

A. Describe the program as it would appear in the institution's catalog.

ASSOCIATE OF APPLIED SCIENCES IN HEALTH TECHNOLOGY
CURRICULUM LISTING

I. Health Technology Specialty: up to 36 credit hours assigned for current healthcare certification

II. Core Requirements: 48 credit hours
   II. A. General Core: 32 credit hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 103</td>
<td>Human Biology</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or BIOS 130</td>
<td>Prin. Of Human Anatomy and Physiology I or II (5 ea)</td>
<td>11 (5 ea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or BIOS 131</td>
<td>Fund. of Public Speaking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 151</td>
<td>Freshmen Composition</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 113</td>
<td>Algebra (Tier quantitative skills course)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 101</td>
<td>General Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 101</td>
<td>Intro to Sociology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTCH 125</td>
<td>Intro to Computers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. B. Technical Core: 16 credit hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HTCH 100</td>
<td>Principles of Health Technology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTCH 290</td>
<td>Health Technology Capstone Seminar</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT 140</td>
<td>Medical Terminology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT 210</td>
<td>Law &amp; Ethics for MA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PESS 227</td>
<td>First Aid</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Selective Requirements: 24 credit hours

A. Choose one of the following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMS 110</td>
<td>Communication between Cultures</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or COMS 205</td>
<td>Techniques of Group Discussion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or COMS 206</td>
<td>Communication in Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Choose one of the following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMT 260</td>
<td>Business Report Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or OTEC 230</td>
<td>Business Communication II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Choose two of the following courses: 8 hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCFN 128</td>
<td>Intro to Nutrition</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH 202</td>
<td>Intro to Health and Lifestyle Choices</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH 204</td>
<td>Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH 270</td>
<td>Family and Consumer Health</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Choose one of the following courses: 4 hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EH 260</td>
<td>Intro to Environmental Health and Safety</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH 119</td>
<td>Bioterrorism, Disasters, and Health</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH 217</td>
<td>Intro to Health Care Organizations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Choose one of the following courses: 4 hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMT 110</td>
<td>Intro to Management</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or BMT 150</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or MGT 202</td>
<td>Elements of Supervision</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Electives to reach a minimum of 96 credit hours.

Non-technical Studies = 45 (additional hours are available)
Technical Studies (no certification) = 32 (12 additional hours are available + new HTCH courses)
Technical Studies (with certification) = 24 plus certification
B. List the courses (title, number, quarter credit hours, catalog description, and classification, i.e. non-technical or technical) that will constitute the requirements of the proposed program. Indicate which courses are new:

Required Technical Courses:

BIOS 103 Human Biology I: Basic Principles (5) (2N) Staff. Designed for non-science majors. Humans as biological organisms: our origins, ecology, and inheritance; and functioning of our body systems. 5 lec.

BIOS 130 Principles of Human Anatomy and Physiology I (5) (2N) (Chillicothe, Lancaster, and Zanesville campus only) Introduction to the structure and function of the human body in the study of cells, tissues, and the integumentary, skeletal, and muscular systems. Cat used for dissection. 3 lec, 4 lab.

BIOS 131 Principles of Human Anatomy and Physiology II (5) (2N) Prereq: BIOS 130. (Chillicothe, Lancaster, and Zanesville campus only) Introduction to the structure and function of the human body in the study of the digestive, urinary, reproductive, cardiovascular, lymphatic, respiratory, endocrine, and nervous systems. Cat used for dissection. 3 lec, 4 lab.

BMT 110 Introduction to Management (4) Nature of managerial concepts, managerial functions, and organizational structure, with emphasis on current issues.

BMT 150 Elements of Supervision (4) Concepts of modern-day supervision. Emphasis on supervisor’s major functions and development of sensitivity to human facets in management, using behavioral science findings.

BMT 260 Business Report Writing (4) Prereq: Tier I ENG; not open to College of Business majors. Practice in planning and writing effective business letters, memoranda, and reports.

COMS 103 Fundamentals of Public Speaking (4) Principles of public speaking, practice in presenting informative and persuasive speeches with emphasis on communicative process.

COMS 110 Communication Between Cultures (4) The purpose of the course is to explore the role of communication in understanding, accepting, and appreciating cultural differences. Students in this course will understand that culture includes not only issues of nationality, ethnicity, and race, but also gender, socioeconomic status, age, etc. Using a number of cross-cultural, cross-cultural, and intercultural examples, students will explore how communication is a key component of bridging cultural differences.

COMS 205 Techniques of Group Discussion (4) Study of structure and dynamics of small groups, nature and functions of leadership, group participation, problem solving, and decision making; frequent participation in group discussion activities.

COMS 206 Communication in Interpersonal Relationships (4) Provides maximum experience in study of communication in social interaction. Exploration of communication variables, and skill development in message generation in one-to-one informal settings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Prerequisites</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTCH 125</td>
<td>Introduction to Computers</td>
<td>(4) Prereq: C or better in MATH 101. Introduces productivity software within the framework of business applications. Involves hands-on assignments including Windows, word processing, spreadsheets, presentation graphics, the Internet, and e-mail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 151</td>
<td>Writing and Rhetoric I</td>
<td>(5) (1E) Prereq: fr or soph only; 150, or 151 placement into requested or earlier quarter or into 152/3. Practice in composing and revising expository essays which are well organized, logically coherent, and effective for their purpose and audience. Topics from personal experience or nonfiction reading. (Nonnative speakers take 151A.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH 260</td>
<td>Introduction to Environmental Health and Safety</td>
<td>(4) (2A) Survey of technical and administrative procedures needed to control the environment, especially as they relate to health effects encountered in daily activities. Emphasis on general ecological environmental protection and environmental degradation, along with safety concepts, practices, and procedures. 4 lec.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCFN 128</td>
<td>Introduction to Nutrition</td>
<td>(4) (2A) Nutrients, their food sources and functions in body, application to planning adequate diet through life cycle. 4 lec.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH 119</td>
<td>Bioterrorism, Disasters, and Health</td>
<td>(4) Exploration of bioterrorism, disasters, and the implication on individual and public health. Discussions on the global and domestic impacts of bioterrorism and disasters and the roles of public health agencies. 4 lec.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH 202</td>
<td>Introduction to Health and Lifestyle Choices</td>
<td>(4) (2A) Prereq: fresh or soph. Practices and appreciation of means whereby health of individual and group may be maintained. 4 lec.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH 204</td>
<td>Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs</td>
<td>(4) Presents basic pharmacology and toxicology of common drugs, alcohol, and tobacco and consequences of their abuse. 4 lec.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH 270</td>
<td>Family and Consumer Health</td>
<td>(4) Covers consumer health issues, health quackery, purchasing health products and services, alternative health care, and marketing strategies. Regional practices within the U.S. will be discussed. 4 lec.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTCH 100</td>
<td>Principles of Health Technology</td>
<td>This course will introduce health technology students to a wide range of health care concepts, careers, and systems. This course is designed for students to learn about health care and how different health care professionals are integrated into the entire health care delivery system. Students will gain an understanding of the professional responsibilities for a myriad of health professionals and requirements for certification/licensure/registration of them. Additionally, students will discuss the historical and futuristic implications of health care professionals and their relationships to patients.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTCH 290</td>
<td>Health Technology Capstone Seminar</td>
<td>Prereq. HTCH 100 and sophomore standing. A capstone for the HTCH degree, this course requires the HTCH student to integrate and apply knowledge about health care systems and professionals and their relationship to the non-medical world. Students will be expected to develop a professional presentation/project. Students will work individually and in teams to further their professional communication and presentation skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTCH 189</td>
<td>Independent Study</td>
<td>Prereq. HTCH 100 and permission. Independent study of a particular topic pertinent to health technology under the direction of a faculty member. May be repeated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTCH 289</td>
<td>Special Topics</td>
<td>Prereq: HTCH 100. Special topics current and relevant to the health technology area. May be repeated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MGT 202 Management (4) Prereq: soph. Understanding of and practice in solving problems facing managers and administrators using concepts and principles from behavioral sciences and other applicable disciplines.

MATH 113 Algebra (5) (1M) Prereq: 101 or 102 or placement level 1. Topics in algebra including functions, linear equations and systems, polynomials, rational and radical expressions, quadratic equations, exponential and logarithmic functions, and inequalities. Graphing calculators are employed. No credit to those with credit for 117 or 263A.

MAT 140 Medical Terminology for the Medical Assistant (3) Understanding and usage of medical terms used in the allied-health field. Emphasis is on the spelling of, definition of, and creation of medical terms through the understanding of prefixes, suffixes, and root words. Terminology learned through body system knowledge. Credit cannot be earned for both 140 and OTEC 141M.

MAT 210 Law and Ethics for Medical Assisting (2) Prereq: 101. Introduction to the law and ethics as they apply to allied health fields. Topics include practicing in a medical office, professional liability and medical malpractice, medical records and informed consent, medical ethics, documentation and reporting, and licenses and accreditation.

OTEC 230 Business Communication II (4) Prereq: 130 or ENG 150 or higher placement. Extensive and detailed practice in written communication for business, industry, and professions. Involves composition of letters, memoranda, and reports.

PSY 101 General Psychology (5) (2S) Introduction to psychology. Survey of topics in experimental and clinical psychology including physiological bases of behavior, sensation, perception, learning, memory, human development, social processes, personality, and abnormal behavior.

PESS 227 First Aid: Work Place Training (3) Presents the knowledge and skills of the American Red Cross Standard First Aid course, including adult CPR. Certification granted upon successful completion. Special fee. 2 lec., 2 lab.

SOC 101 Introduction to Sociology (4) (2S) Nature of human society and factors affecting its development. Fundamental concepts of sociology: culture, personality, socialization, social organization, groups, institutions.
## Curriculum summary

Provide a summary and classification of the courses comprising the program by quarter/semester, assuming full-time enrollment. Provide subtotals of credit hours by quarter, semester, by course type, and by total credit hours required.

### UORC

**Campus**

**Health Technology**

**Associate Degree Program**

**Date**: March 31, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Tech</th>
<th>Non-Tech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Quarter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTCH 100</td>
<td>Principles of Health Technology (NC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 103</td>
<td>Human Biology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT 140</td>
<td>Medical Terminology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PESS 227</td>
<td>First Aid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Quarter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 151</td>
<td>Freshmen Composition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMS 110</td>
<td>Communication between Cultures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCFN 128</td>
<td>Intro to Nutrition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Quarter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMS 103</td>
<td>Fund. of Public Speaking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 113</td>
<td>Algebra</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTCH 125</td>
<td>Intro to Computers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fourth Quarter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 101</td>
<td>General Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMT 260</td>
<td>Business Report Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH 202</td>
<td>Intro to Health and Lifestyle Choices</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fifth Quarter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 101</td>
<td>Intro to Sociology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT 210</td>
<td>Law &amp; Ethics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH 217</td>
<td>Intro to Health Care Organizations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sixth Quarter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTCH 290</td>
<td>Health Technology Capstone Seminar (NC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMT 110</td>
<td>Intro to Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART VI: STAFFING REQUIREMENTS

A. Indicate how the proposed program will be staffed.

A director and several full-time faculty members will teach in the program. Selected adjunct faculty will assist ther
PART VII: FACILITIES AND SUPPORT SERVICES

A. Describe facilities and equipment currently in existence at your institution that will be used for the proposed programs.

It is anticipated that this program can be accommodated within the college’s present facilities.

B. Describe additional facilities, facility modifications, and equipment that will be required for use in the proposed program.

No additional facilities are anticipated at this time.

C. Indicate institutional plans for meeting needs for additional facilities or support resources.

No additional needs are anticipated.
PART VII: FINANCIAL RESOURCES

A. See “Financial Impact Statement Attached”

B. Discuss briefly sources of funding other than state subsidy and student tuition that will be available for program support.

No other sources of funding are anticipated at this time.
## Financial Impact Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006-7</th>
<th>2007-8</th>
<th>2008-9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Projected additional FTE</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. General studies subsidy income (1/2 FTE X GS model)</td>
<td>13908</td>
<td>25508</td>
<td>25508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Technical subsidy model (1/2 FTE X Technical model)</td>
<td>33476</td>
<td>61394</td>
<td>61394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Student fee income (3 quarters/2 semi)</td>
<td>134035</td>
<td>245731</td>
<td>245731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other income (if any)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Total additional income</td>
<td>181419</td>
<td>332633</td>
<td>332633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Personnel costs</td>
<td>90000</td>
<td>90000</td>
<td>90000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Instruction (Technical and general)</td>
<td>90000</td>
<td>90000</td>
<td>90000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non-instruction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>90000</td>
<td>90000</td>
<td>90000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Staff benefits</td>
<td>31436</td>
<td>31436</td>
<td>31436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Supplies</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Information &amp; communications</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Maintenance and repairs (including rentals)</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Miscellaneous expenses</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Capital purchases (equipment, furniture, library books)</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Indirect costs</td>
<td>37859</td>
<td>35109</td>
<td>35109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Total costs</td>
<td>189295</td>
<td>175545</td>
<td>175545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Annual balance: gain (or loss)</td>
<td>(7876)</td>
<td>157088</td>
<td>157088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Deficits may normally be incurred during the first year of a new program because of the initial one-time start-up costs associated with each new offering.
Attachment A
December 19, 2005

Dear Sirs:

It is my pleasure to write a letter of support for the application for the new Associate of Applied Science degree in Health Technology. This degree provides an excellent opportunity for current and future health care employees to progress academically and professionally within their chosen technology.

As a member of the Route 33 Health Care Alliance and as Chief Executive Officer at Fairfield Medical Center, I have been a strong advocate for new academic pathways in health care. I know firsthand how difficult it is to find employees (particularly supervisors) who have the technical, communication and leadership skills necessary for the complexities of the health care environment. Many of these employees cannot travel long distances for educational opportunities so the convenience of this degree option close to health care facilities is an added benefit.

Those of us in leadership roles in health care know that we are in a service economy. New avenues for collaboration with academic institutions that help us develop our staff to the highest professional level are always appreciated and encouraged. As Fairfield Medical Center strives for the highest level of service possible, it is imperative that we develop and mentor our staff. This degree option is one more way that we can achieve that goal.

Sincerely,

FAIRFIELD MEDICAL CENTER

Mina Ubbing
President & CEO

sjm
April 27, 2006

Ohio University
Attention: William Willan
Associate VP of Academic and Student Affairs
University Outreach and Regional Campuses
131 Haning Hall
Athens, OH 45701

RE: HTCH Degree

Dear Mr. Willan:

This letter is written in strong support of the proposed Associate of Applied Science in Health Technologies (HTCH) degree on the Ohio University-Chillicothe campus. This degree would be a huge asset to the campus as well as the community.

I am currently serving on the Board of Directors of Adena Health System in Ross County and chair the Human Resource Committee. Adena is currently expanding in the areas of open heart surgery, oncology and women's health. The Board is concerned that the lack of qualified health professionals could significantly impact current expansion plans. Programs such as this provide a perfect example of how institutions of higher learning and communities can align their efforts for the betterment of everyone.

Built in the curriculum is recognition of up to 36 credit hours for healthcare certification. Many of the courses required during the first two years can be applied towards a Health Services Administration degree.

Southeastern Ohio, as well as neighboring areas, currently has numerous employment opportunities for health care professionals. Furthermore, employment projections through 2012 project that nearly half of the fastest
growing occupations will be in the health field, many of those will not require a bachelor’s degree.

As the management at Adena would agree, there can never be enough health care professionals in the right place at the right time. This region will be better served by educating students with the skills necessary in relation to the broader health care system. In conclusion, this Health Technology degree would be an outlet for those students who do not get into the nursing program and could significantly revolutionize the campus and community.

I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss any aspect of our interest in this program at your convenience. Please feel free to contact me at (740) 773-6874, day or evening.

Sincerely,

Larry A. Gates
98 Applewood Drive
Chillicothe, OH 45601
April 27, 2006

Ohio University
Attn.: William Willan
Associate VP or Academic and Student Affairs
University Outreach and Regional Campuses
131 Haning Hall
Athens, OH 45701

RE: Letter of Support

Dear Mr. Willan:

This letter is written in strong support of the proposed Associate of Applied Science in Health Technologies (HTCH) degree on the Ohio University-Chillicothe campus. This degree would be a huge asset to the campus as well as the community for numerous reasons. Built in the curriculum contains recognition of up to 36 credit hours for a healthcare certification. Many of the courses required during the first two years can be applied for a Health Services Administration degree.

Southeastern Ohio as well as neighboring areas currently has numerous employment opportunities for health care professionals. Furthermore, employment projections through 2012 claim that at least half of the fastest growing occupations will be in the health field, many of those will not require a bachelor's degree but certification and/or associate degree.

As many would agree, there can never be enough health care professionals in the right place at the right time. This region would be better served by educating students with the skills necessary in relation to the broader health care system. In conclusion, this Health Technology degree would be an outlet for those students who do not get into the nursing program and could drastically revolutionize the campus and community.

Sincerely,

Sandy Radowsky, RN, JD, CHE
Corporate Sr. VP & COO
Berger Health System

Caring For You - Caring For Our Community
Ohio University
Attn.: William Willan
Associate VP or Academic and Student Affairs
University Outreach and Regional Campuses
131 Haring Hall
Athens, OH 45701

RE: Letter of Support

Dear Mr. Willan:

This letter is written in support of the proposed Associate of Applied Science in Health Technologies (HTCH) degree on the Ohio University-Chillicothe campus. This degree would be a huge asset to the campus as well as the community for numerous reasons. The curriculum contains recognition of up to 36 credit hours for coursework received from various healthcare certifications. This may appeal to students who currently have certifications and wish to further their education.

Southeastern Ohio as well as neighboring areas currently has numerous employment opportunities for health care professionals. The health care field is one of the fastest growing career paths. As a Licensed Dietitian, who has an Associate Degree in Dietetic Technology, I know firsthand that the health care field has employment opportunities available. I completed a Bachelor and Master’s degree and have obtained licensure as a Licensed Dietitian from the State of Ohio.

My associate degree provided me with an opportunity to obtain a job in the health care field providing nutrition counseling to underserved clients. This Associate degree can provide a viable option for those students who are unable to enroll in a traditional nursing program or who have other health care interests.

Sincerely,

Michelle Treber, LD, MA
Heart Health of Ross County

Equal Opportunity Employer
April 27, 2006

Ohio University
Attn.: William Willan
Associate VP or Academic and Student Affairs
University Outreach and Regional Campuses
131 Haning Hall
Athens, OH 45701

RE: Letter of Support

Dear Mr. Willan:

This letter is written in strong support of the proposed Associate of Applied Science in Health Technologies (HTCH) degree on the Ohio University-Chillicothe campus. This degree would be a huge asset to the campus as well as the community for numerous reasons. Built in the curriculum contains recognition of up to 36 credit hours for a healthcare certification. Many of the courses required during the first two years can be applied for a Health Services Administration degree.

Southeastern Ohio as well as neighboring areas currently has numerous employment opportunities for health care professionals. Furthermore, employment projections through 2012 claim that at least half of the fastest growing occupations will be in the health field, many of those will not require a bachelor’s degree but certification and/or associate degree.

As many would agree, there can never be enough health care professionals in the right place at the right time. This region would be better served by educating students with the skills necessary in relation to the broader health care system. In conclusion, this Health Technology degree would be an outlet for those students who do not get into the nursing program and could drastically revolutionize the campus and community. Adena’s Mission is to provide exceptional patient care while enhancing the quality of health in the communities we serve and this program would assist us in achieving that Mission.

Sincerely,

Mark H. Shuter
President and CEO
Adena Health System
272 Hospital Road
Chillicothe, OH 45601
Ohio University
Attn.: Dr. William Willan
Associate VP or Academic and Student Affairs
University Outreach and Regional Campuses
131 King Hall
Athens, OH 45701

RE: Letter of Support

Dear Dr. Willan:

This letter is written to express Our Lady of Bellefonte Hospital's strong support of the proposed Associate of Applied Science in Health Technologies (HITC) degree to be offered on the Ohio University-Southern Campus. This degree would be a huge asset to the campus as well as the community for numerous reasons. We are especially encouraged that the curriculum contains recognition of up to 36 credit hours for existing healthcare certification and/or licensure. I also understand that many of the courses required during the first two years meet the requirements toward a bachelor's degree in Health Services Administration.

There are numerous employment opportunities for health care professionals in our Tri-state area. Furthermore, according to U.S. Labor Market projections, at least half of the fastest growing occupations through 2012 will be in health related fields with many of these jobs requiring certification and/or an associate degree.

There never seems to be enough health care professionals in the right place at the right time, and our region would be better served if there were more opportunities for access to health education programs. In conclusion, the Health Technology degree would provide an excellent career pathway outlet for those health care positions that now require less than an associate's degree.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Moore, RN, BSN, MHA
Vice President Patient Care Services/CNO
Ohio University
Health Technologies Advisory Board

Dr. Timothy Angel
Health Commissioner/CEO
Ross County Health District
475 Western Avenue, Suite A
Chillicothe, OH 45601

Dr. Steven Cox, M.D.
1566 Monmouth Street
Lancaster, OH 43130
740-654-4773

Jennifer Moore, RN, BSN, MHA
Vice President Patient Care Services/CNO
Our Lady of Bellefonte Hospital
St. Christopher Drive
Ashland, KY 41101

Kay Swartzwelder, MSN, RN
Associate Director of Nursing/Allied Health
Collins Career Center
11627 State Route 243
Chesapeake, OH 45619

Michelle Treber, LD, MA
Heart Health of Ross County
Community Health Services
475 Western Avenue, Suite A
Chillicothe, OH 45601

Ms. Mina Ubbing
President & CEO
Fairfield Medical Center
401 North Ewing Street
Lancaster, OH 43130
740-687-8009
WHEREAS, the College of Business has proposed the creation of a certificate program in Financial Planning, and

WHEREAS, the development of the degree has the support of the Dean and Faculty of the College and the University Curriculum Council, and

WHEREAS, many College of Business graduates pursue careers in financial planning, and

WHEREAS, the Certificate in Financial Planning will allow students to pursue the credential of Certified Financial Planner™ designation awarded by the CFP® Board, pursue careers in comprehensive financial planning, and significantly augment their marketability to potential employers, and

WHEREAS, the College of Business currently offers courses in most of the areas needed,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University approves offering the Certificate in Financial Planning.
Date: September 21, 2006

To: Roderick McDavis, President

From: Kathy Krendl, Provost

Subject: Certificate in Financial Planning

This memorandum is written to express my support for the development of a Certificate in Financial Planning within the Department of Finance in the College of Business.

The certificate will be a strong addition to the department and will appeal to students who want to focus their business careers in comprehensive financial planning. The curriculum defined in the certificate program will provide the necessary educational foundation for students pursuing Certified Financial Planning (CFP) credentials.

The certificate program has the full support of the College of Business and the Department of Finance and I am convinced that this new certificate offering will prove to be a popular and valuable curriculum addition to the institution.

I am therefore pleased to also lend my full support for the development of this certificate program.
PROPOSAL:
Certificate in Financial Planning

Proposal:
Many graduates of the College of Business pursue careers in financial planning. Some of these choose to obtain credentials in this field. One of the most respected is the Certified Financial Planner™ designation awarded by the CFP® Board. Before a candidate can sit for the certification exam, they must prove that they have fulfilled the education requirement through a registered program. We are applying to become one of these registered programs; the Certificate in Financial Planning will be the credential used to verify that the candidate has successfully completed the education requirement. Some students will choose not to sit for the certifying exam; they may choose to obtain the Certificate for their personal benefit.

The finance major at Ohio University prepares students for careers in corporate finance and financial services. The Certificate in Financial Planning along with the major provides the educational foundation for students planning to obtain CFP® credentials and pursue a career in comprehensive financial planning. The course work for this certificate is structured around the job knowledge requirements set forth by the CFP Board and covers the areas of risk management, personal income tax planning, investment planning, retirement planning, and comprehensive financial planning. This course work is supported by required courses in economics, accounting, communications, business law, and statistics.

Need for a Program in Financial Planning:
The College of Business currently offers courses in most of the areas needed for financial planning. There is, however, no comprehensive program to integrate the areas a financial planner needs to understand. The Certificate in Financial Planning will appeal to students who want to focus their careers in this area. We periodically receive calls from business graduates who want to sit for the certifying exam. They ask if we are a registered program and can fulfill their educational requirement.

Benefits of a Certificate in Financial Planning:
- Students would learn how to manage money, insurance, and investments for themselves and clients;
- Students would differentiate themselves favorably in job interviews;
- Students would excel in training programs offered by employers after graduation;
- Students would gain a competitive advantage over graduates from other universities without this program.
- Recruiters would be more interested in meeting our students since they know they are well prepared;
- Companies will know that they will spend less time training our graduates;
- Companies will have the opportunity to hire college students who know they are interested in and comfortable with financial planning.
- The University will find more recruiters are interested in our students;
- The University will recruit more high quality students due to this program;
- The University will be included in the list of CFP Board registered programs.
Implementation:

Basic Requirements. The criteria for receiving the Certificate include maintaining an overall 2.2 GPA and completing all the listed courses.

Program Customization. We anticipate no customization at this time but will review the need for it in the future.

Proposal for: Certificate in Financial Planning at Ohio University

The College of Business through the Finance Department at Ohio University sponsors the undergraduate Certificate in Financial Planning for students wishing to obtain special preparation for a financial planning career.

Completion of this program results in the awarding of a certificate and is officially recognized on transcripts upon graduation. A student can earn a Certificate in Financial Planning by completing the 32 hours of approved coursework listed below. Some of these courses require additional prerequisites.

Requirements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 102</td>
<td>Managerial Accounting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSL 255</td>
<td>Law and Society</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN 410</td>
<td>Personal Financial Planning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN 331</td>
<td>Risk and Insurance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN 341</td>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN 411</td>
<td>Retirement Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN 412</td>
<td>Estate Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT 317</td>
<td>Federal Income Taxes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN 414</td>
<td>Cases in Financial Planning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 32 hours
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS  
SALES CERTIFICATE WITH A TECHNICAL FOCUS  

RESOLUTION 2006 - 2068  

WHEREAS, the College of Business Sales Centre has proposed the creation of a Sales Certificate with a Technical Focus, and  

WHEREAS, the development of this certificate has the support of the Dean and Faculty of the College of Business as well as the Russ College of Engineering and Technology, and the University Curriculum Council, and  

WHEREAS, this certificate will be a strong addition to the five current certificates offered through the Centre, and  

WHEREAS, the certificate meets a timely need in the business community, especially with manufacturing firms and industrial suppliers, and  

WHEREAS, the College of Business and the Russ College of Engineering and Technology currently offer courses in the areas needed,  

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University approves offering the Sales Certificate with a Technical Focus.
Date: October 5, 2006

To: Roderick McDavis, President

From: Kathy Krendl, Provost

Subject: Proposed Sales Certificate in Technical Sales

This memorandum is written to express my support for the development of a new Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales focus to be awarded by The Sales Centre of Ohio University. This certificate will be a strong addition to the five current certificates offered through the Centre. Like the others, this certificate meets a timely need in the business community especially with manufacturing firms and industrial suppliers. It is expected that students mainly from the College of Business and the Russ College of Engineering and Technology will be applying for admission. The addition of the certificate to their Ohio University degree will greatly enhance their educational scope and employability.

The addition of the certificate has the support of the Colleges of Business and the Russ College. I am therefore pleased to also lend my support to the development of this certificate program.
MEMORANDUM

TO: University Curriculum Council

FROM: Kenneth L. Hartung

RE: Sales Certificate with a Technical Focus

Recommend approval:

[Signatures and dates]

Chair, University Curriculum Council

Kathy Krendl, Provost
To: The University Curriculum Council

From: Kenneth L. Hartung, Executive Director, The Sales Centre

Subject: Proposal for a Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales Focus

The attached proposal reflects a collaborative effort of The Sales Centre at Ohio University within the College of Business and the College of Engineering and Technology to offer a Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales Focus.

Memos or emails of support for this new program are attached from the Marketing Department where the sales courses are offered, from the Dean of the College of Engineering and Technology and the Dean of the College of Business. An email from the School of Communication Studies is also attached indicating the appropriateness of the Communication Studies classes included.

We expect to recruit 15-25 students who will successfully apply for a Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales Focus during the academic year 2006-2007.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at your earliest convenience...hartung@ohio.edu or 3-9328.

Thank you.

K. Hartung, Executive Director

Date:

May 11, 2006
Proposal for: The Sales Certificate Specializing in Technical Sales

PROPOSAL:

Sales Certificate — Technical Sales

Proposal:

The Sales Centre at Ohio University embraces a strategy of meeting the market needs of companies hiring college seniors by offering specialty sales programs. Currently, five sales certificates have been approved and are offered to Ohio University students: Professional, Retail, Media, Financial Services and Sports Management. It is proposed that The Sales Centre at Ohio University offer a Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales Focus to meet the needs of manufacturing firms and industrial suppliers who sell material, equipment, ingredients and services business to business. Anecdotal history indicates that many engineering and technology graduates are involved in the business to business sales process, including technical sales support.

Need for a Technical Sales Focus:

Void in Current Academic Programming. Engineering and Technology at Ohio University is a strong program with a demonstrated history of preparing graduates for career success. There is currently, however, no opportunity for Engineering and Technology students to prepare specifically for selling. We believe that such a sales program would give students an advantage in the job marketplace. Ohio University needs to expand career opportunities for its students and one way it can do so is by introducing the Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales Focus.

Strong Demand. The lack of current preparation in the area of technical sales at universities across the country will make this new sales certificate program extremely valuable. According to Craig Rich, Business Manager for ICraft Food Ingredient, “Technical sales is a growing field. Organizations such as my own who focus on business to business sales have a great need for sales people with a technical background. A Sales Certificate program would be valuable.” Larry McHale, President of R.A. Staff Company, an engineering oriented sales company, writes, “I have hired engineering graduates from both another university and Ohio University. The combination of an engineering degree with the Sales Certificate would allow me to focus only on graduates from Ohio University.” Tom Starr, Sales and Marketing Operations Manager for Xerox believes that, “The Sales Centre at Ohio University would provide engineers with a unique set of skills required for success in their cross-discipline environments.” Adding the Sales Certificate option to the existing engineering curriculum will help differentiate the Ohio University Engineering and Technology programs from other undergraduate programs in this country.
**Little Competition.** We are aware of only a very few undergraduate engineering and technology programs that specifically include some sales education. We believe, therefore, that this new technical sales certificate program would create a unique niche for Ohio University in recruiting prospective students to the university and would support the career development and career success of the University’s students majoring in Engineering and Technology.

**Benefits of a Technical Sales Focus:**

A Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales Focus would create value for students, businesses and Ohio University.

**Student Benefits:**

- Learn to sell effectively in a variety of manufacturing and distribution environments;
- Differentiate themselves favorably in their initial job search as a college senior from others who have not had undergraduate sales education;
- Have more choice in selecting a job due to more companies recruiting at Ohio University;
- Excel in sales training offered to new employees once hired after graduation; and
- Compete more effectively throughout their careers.

**Business Benefits:**

- Targeted, less expensive and more effective recruiting opportunities;
- Less time and investment involved training new hires in sales skills;
- More revenue generation potentially from new hires;
- The opportunity to hire college seniors into jobs that may have previously been limited to persons with some experience;
- The opportunity to hire college seniors who know what they want to do based on their exposure to the business world via a unique sales program.

**Benefits to Ohio University:**

- Increased recruiting interest from manufacturing firms and industrial suppliers;
- Better opportunity to recruit high quality students to the University due to a unique program;
- National recognition for a unique educational offering;
- Increased opportunities for fundraising with companies that recruit and hire our graduates.
Proposal for: The Sales Certificate Specializing in Technical Sales

- Better sales research opportunities due to relationships with manufacturing and distribution organizations based on the value The Sales Centre creates for them in recruiting and hiring.

**Implementation:**

**Basic Requirements.** Acceptance requirements and program expectations would be the same as for the five currently approved sales certificates offered by The Sales Centre at Ohio University. Criteria for admission includes a minimum 2.75 gpa and, once enrolled in the program, an overall gpa of 2.5 is required in certificate courses.

**Curriculum Specialization.** To earn the Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales Focus, students will be required to take MKT 358 Professional Selling Techniques, MKT 458 Sales Management and to pursue a senior level MKT 498 sales internship for practical, work experience in their field. MKT 425 Business to Business Marketing has been added along with MKT 491 Seminar in Sales to choose from as the one Advance Course selection required. One four-hour Communication Studies class is also a requirement. Two cross disciplinary courses must be selected from Industrial Technology, Chemical Engineering, Industrial and Systems Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Aviation or Computer Science.

**Program Customization.** Additional Professional Sales Advisory Board Members will be recruited to represent manufacturing and distribution organizations to provide mentors, networking, learning opportunities and potential internships/full time jobs for Ohio University students in the program. Current faculty from the College of Engineering and Technology will participate in the program, actively advise students and recruit firms from the manufacturing and distribution industry to actively engage in the new sales program.
Proposal for: The Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales Focus at Ohio University

The College of Business through The Sales Centre at Ohio University sponsors the undergraduate Sales Certificate Program for students wishing to obtain special preparation for successful professional development. The Sales Certificate Program is open to students in any major within the University who want to gain knowledge and understanding about professional selling.

Completion of this program, which is similar to a minor, results in the awarding of a certificate and is officially recognized on transcripts upon graduation. Once accepted into the program, a student can earn a Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales Focus by completing 28 hours of approved coursework selected from the courses outlined below. Be advised that some courses require prerequisites and plan accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Requirements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MKT 358 Professional Selling Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKT 458 Sales Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKT 498 Internship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advanced Courses (must select one):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MKT 425 Business to Business Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKT 491 Seminar in Sales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Requirement (must select one):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMS 206 Communication in Interpersonal Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMS 310 Information Diffusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-disciplinary Requirements (must select two):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT 452 Contemporary Integrated Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT 462 Product Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 432 Structural Design in Concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE 433 Structural Design in Steel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE 443 Chemical Engineering Design 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE 444 Chemical Engineering Design 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISE 432 Inventory &amp; Mfg. Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISE 441 Operations Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME 301 Kinematics &amp; Dynamics of Machines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME 404 Machine Design 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 462 Database Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 475 Internet Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVN 100 Introduction to Aviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVN 480 General Aviation Operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other cross-disciplinary courses that support the certificate curriculum may be substituted with the approval of the Executive Director of the Sales Centre.
Criteria for admission into the Sales Certificate Program include: 1) submission to The Sales Centre office of a completed application form; 2) submission to The Sales Centre office of a copy of the applicant's most recent DARS report indicating an overall g.p.a. of 2.75 or higher; 3) submission to the Sales Centre office of the applicant's resume demonstrating the characteristics that support a successful sales career, for example, a strong work ethic; and 4) completion by the applicant of a panel interview with Sales Centre faculty and others. Further, applicants demonstrating past sales experience, either paid or unpaid, are preferred. Application forms may be picked up from The Sales Centre office in Copeland Hall 609.

Admission to this certificate program is competitive. Admission cannot be guaranteed to all students meeting the admission criteria. The Sales Centre will admit students up to its enrollment ceiling, and students judged to have the highest probability of success will be admitted. Members of groups historically underrepresented in the manufacturing and distribution industries will receive special consideration.

Each quarter those accepted into the Sales Certificate program will have their progress tracked by DARS. An overall g.p.a. of 2.5 in certificate courses is required. The Sales Certificate will be awarded only to students who have been accepted into the Sales Certificate Program and who have fulfilled all certificate requirements. Students will need to consult the Executive Director of The Sales Centre before the deadline for graduation to ensure that the certificate will be awarded. For more information about the program, contact the Executive Director of The Sales Centre at 740.593.9328 or email thesalescentre@ohio.edu, or visit our website at www.thesalescentre.com.
Dear Ken:

On behalf of the Marketing Department I am pleased to support the addition of the Sales Certificate with Technical Sales Focus. This program will provide an excellent complement to our existing offerings.

Dawn Deeter

At 06:27 PM 4/30/2006, you wrote:

Dear Drs. James, Deeter and Day

Attached please find our proposal including curriculum...see page 4... for a Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales Focus for your department/college review as part of the process in submitting a new program to the University Curriculum Council for their approval. Classes from Communications and Marketing are included in the proposed curriculum. I have a letter of support from Dean Irwin of the College of Engineering and Technology. John, would you please provide same from the College of Business.

The attached proposal reflects a collaborative effort between The Sales Centre at Ohio University with the College of Business and the College of Engineering and Technology to offer a Sales Certificate with Technical Sales Focus.

Upon completion of a satisfactory review, please indicate your department/college support of this new certificate in writing to my attention at hartung@ohio.edu. Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at your earliest convenience at 3-9328.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request.

Ken

Kenneth L. Hartung
Executive Director, The Sales Centre at Ohio University and Executive-in-Residence, Marketing Department
Ohio University
Copeland Hall 630
Athens, Ohio 45701-2979
(phone) 740-593-9328
January 20, 2006

Re: Technical Sales Certificate

University Curriculum Council:

I have reviewed the cross-disciplinary requirements for the proposed Sales Certificate with a technical focus that incorporates courses from each academic discipline in the Russ College. The Russ College believes this is an excellent opportunity for our graduates to prepare for career paths that are in high demand.

Sincerely,

Dennis Irwin, Ph.D., P.E.
Dean and Moss Professor of Engineering Education

DI:kr
Date: May 4, 2006

To: University Curriculum Council

From: Glenn E. Corlett, Dean, College of Business

Subject: Proposed Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales Focus

The Sales Centre at Ohio University, sponsored by the College of Business, awards a Sales Certificate, recognized on the official Ohio University transcript, to undergraduate students upon successful completion of a 28-credit hour, cross disciplinary classroom experience. A 300-hour internship is included. Entrance into the program is competitive.

The fact that all Ohio University students in any major within the university can apply for admission is one of its greatest strengths. Currently, we have Sales Certificate Candidates majoring in marketing, communications, retail merchandising, journalism, accounting, finance, anthropology, biology, advertising, actuarial science and many others enrolled in our sales programs.

The Sales Centre embraces a strategy of meeting the market needs of the business community by offering specialty sales programs. Currently, we offer four Sales Certificates:

- a Professional Sales Certificate
- a Sales Certificate with a Retail Focus, in partnership with the Retail Merchandising Program of the School of Human and Consumer Sciences and
- a Sales Certificate with a Media Focus, in partnership with the School of Journalism.
- a Sales Certificate with a Financial Services Focus

Each sales program has a curriculum tailored to its specific needs by the collaboration of the academic and business communities.

A fifth program - a Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales Focus, in partnership with the Russ College of Engineering and Technology - is now being proposed. The College of Business fully supports this proposal and believes that it will be a valuable addition to the interdisciplinary programs available to all students at Ohio University.
To: Ken Hartung <hartung@ohio.edu>
Subject: Re: Proposal for a Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales Focus

Dear Mr. Hartung,

I have reviewed the proposal for a Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales Focus and find the inclusion of two courses from the School of Communication Studies, 206 and 310, appropriate.

Good luck,
Anita James

P.S. I have reattached the proposal with edited sections that might be of interest to you as the proposal moves forward.

At 06:27 PM 4/30/2006 -0400, you wrote:
Dear Drs. James, Deeter and Day

Attached please find our proposal including curriculum...see page 4... for a Sales Certificate with a Technical Sales Focus for your department/college review as part of the process in submitting a new program to the University Curriculum Council for their approval. Classes from Communications and Marketing are included in the proposed curriculum. I have a letter of support from Dean Irwin of the College of Engineering and Technology. John, would you please provide same from the College of Business.

The attached proposal reflects a collaborative effort between The Sales Centre at Ohio University within the College of Business and the College of Engineering and Technology to offer a Sales Certificate with Technical Sales Focus.

Upon completion of a satisfactory review, please indicate your department/college support of this new certificate in writing to my attention at hartung@ohio.edu. Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at your earliest convenience at 3-9328.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request.

Ken

Kenneth L. Hartung
Executive Director, The Sales Centre at Ohio University
and Executive-in-Residence, Marketing Department
Ohio University
Copeland Hall 630
Athens, Ohio 45701-2979
(phone) 740-593-9328
(email) hartung@ohio.edu
www.thesalescentre.com
Make no little plans. They have no magic to stir men’s blood and probably themselves will not be realized. Make big plans; aim high in hope and work, remembering that a noble, logical diagram once recorded will never die, but long after we are gone will be a living thing, asserting itself with ever growing insistency."

David Burnham (1846-1912)
ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OHIO CENTER FOR ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTIONARY STUDIES

RESOLUTION 2006 - 2069

WHEREAS, a need exists for a center at Ohio University that performs ecological and evolutionary research that also has a bearing of success in the environmental sciences.

WHEREAS, the establishment of the center will enhance interdisciplinary undergraduate and graduate programs that will enhance the prominence of Ohio University as institution of research and learning.

WHEREAS, the initiative satisfies the requirements of the university’s strategic plan and the strategic plan of the college of Arts and Sciences.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees establishes the Ohio Center for Ecology and Evolutionary Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences.
DATE: October 5th, 2006

TO: Roderick McDavis, President

FROM: John A. Bantle, Vice President for Research
       Kathy Krendl, Provost

SUBJECT: Recommendation to approve the Ohio Center for Ecology and Evolutionary Studies.

We have reviewed the materials submitted by Dean Ogles of the College of Arts and Sciences requesting the creation of the Ohio Center for Ecology and Evolutionary Studies. We have determined that the proposed center meets all the criteria established for Centers and Institutes at Ohio University. The new center will be an important partner of the Consortium for Energy, Economy and the Environment as it greatly expands the scientific and technical expertise of that center. We also confirm that the new center fits the strategic plan of Ohio University and promises to advance the university in its quest for national prominence in research.

Approved:

John A. Bantle
Vice President for Research

Kathy Krendl
Provost
Dear Jack:

I am forwarding to you a revised proposal for the establishment of the Ohio Center for Ecology and Evolutionary Studies (OCEES) prepared by Professors Stephen Reilly and Willem Roosenburg of the Department of Biological Sciences. After receiving feedback from you, the Provost, and the cabinet, the proposal was revised to address several issues.

The proposed OCEES brings together a diverse and wide-ranging group of faculty in organismal biology across the campus from the College of Osteopathic Medicine and the College of Arts and Sciences, including the Voinovich Center and the Environmental Studies Program. Over 40 faculty members have expressed a desire to join OCEES. The proposal provides a strong rationale for the center with appropriate objectives and measurable metrics. Further, the resources required for the center are clearly identified and the necessary infrastructure already available.

As outlined in the proposal, The College of Arts and Sciences is committed to provide financial assistance for the operation of OCEES for its first three years from funds received for the implementation of Vision Ohio. Further, the letters of endorsement from across the campus, including the Voinovich Center, show strong support for OCEES and demonstrate its potential ability to “dovetail” with environmental research groups on campus.
I believe OCEES will provide one mechanism to further strengthen and enhance our ability to significantly increase our success in obtaining funding from external agencies supporting research in ecology and evolutionary studies. Indeed OCEES should be able to immediately become competitive in applications for specialized grants, such as the NSF Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) Program.

The potential benefits of OCEES to Ohio University are tremendous and fall in line with the strategic goals of the College of Arts and Sciences and those articulated for research productivity and national prominence as outlined in Vision Ohio. Importantly, these goals can be achieved with a relatively modest investment.

The OCEES has the potential to become a model center and one that will showcase Ohio University in its mission for excellence in both education and research. For these reasons I support and recommend the establishment of OCEES.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Ogles
Dean

cc: Stephen Reilly, Associate Professor, Department of Biological Sciences
    Ralph DiCaprio, Professor and Chair, Department of Biological Sciences
MAJOR AND DEGREE PROGRAM REVIEWS

RESOLUTION 2006 - 2070

WHEREAS, the continuous review of academic programs is essential to the maintenance of quality within an educational institution, and

WHEREAS, Ohio University has had for many years a rigorous program of internal review, and

WHEREAS, Section 67 of Am. Sub. H.B. 694 requires the college and university Board of Trustees “shall during the 1981-83 biennium initiate on-going processes for the review and evaluation of all programs of instruction presently conducted by the institutions for which they are responsible”

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University accepts the 2005-2006 reviews for the following:

Environmental Engineering and Technology (EVT) and Hazardous Materials Technology (HMT)

Hearing, Speech and Language Sciences

Computer Science Technology (CTCH)

Individual Interdisciplinary Program (IIP)
DATE: September 21, 2006
TO: Roderick J. McDavis, President
FROM: Kathy A. Krendl, Provost
SUBJECT: Seven-year Program Reviews

Please find attached summaries of the seven-year academic program reviews, completed during 2005-2006 by the University Curriculum Council. These summaries should be presented to the Ohio University Board of Trustees Academic Quality Committee at their October 2006 meeting.

These reviews provide a useful self-examination of our programs.
Name of Program: Environmental Engineering Technology and Hazardous Materials Technology

Program Type (check all that apply):
- [ ] undergraduate certificate
- X graduate certificate
- [ ] bachelor's degree
- [ ] master's degree
- [ ] associate degree
- [ ] doctoral degree

Date last review was seen by Board of Trustees: ______________ first review ______________

Report prepared by: Miki Crawford

External Reviewer: Rodney Handy

Draft completed and sent to chair and dean: *

Unit Reviewer: Miki Crawford ______________

(signature) ______________ (date)

Program chair: ______________

(signature) ______________ (date)

Dean of college: ______________

(signature) ______________ (date)

Return draft and all comments to Review Committee

University Curriculum Council

Pilcher House 202

Approved by UCC chair: ______________

(signature) ______________ (date)

* the word "DRAFT" must appear on each page of the review until it has been formally approved by the University Curriculum Council.
I. General Department Information

A. Faculty Profile

The Environmental Engineering Technology and Hazardous Materials Technology faculty consisted of two full time Group I members, one of which was denied tenured during the seven year review period in the spring of 2002. The remaining Group I faculty member served as the program director for both the Environmental Engineering and Hazardous Materials technical programs. He was also the director of the Environmental Training and Research Center, the industrial outreach for both programs. This Group I member held the rank of assistant professor, and has since been promoted to Associate Dean of the Chillicothe Campus where he continues to direct these programs. The director has experiences in environmental engineering and health/safety and holds a BS and MS in engineering with additional coursework towards a Ph.D. in education. He has an impressive vita with teaching, industrial, grant and fund raising, certifications and training, and publications and presentation experiences.

During the seven year review, seven other faculty (six males and one female) have taught courses in the EVT and HMT programs as adjuncts.

B. Programmatic Practices

1. Teaching

The EVT and HMT are separate associate degrees, but have several common courses in the curriculum. Adjunct faculty have been hired to teach when needed as there were no other Group I-III on staff to teach in these programs. The director taught from six to twelve credit hours per quarter and has taught a total of 21 different courses. Some of the core requirements are offered online. However, much of the coursework is hands-on and utilizes the Environmental Training and Research Center and an eight acre outdoor training complex. The classroom complex area includes a student learning area, hazmat storage rooms, four faculty offices, two classrooms, two restrooms and three lab areas. The labs include bench-top instrumentation to perform wet chemistry activities and necessary equipment to conduct direct-reading instrument calibrations. Unique to this program is the comprehensive...
list of direct-reading instruments required to sample and monitor for hazardous chemicals.

2. Research, Scholarship, and Creativity Activity
The Environmental Training and Research Center provides opportunities for research and engagement. Faculty and students conduct environmental, health and safety training for business, industries, and governmental industries. This provides hands-on experiences for students with an opportunity for potential employers to evaluate students as future employees. Several of the engagements have lead to private industrial contracts. Some of the partnerships developed includes: General Motors, Waste Management, DESA International, Thompson Electronics, and Mead Paper. The majority of the director’s publications have been based on applied research and activities at the Environmental Training and Research Center. These include Proceeding of the First NSF international Conference on Indoor Air Health, Proceedings of the Waste Management Symposium, and American Industrial Hygiene Conference and Exhibition.

II Undergraduate Program Review
A. Program Goals and Curriculum
The goals of EVT and HMT are to provide students academic experiences which will allow them to acquire analytical thinking skills, verbal and written communication skills, understanding of the professional concepts, acquire expertise of the profession’s tools, practice of the profession within the framework of the law, high ethical behavior, problem solving skills, recognize and appreciate the roles of the hazardous materials responder and environmental professional in society, prep for further education in the field, and responsibility and duty to the community.

HMT has been offered at Chillicothe since fall of 1993 and the EVT program has been offered since fall of 1998. These programs share a teaching/laboratory facility with the Law Enforcement Technology program. A typical course has a lecture component with a lab experience of some type. The program is capital intensive involving intricate and sophisticated lab and field instrumentation and equipment.

B. Students
Distribution of student enrollment is predominately Caucasian, with the ratio of males to females about 2:1. The range of ACT scores have been from 17.5-19.0 for EVT and 16.0-18.0 for HMT.

C. Graduates
The number of degrees granted was two in 2001-2002 and four in 2002-2003. There are no earlier graduates (the program began in 1998). HMT had one graduate in 2002-2003 and five in 2000-2001. Most of these students work
full or part time and approximately half of these students continue education beyond the associate's degree.

III. Overall Evaluation
This is the first program review for the Environmental Engineering Technology and Hazardous Materials Technology programs. There is concern about the program numbers and faculty. It has been suggested that cutting one program to build the other could help enrollment. The most pressing need is for a full time program director and faculty in order to build the program(s) numbers.

These programs have much appeal in course content, hands on experience, and the Environmental Training and Research Center. The programs also provide certificate programs in Environmental Management, Environmental Restoration, Environmental Sampling Technician, Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Technician, and health and Safety Technician which help to serve the community. With the excellent facilities that are already in place, it would be expected that faculty could generate successful interest in the program(s). Job placement for graduates has been good and graduates can build on the two year degree with a bachelor's from Shawnee University or at Ohio University in Environmental Engineering. With the excellent facilities that are already in place, it would be expected that faculty could generate successful interest in the program(s).
External Report
Environmental Engineering Technology (EVT)

Adequacy of Resources

The Environmental Engineering Technology (EVT) program has excellent laboratory and classroom facilities. The program shares a technical classroom and laboratory complex with its complementary program, Hazardous Materials Technology (HMT), and with the Law Enforcement Technology (LET) program. The instructional equipment and laboratory instrumentation assets are outstanding and, in the evaluator's opinion, unmatched by other degree programs similar in nature and stature throughout this country. Also, a major attribute of this program is the eight-acre outdoor training site available to those enrolled in both academic and continuing educational-related coursework. For these reasons, there is no recommendation for the appropriation of any additional physical resources at this time.

During the early days of this evaluation cycle, this program had two dedicated, full-time Group I faculty members that it shared with its complement program, HMT. However, due to an internal promotion and an employee denial of tenure, the EVT program now lacks a dedicated, full-time Program Director as well as any other Group I faculty members. Currently, the program courses are being taught by adjunct faculty. The current Program Director is also the Associate Dean at the Chillicothe campus and is still in charge of student advisement and program marketing and outreach. It is recommended that a new Program Director be hired as soon as possible to manage the activities of the EVT program (as well as HMT) and to assist in course instruction. It is further recommended to continue using adjunct faculty members to teach concentrations in their respective areas of expertise.

Program Goals and Curriculum

The curriculum of the Environmental Engineering Technology (EVT) program was developed within the guidelines presented by the Accreditation Board for Engineering Technology (ABET). The program has substantial rigor and adequate course requirements in the sciences, math, and general education. The core requirements resemble those of most similar ABET accredited (or accreditable) programs found in the U.S. Thus, there is no recommendation at this time to immediately change any of the requirements of the basic EVT curriculum. However, due to the existence of two very similar degree programs (i.e., EVT and HMT), and both with relatively low enrollments, considerations should be made in the future of possibly merging the two programs. And, due mainly to program marketability, it is in the evaluator's opinion that the best strategy would be to eliminate the HMT program as a degree program and offer it instead as a strong option in the EVT program.

The main goal for the EVT program should be targeted toward the growth of student enrollment. This would best be accomplished by the immediate hiring of full-time director/faculty member and a relentless effort at the marketing of this very resource-rich and potentially lucrative program. Another major effort that should be undertaken is the alignment of this degree program and its requirements with those of related, four-year degree programs available within the Ohio University system. The most promising two programs currently available as an avenue for students are the BS in Technical and Applied Studies (TAS) and the BS in Industrial Hygiene, available only on the Athens campus.
Hazardous Materials Technology (HMT)

Adequacy of Resources

The Hazardous Materials Technology (HMT) program has excellent laboratory and classroom facilities. The program shares a technical classroom and laboratory complex with its complementary program, Environmental Engineering Technology (EVT), and with the Law Enforcement Technology (LET) program. The instructional equipment and laboratory instrumentation assets are outstanding and, in the evaluator's opinion, unmatched by other degree programs similar in nature and stature throughout this country. Also, a major attribute of this program is the eight-acre outdoor training site available to those enrolled in both academic and continuing educational-related coursework. For these reasons, there is no recommendation for the appropriation of any additional physical resources at this time.

During the early days of this evaluation cycle, this program had two dedicated, full-time Group I faculty members that it shared with its complement program, EVT. However, due to an internal promotion and an employee denial of tenure, the HMT program now lacks a dedicated, full-time Program Director as well as any other Group I faculty members. Currently, the program courses are being taught by adjunct faculty. The current Program Director is also the Associate Dean at the Chillicothe campus and is still in charge of student advisement and program marketing and outreach. It is recommended that a new Program Director be hired as soon as possible to manage the activities of the HVT program (as well as EVT) and to assist in course instruction. It is further recommended to continue using adjunct faculty members to teach concentrations in their respective areas of expertise.

Program Goals and Curriculum

The curriculum of the Hazardous Materials Technology (HMT) program was developed in the early 1990's, due primarily to an educational need presented by local public emergency responders to releases of hazardous materials as well those employed in similar job functions at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant. The program has substantial rigor and adequate course requirements in the sciences, math, and general education. While there are very few of these similar-named programs in the U.S., the core requirements resemble most that have been evaluated. Thus, there is no recommendation at this time to immediately change any of the requirements of the basic HMT curriculum. However, due to the existence of two very similar degree programs (i.e., EVT and HMT), and both with relatively low enrollments, considerations should be made in the future of possibly merging the two programs. And, due mainly to program marketability, it is in the evaluator's opinion that the best strategy would be to eliminate the HMT program as a degree program and offer it instead as a strong option in the EVT program.

For the short term, the main goal for the HMT program should be directed toward the growth of student enrollment. This would best be accomplished by the immediate hiring of full-time director/faculty member and a relentless effort at the marketing of this very resource-rich program (or potential program option). Another major effort that should be undertaken is the alignment of this degree program and its requirements with those of related, four-year degree programs available within the Ohio University system. The most promising two programs currently available as an avenue for students are the BS in Technical and Applied Studies (TAS) and the BS in Industrial Hygiene, available only on the Athens campus.
August 27, 2006

To Whom It May Concern:

On behalf of Ohio University-Chillicothe, I would like to provide a letter of agreement with the assessment and overall evaluation of the Environmental Engineering Technology and Hazardous Materials Technology academic program review.

Specifically, since this is the first program review for the Environmental Engineering Technology and Hazardous Materials Technology programs—we, too, are concerned about the program numbers and lack of faculty. We concur with the recommendation to combine programs to build enrollment. We also concur the most pressing need is for a full time program director and faculty member in order to build these program numbers.

In addition, we believe (as stated in the evaluator’s report) that these programs have much appeal in course content, hands-on experience, and the added feature of the Environmental Training and Research Center. The programs also provide certificate programs in Environmental Management, Environmental Restoration, Environmental Sampling Technician, Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Technician, and Health and Safety Technician which help to serve the community.

With the excellent facilities that are already in place, we believe a faculty member could generate successful interest in a newly combined program. Job placement for graduates has been good and graduates can build on the two year degree with a bachelor’s from Shawnee State University or at Ohio University in Technical and Applied Studies or Environmental Engineering.

If you need additional information to support this letter of agreement pertaining to the evaluation of the Environmental Engineering Technology and Hazardous Materials Technology academic programs, please contact me at 774.7207 or via email at lafrenie@ohio.edu.

Sincerely,

Michael Lafreniere, Associate Dean
Ohio University-Chillicothe
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The School of Hearing, Speech and Language Sciences (SHSLS) provides undergraduate and graduate education and clinical training in audiology and speech-language pathology. Speech, hearing, and language sciences lead to the Bachelor of Science (BS), Master of Arts (MA) in Audiology (now discontinued) and in Speech-Language Pathology, Clinical Doctorate in Audiology (AuD), and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degrees. The BS degree is a pre-professional degree and the MA program in Audiology officially closed in the spring of 2005. The AuD program was not approved until 2002 and because it is a new degree offering, no AuD degrees were awarded during the review period since admission of the first students in 2003. The MA and AuD programs are accredited by the Council on Academic Accreditation in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. During the review period, the School awarded a total of 412 BS degrees, yielding an annual graduation average of 59 students. The highest number of BS degrees awarded was 68 in 1988-99 and the lowest was 47 during the 2000-01 academic year. The 160 awarded MA degrees have varied from the highest number of 29 graduates during the 1997-98 and 2002-03 academic years, to a low of 20 in 1998-99. The annual average number of MA degrees granted during the review period was approximately 23. The total doctoral graduates have remained fairly steady in the first 4 years of the review period from 1996-2000 with one student graduating per year. There were no Ph.D. graduates in 2000-01 while two were awarded in the 2001-02 and 2002-03 academic years. There were a total of 8 doctoral graduates with an average number of 1 Ph.D. degree awarded per year during the review period. The admission and graduation goals of the SHSLS program appear to be reasonable and appropriate. Their goal of increasing minority students at all levels has been assisted by additional money through grants awarded from Ohio University for recruiting these students. The college appears to be aware that the region has low minority populations making the task of recruiting minority students difficult. The enrollment of international students at the graduate level helps with the balance of students in the program. In addition, the SHSLS program provides diversity oriented courses at all levels so that the students can increase their sensitivity towards people of different backgrounds, an important skill for professionals in rehabilitation professions. Graduates of the master's and audiology programs are employed in clinical careers in public schools, private practice, rehabilitation centers, hospitals, state agencies, and federal agencies. Graduates of the doctor of philosophy (Ph.D.) program are employed in teaching or research careers in universities, hospitals, state agencies or federal agencies as well as advanced clinical careers.

1. Faculty Profile

The most noticeable change in the SHSLS between the previous and present review periods is the significant change in the faculty. This seven year period was one in which several faculty members with many years of service at Ohio University retired. Thus, the balance of the faculty has changed from almost all senior, tenured faculty members to mostly junior, tenure track faculty that are currently in their probationary period. At the end of the review period, there were three (3) tenured faculty members and seven (7) non-tenured, tenure track faculty. The rationale in this change has been to hire new faculty members with potential to seek research grants and
disseminate knowledge through effective and innovative classroom teaching. The clinical faculty has also undergone a shift with the hiring of several new clinical faculty members. The SHSLS program has made a sincere effort to hire a diverse faculty during the review period. Among the academic faculty hired, there are three men of Asian descent. Similarly, among the clinical faculty there was one African American woman hired during the review period. Faculty scholarship goals are developed for each faculty member individually. These goals and annual faculty evaluation reports help tenure track faculty members monitor their progress toward tenure. Senior faculty mentor the junior faculty in this process and internal OU funding is made available for their research projects early in their careers in order for the project to progress to the point where the faculty will be competitive for external funding awarded by major federal granting agencies. The faculty of the SHSLS have opportunities to collaborate with other academicians and professionals through a variety of venues both on and off campus. Nearly all of the faculty members have some involvement with the clinic. The scholarly publications, presentations, and grant involvement were noticeably high during the review period however with a rather uneven distribution among the individual faculty members. This unevenness is attributed in the self-study report to the high number of retiring and newly hired faculty as well as the departure of a tenure denied faculty member and a changing faculty profile.

2. Programmatic Practices

The SHSLS has developed a set of articulated goals to guide the advancement of the school in student training, faculty scholarship, and professional services, which is assessed and re-evaluated during an annual faculty retreat at the beginning of each fall quarter. The undergraduate program goals focus on an academic foundation that provides a basis for further study and clinical training at the graduate level. Prior to the pre-registration period, the undergraduate coordinator conducts a group advising session for each quarter on separate evenings for freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors. All faculty advisors attend these group advising sessions and meet with their individual advisees following the group advising sessions. The professional programs in speech-language pathology and audiology are focused on effective clinical practice. The graduate program goals focus on research and scholarly development. The coordinator of professional programs assigns advisors to the entering masters and AuD students on the basis of their major area of study. Faculty members carry an advising load of about six (6) MA students, who are also counseled by the clinical supervisors. Thesis students often have a separate advisor and the individual thesis committees are formed by the thesis advisor and the student. The summative assessment tool for the professional programs in speech-language pathology and audiology is the PRAXIS examination provided by NTS for each content area. Doctoral students are matched with an advisor as part of the Ph.D. program admission process. The summative assessment tools for the Ph.D. program are the comprehensive examination and the dissertation defense.

3. Adequacy of Resources

The facilities for the SHSLS program are adequate in terms of office space, clinical equipment, and computing support. The location of the college is in the newly renovated and modernized Grover Center which provides sufficient office and laboratory space for faculty as well as the clinical facilities. Adequate computers and related equipment are available for faculty and staff. The college has computer laboratories with internet access available for students. A designated computer laboratory in the Hearing, Speech and Language and Physical Therapy Clinic is not connected to the internet. This, in turn, supports the privacy of clinical information to be HIPAA compliant. The computers in the clinic appear to be older and signs on them indicate that they are not always in satisfactorily working condition. Since these machines are used for HIPAA sensitive documents, they need to be kept in better operating condition. The SHSLS operates with a single
full-time staff person and the Hearing, Speech and Language and Physical Therapy Clinic operates with no full-time staff people. Both clinic offices are staffed by graduate assistants. The college has a technical support person to maintain the computer equipment. The Hearing, Speech and Language and Physical Therapy Clinic recently restructured its operations so that the clinic is financially self-supporting. This target is in keeping with efforts in other university clinics to control the costs of clinical services to the department and college.

II. Undergraduate Program Review

1) Program Goals and Curriculum

The undergraduate curriculum is designed to establish a general education in arts and sciences with a sound understanding of human communication processes and the basic scientific aspects of speech, language, and hearing for the pre-professional BS degree. This academic foundation provides a basis for further study and clinical training at the graduate level. The BS curriculum consists of 9 courses from the Basic Human Communication Sciences, 5 courses from the Pre-Professional Foundation, 6 elective courses within the major, 9 courses from related disciplines, 4 courses from the Biological and Physical Sciences, 1 Computer Literacy course, 3 courses from Cultural Diversity, 2 Foreign Language courses, 2 courses from Life Span, 2 Linguistics courses, and 2 courses from Special Needs. A significant percentage of the undergraduate students complete the program successfully in four (4) years. The total number of credit hours required for graduation was not specified in the self-study report.

2) Faculty

A typical faculty teaching load is two (2) courses (8 to 10 credit hours) per quarter. Over the review period, the school has experienced a moderately steady increase in credit hours taught to undergraduate students and a decrease in graduate credit hours. This situation is attributed to the increase in undergraduate enrollment and early faculty retirement. For the current review period, faculty members have averaged about 30 undergraduate advisees. Teaching evaluation scores have generally been high ranging from 3.5 to 4.9 as an overall ranking with an average 4.4 on a five-point scale, suggesting that the students are satisfied with teaching effectiveness. However, the self-study report does not include the overall outcomes of the student responses to such questions as the amount of learning and the level of difficulty.

3) Students

The minimum required GPA for HSLS undergraduate majors is 2.0. Students are admitted to the program simply by declaring the major. During the review period there were some shifts in the enrollment of students in the programs. At the undergraduate level, there was an increase from 217 to 244 students, an increase of 12.4%. Approximately 96% of these students are female and 4% male. Fewer than 2% of the students are African American, Asian American and Hispanic American, combined. Although the proportion of minority students appears low on the basis of numbers only, these numbers are a fair representation of the region of the state of Ohio and of the county in which Ohio University is located. The school has active campaigns to attract minority students at all levels. During the interview the undergraduate students commented they would be interested in having opportunities to observe in the clinic during their senior year. Presently, the undergraduate students have no contact with the clinic at all, and they would like the opportunity to observe the graduate students providing therapy to clients. Interviewed students commented they would also like to have more audiology courses in the undergraduate program, particularly in
the junior year. Such courses would be helpful to students in determining if they are interested in attending graduate programs in audiology.

4) Graduates

During the review period, the school has awarded a total number of 412 BS degrees, yielding an annual graduation average of 59 students. The highest BS graduation rate of 68 students was in 1988-99 and the lowest of 47 in the 2000-01 academic year. The SHSLS self-study report does not indicate the proportion of the undergraduate students who continue in graduate school. This information could be important to the program as the number of undergraduate students has increased over the period of this report. Since a graduate degree is required to practice as an audiologist or speech-language pathologist, it may be reasonable to restrict entry to the undergraduate program by requiring a 2.8 GPA of juniors and seniors. This GPA would be a minimum level for students to be successful in being admitted to a graduate program. If student awareness were increased by the higher GPA required to be retained in the program, they might select other related majors if they see that they cannot achieve the required GPA. This self selection may head off problems of students receiving the undergraduate degrees and wanting to practice in the profession but not being able to gain admittance into graduate school.

III. Graduate Program Review

1) Program Goals and Curriculum

The speech-language pathology master's degree program is considered the entry level degree and is accredited by the Council on Academic Accreditation of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA). The speech-language pathology program provides the necessary academic and clinical experiences leading to a professional certification and licensure. Teacher licensure is also an available option. Admission criterion to the MA program includes satisfactory GRE (Graduate Record Examination) scores and a minimum 3.0 undergraduate grade-point average (GPA) on a 4.0 scale. Students typically complete the program in two (2) years. It includes a planned sequence of 11 core courses, approved elective courses, clinical practicum, and a choice between one or two externships near the end of the program. Students satisfy all ASHA academic and clinical requirements for certification, including the National Teacher's Examination (Praxis) as part of the degree program. The Ph.D. degree in Hearing, Speech and Language Sciences is granted on the evidence of the candidate's high level of scholarship and proficiency in research. It requires the successful completion of at least 150 credit hours of graduate-level courses, written and oral examinations, and research. Ph.D. admission criteria require a 2- or 3-page narrative detailing previous experience and long- and short-term career objectives, letters of recommendation, GRE scores consistent with doctoral academic demands, a minimum 3.0 GPA from former undergraduate study, and interviews with the school director as well as the Ph.D. study coordinator and/or a potential faculty mentor in the student's intended area of study.

2) Faculty

Although the overall number of faculty to support the program has remained relatively constant over the review period, there have been significant changes in the faculty teaching within the school. The range of specializations among the present faculty is adequate to cover the curricular needs with the support of graduate students, part-time teaching staff, and early retirees. However, there is a great need for additional areas of representation in the Group I positions for Ph.D. study mentoring and recruitment, clinical education, and research productivity in the underrepresented...
areas. The faculty of the SHSLS program have been awarded five (5) NIH grants during the review period when they previously had none, and have been awarded three NSF grants. There have been 44 intramural and 27 extramural projects funded during this reporting period. The self-study report did not include the grant dollar amount vs. faculty statistics. Although the SHSLS faculty members have maintained a steady publication rate during the reporting period, averaging approximately 1.65 per faculty member per year and 4.43 national/international presentations per faculty member per year during the review period, this productivity has not been evenly distributed among the faculty.

3) Students

At the master's level, the discontinuation of the audiology program contributed to a decline from 53 to 44 students during the review period. At the Ph.D. level, the number of students was fairly constant in the range of 3 to 6 students. Approximately 1% of the graduate students are male and 99% are female. The proportion of minority groups in the graduate programs is similar to that in the undergraduate program, less than 2%. However, the graduate programs have a high proportion of international students, 18% of the master's students and 75% of the Ph.D. students. The quality of the graduate students has been good with GRE scores averaging around mean levels for each section of the exam. On the surface, it appears that graduate enrollment in the SHSLS has gone down slightly during the review period; however, this period marks a shift in the audiology professional program from a master's level program to a professional doctorate. The SHSLS professional doctorate program in audiology was approved in 2003. In the time since the end of the review period, 11 students have enrolled in the Doctor of Audiology program, resulting in an overall increase in professional degree students. The new audiology program should increase the percentage of male graduate students as the male to female proportion among students in audiology has been higher than among speech-language pathologists. At the end of the review period, the number of Ph.D. students enrolled in the SHSLS program had increased to nine (9).

4) Graduates

The awarded 160 MA degrees have varied from its highest number of 29 graduates in the 1997-98 and 2002-03 academic years, to its lowest value of 20 in 1999. The annual average number of MA degrees granted during the review period is approximately 23. The doctoral graduates have remained fairly steady in the first 4 years from 1996 to 2000 with one student per year. There were no Ph.D. graduates in 2000-01 while two were awarded in the years 2001-02 and 2002-03. This totals 8 doctoral graduates with an average number of roughly 1 Ph.D. degree per year in the review period.

IV. Overall Evaluation

The SHSLS has had a long history of teaching and research in speech and hearing sciences. It has shown significant growth through the review period in grant production. This growth is impressive given the transition that has occurred as senior faculty members have retired and junior faculty members have been hired. There has been a steady increase in undergraduate enrollment from 217 to 244, an increase of 12.4%, and a decrease in the MA program from 53 to 44 students, almost 17%. The Ph.D. enrollment has been low and remained steady over the review period by almost one (1) student per year. The SHSLS appears well poised for increasing the level of faculty scholarly productivity while maintaining the high quality of academic preparation of its undergraduate and graduate students. Strategic planning and an array of feedback mechanisms should help the growth continue. The support mechanisms in place should be adequate to mentor
the junior faculty as they develop as scholars. The goals of the SHSLS for increasing professional visibility through scholarship and service, increased student and faculty diversity, and increasing the number of Ph.D. students are appropriate. For a better preparation of the BS graduates for advance study, the SHSLS program should petition the university to raise the required junior and senior undergraduate GPA to 2.8 on a 4.0 scale. The undergraduate program will benefit from the inclusion of a course that includes clinic observation and an audiology course at the junior level. Upgrading the computers in the Hearing, Speech and Language Clinic is necessary. These machines are the only ones available to the students for writing HIPAA sensitive documents. As such, these machines should be a high priority for updated computer equipment.
Undergraduate Executive Summary

EVALUATION OF School of Hearing, Speech and Language Sciences

DATE April 2005

Commendations:

Over the review period, the school has experienced a moderately steady increase in credit hours taught to undergraduates per faculty member. This is attributed to the increase in undergraduate enrollment from 217 to 244, a 12.4% increase, and early faculty retirement. For the current review period, faculty members have averaged about 30 undergraduate advisees. Teaching evaluation scores have been generally high ranging from 3.5 to 4.9 with an overall average 4.4 on a five-point scale, suggesting that the students are generally satisfied with teaching effectiveness.

Concerns:

The SHSLS self-study report does not indicate the proportion of the undergraduate students who continue in graduate school. This information could be important to the program as the number of undergraduate students has increased over the period of this report. Since a graduate degree is required to practice as an audiologist or speech-language pathologist, it may be reasonable to restrict entry to the undergraduate program by requiring a 2.8 GPA of juniors and seniors. This GPA would be a minimum level for students to be successful in being admitted to a graduate program. If student awareness were increased by the higher GPA required to be retained in the program, they might select other related majors if they see that they cannot achieve the required GPA. This self selection may head off problems of students receiving the undergraduate degree, wanting to practice in the profession, and not being able to gain admittance into graduate school. Approximately 96% of the undergraduate students are female and 4% male. The school needs a better recruitment plan for a more uniform gender enrollment. The outcome of teaching evaluations has not been assessed in the self-study report. The outcomes of such questionnaires such as the level of course difficulty and the amount of learning should be included in the presented statistics for a more qualitative measure of teaching effectiveness.

Weaknesses:

The undergraduate students enrolled in the school are interested in having opportunities to observe in the clinic during their senior year. Presently, the undergraduate students have no contact with the clinic at all; they would like the opportunity to observe the graduate students providing therapy to clients. They would also like to have more audiology courses in the undergraduate program, particularly in the junior year. Such courses would be helpful to students in order to determine if they are interested in attending graduate programs in audiology.
Graduate Executive Summary

EVALUATION OF School of Hearing, Speech and Language Sciences

DATE April 2005

Commendations:

The range of specializations among the present faculty is adequate to cover the curricular needs with the support of graduate students, part-time teaching staff, and early retirees. During the review period, the SHSLS faculty has been awarded five (5) National Institutes of Health grants and three (3) National Science Foundation grants when they previously had none. There have been 44 intramural and 27 extramural projects funded during this reporting period with the respective total dollar amounts of $390,822 and $1,306,136. The SHSLS faculty members have maintained a steady publication rate during the reporting period, averaging approximately 1.65 per faculty member per year and 4.43 national/international presentations per faculty member per year during the review period.

Concerns:

There has been a decrease in the enrollment of the MA program from 53 to 44 students by approximately 17%. The Ph.D. enrollment has been low and remained steady over the review period by almost one (1) student per year. The self-study report does not include the grant dollar amount vs. faculty statistics. Scholarly publications and presentations have not been evenly distributed among the faculty. Although all HSLS doctoral students are required to maintain a B (3.0) or better GPA on a continuing basis, the school allows a Ph.D. student to have a grade of C (2.0) from a course to count toward degree requirements. The HSLS graduate committee should consider increasing this requirement from C to B for all the courses taken by the Ph.D. students. Approximately 1% of the graduate students are male and 99% are female. A better recruitment plan should be able to make the graduate student enrollment uniformly distributed over male and female genders.

Weaknesses:

Although the summative assessment for the Ph.D. program is the qualifying examination, there are no specific oral or written qualifying examination guidelines available for the students and faculty. No clinical data has been collected over the review period to indicate the effectiveness of the faculty and graduate students' involvement in clinical practice. There is a great need for additional areas of representation in the Group I positions for Ph.D. study mentoring and recruitment, clinical education, and research productivity in the underrepresented areas.
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Program Description, Mission, and Goals  

Description. The School of Hearing, Speech and Language Sciences (SHSLS) provides academic training in audiology, speech-language pathology, and speech, language and hearing science. The bachelor's degree in Hearing, Speech, and Language Sciences (B.S.) is pre-professional. The master's degree program in speech-language pathology (M.A.) and the doctoral program in audiology (AuD) are accredited by the Council on Academic Accreditation in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. Graduates of the master's and audiology programs are employed in clinical careers in public schools, private practice, rehabilitation centers, hospitals, state agencies, and federal agencies. Graduates of the doctor of philosophy (Ph.D.) program are employed in teaching or research careers in universities, hospitals, state agencies or federal agencies as well as advanced clinical careers. Each year, the SHSLS awards approximately 60 bachelor's degrees, approximately 25 master's degrees, and one doctoral degree. In two years the AuD program will begin awarding approximately six degrees per year.  

Mission. The mission of the SHSLS is “excellence in research and teaching undergraduate and graduate students who will be successful in future academic study and employment.” The mission of the Ohio University Hearing, Speech and Language Clinic is “to promote excellence in the clinical education of students and to provide high quality services to the community.”  

Goals. The SHSLS has developed a set of clearly articulated goals to guide the advancement of the department in student training, faculty scholarship, and professional service. These goals are evaluated and updated as necessary during an annual faculty retreat at the beginning of fall semester. The undergraduate program goals focus on a solid academic foundation that will provide a basis for further study and clinical training at the graduate level. The professional programs in speech-language pathology and audiology are focused on outcomes that will lead to excellence in clinical practice. The Ph.D. program goals focus on research and scholarly development. A variety of formative assessment techniques are used at all levels of academic training. The summative assessment for the professional programs in speech-language pathology and audiology is the PRAXIS Examination provided by NTS for each content area. The summative assessment for the Ph.D. program is the qualifying examination. The university provides means for the faculty members to enhance their teaching skills. The College and School leadership encourage faculty members to participate in these programs and to share new teaching strategies with fellow faculty members.
The SHSLS goals in scholarship include increased federal funding of research for the members of the faculty. Faculty scholarship goals are developed for each faculty member individually. These goals and annual FARS reports help tenure track faculty members monitor their progress toward tenure. Senior faculty members mentor the junior faculty in this process. The process for junior faculty development includes a progression from internal OU funding for early projects over a few years to external funding by federal agencies for major projects.

The SHSLS goals in service include increased visibility of the program at the national level and increased professional service to the local and regional community. The former is primarily organizational activity by faculty members and the latter is primarily recognizing and developing opportunities for providing professional speech, language, and hearing services in the local and regional community.

Students

Enrollment. During the review period there were some shifts in the enrollment of students in the programs. At the undergraduate level there was an increase from 217 to 244 students, an increase of 12.4%. Approximately 96% of these students are female and 4% male. Fewer than 2% of the students are African American, Asian American and Hispanic American, combined.

At the master’s level the discontinuation of the audiology program contributed to a decline from 53 to 44 students. Similarly, at the Ph.D. level, the number of students was fairly constant in the range of 3 to 6 students. Approximately 1% of the graduate students are male and 99% are female. The proportion of minority groups in the graduate programs is similar to that in the undergraduate program, less than 2%. However, the graduate programs have a high proportion of international students, 18% of the master’s students and 75% of the Ph.D. students. The quality of the graduate students has been good with GRE scores averaging around the mean levels for each section of the exam.

Comments. Although the proportion of minority students appears low on the basis of numbers only, these numbers are a fair representation of the region of the state of Ohio and of the country in which Ohio University is located. The department has active campaigns to attract minority students at all levels. With Ms. Wright on the faculty the SHSLS is likely to see an increase in the enrollment of African American students. The ability of the program to attract international students indicates that the program is making successful efforts to attract a diverse study body.

On the surface, it appears that graduate enrollment in the SHSLS has gone down slightly during the review period; however, this period marks a shift in the audiology professional program from a master’s level program to a professional doctorate one. The SHSLS professional doctorate program in audiology was approved in 2003. In the time since the end of the review period 11 students have enrolled in the Doctor of Audiology program, resulting in an overall increase in professional degree students. The addition of the audiology program should increase the percentage of male graduate students as the male to female proportion among students in audiology has been higher than among speech-language pathologists. In addition, since the end of the review period the number of Ph.D. students enrolled in the SHSLS program has increased to nine.

The goals of the SHSLS program in regards to students appear to be reasonable and appropriate. Their goal of increasing minority students at all levels has been assisted
by additional money through grants from Ohio University for recruiting these students. The program and college administration are aware that the region has low minority populations making the task of recruiting minority students difficult. The enrolling of international students at the graduate level helps the balance of students in the program. In addition, the SHSLS program provides diversity oriented courses at all levels so that the students can increase their sensitivity toward people of different backgrounds, an important skill for professionals in rehabilitation professions.

The recent, post review period, growth of the SHSLS Ph.D. program has resulted in a cohort of students that provides adequate collegial opportunities among the students. The program goal of 14 to 15 students is reasonable considering that the junior faculty will be increasing grant submissions and productivity that should attract additional Ph.D. students.

The SHSLS self-study report does not indicate the proportion of the undergraduate students who continue in graduate school. This information could be important to the program as the number of undergraduate students has increased over the period of this report. Since a graduate degree is required to practice as an audiologist or speech-language pathologist, it may be reasonable to restrict entry to the undergraduate program by requiring a 2.8 GPA of juniors and seniors. This GPA would be a minimum level for students to be successful in being admitted to a graduate program. If student awareness were increased by the higher GPA required to be retained in program, they might select other related majors if they see that they cannot achieve that GPA. This self selection may head off problems of students receiving the undergraduate degree, wanting to practice the profession, and not being able to gain admittance into graduate school.

The undergraduate students would be interested in having opportunities to observe in the clinic during their senior year. Presently, the undergraduate students have no contact with the clinic at all; they would like the opportunity to observe the graduate students providing therapy to clients. They would also like to have more audiology courses in the undergraduate program, particularly in the junior year. Such courses would be help students determine if they are interested in attending graduate programs in audiology.

The graduate students indicated that faculty were available to answer questions and for professional discussions. They stated that they felt a good level of collegiality between the faculty members and themselves. In addition, the professional program students in both speech-language pathology and audiology indicated that it was evident that the academic and clinical faculty members were in regular communication.

Faculty

Composition. The most striking change in the SHSLS between the previous review period and the present one is the shift in the academic faculty. This seven year period was one in which several academic faculty members with many years of service at Ohio University retired. Thus, the balance of the academic faculty has gone from almost all senior, tenured faculty members to almost all junior, tenure accruing. At the end of the review period there were three tenured faculty members and seven tenure accruing. With this shift in faculty members, the leadership at the college and program level has emphasized hiring new faculty members who have the potential to generate new knowledge through research and grants as well as disseminate knowledge through
effective and innovative classroom teaching. Similarly, the clinical faculty has undergone a shift with the hiring of several new clinical faculty members.

The SHSLS program has made a sincere effort to hire a diverse faculty during the review period. Among the academic faculty hired there were three men of Asian descent. Similarly, among the clinical faculty there was one African American woman.

**Productivity.** The faculty of the SHSLS program has blossomed as a grant producing group. During the review period they have been awarded five NIH grants when they previously had none and have been awarded three NSF grants. There have been 44 intramural and 27 extramural projects funded during this reporting period. The SHSLS faculty members have maintained a steady publication rate during the reporting period, averaging approximately 1.65 per faculty member per year. They also made an average of 4.43 national/international presentations per faculty member per year during the review period. These publications and presentations provide professional visibility for the SHSLS program and enhance its reputation.

**Collaborative Efforts.** The faculty of the SHSLS has opportunities to collaborate with other academics and professionals through a variety of venues both on-campus and off-campus. Nearly all of the faculty members have some involvement with the clinic. This involvement provides research opportunities for the academic faculty. It also provides opportunities for the academic and clinical faculty members to share evaluation and treatment ideas. Other clinically oriented collaborative experiences include the Appalachian Rural Health Institute. This interdisciplinary institute involves the Schools of Nursing and Physical Therapy from the College of Health and Human Services as well as the College of Osteopathic Medicine. The SHSLS faculty has been involved in the development of a diabetes and biotechnology program.

Other on-campus collaborative opportunities occur through the Institute for the Empirical study of Language (IESL). The IESL includes faculty members from the SHSLS, Psychology, Modern Languages, Linguistics, and Education. Involvement in the IESL has resulted in workshops at Ohio University on various aspects of language, invitation of nationally renowned guest lecturers, and in specific research projects. Other on-campus collaborative efforts have included work with the faculty in Engineering that has resulted in NSF Biomedical Engineering grant funding.

The members of the SHSLS faculty are also involved in several off-campus collaborative efforts. The members of the faculty have collaborated on research projects with colleagues from over 20 other institutions during this review period. Such collaborations enhance the visibility and reputation of the program. In addition, one faculty member has developed a collaborative relationship with the Capital University of Medical Sciences in Beijing, China. It is anticipated that this collaboration will result in research projects as well as student and faculty exchanges. Another member of the SHSLS faculty of the SHSLS program was invited to be a visiting scholar at the University of Leipzig and helped developed Ohio University’s Ohio-Leipzig European Center. This collaboration has resulted in a student from Leipzig being admitted as a combined M.A.-Ph.D. student in the SHSLS program.

**Comment.** In conjunction with ongoing hiring to fill one academic and one clinical audiology position, the number of academic faculty appears to be adequate for the size of the department. The content areas of the profession appear to be well covered by either full time or emeritus faculty. The group of emeritus faculty provides a strong
service to the department by teaching courses. Their teaching allows the junior faculty additional time to develop their scholarly agenda. Without the work from the emeritus faculty the teaching loads of the junior faculty would compromise their ability to develop their research plans.

The scholarly productivity of grants, publications, and presentations has been strongly carried by a single individual. Her productivity accounted for over 50% of the publications during the last six years of the reporting period. Increased productivity by the junior faculty during the last two years of the reporting period reduced her proportion of the external presentations. The other current senior faculty member arrived at Ohio University after the review period; he should soon demonstrate increased research productivity. This increase should help make the distribution of research products more equitable across faculty members. As the junior faculty approach and acquire tenure, their efforts should increase this distribution also.

The promise for increased scholarly productivity from this faculty is strong. The clear research plan that each junior faculty member has and the mentoring that each receives for developing scholarship, article writing and grant writing should assist them at meeting their goals. The junior faculty members all reported that the SHSLS is a nurturing environment that is providing them the opportunity to meet their professional goals. They indicate that there is good collegiality. They also mentioned appreciating the level of strategic planning for the curriculum and research in the SHSLS program.

With the clear need for mentorship among the strong junior faculty and only two tenured faculties available to provide that mentoring, it may be wise for the Director of the SHSLS program to reduce duties at the college level. That reduction will allow her to concentrate on the development of the faculty in her program.

Facilities and Support

Facilities. The physical facilities for the SHSLS program are adequate in terms of space and equipment. The space in the Grover Center provides adequate office and laboratory space for the academic faculty and adequate clinical and office space for the clinical faculty. Adequate computers and related equipment are available for faculty and staff. The college has computer laboratories with internet connectivity available for students. In addition, there is a computer laboratory in the Hearing, Speech and Language and Physical Therapy Clinic. This computer laboratory is not connected to the internet so the privacy of clinical information is guaranteed to be HIPAA compliant.

All of the junior faculty members reported that they had received adequate support and grant opportunities from the SHSLS, College of Health and Human Services, and Ohio University to establish their research agenda.

The SHSLS operates with a single full-time staff person and the Hearing, Speech and Language and Physical Therapy Clinic operates with no full-time staff people. Both offices are staffed by graduate assistants. The college has a technical support person to maintain the computer equipment.

The Hearing, Speech and Language and Physical Therapy Clinic recently restructured its operations so that the clinic is financially self-supporting. This target is in keeping with efforts in other university clinics to control the costs of clinical services to the department and college.
Comment. The SHSLS appears to be well supported by the university and the college. The building facilities and equipment are appropriate for all activities of the faculty. The computers in the clinic appear to be older and signs on them indicate that they do not always work well. Since these machines are used for HIPAA sensitive documents, they need to be kept in better running condition.

Given the rural setting of Ohio University, it is impressive that the clinic has been able to become financially self-sufficient. This accomplishment requires significant effort to get the clinic to operate efficiently and to develop the necessary contracts with clients away from the university.

Summary and Recommendations

The SHSLS has had a long history as a respected program in speech and hearing sciences. This history should continue as the SHSLS makes adjustments to develop in the future. It has shown significant growth through the review period in grant production. This growth is impressive given the transition that has occurred as senior faculty members have retired and junior faculty members have been hired. The SHSLS appears well poised for increasing the level of faculty scholarly productivity while maintaining the high quality of academic preparation of its undergraduate and graduate students. Clear strategic planning and an array of feedback mechanisms should help the growth continue. The support mechanisms in place should be adequate to mentor the junior faculty as they develop as scholars.

The goals of the SHSLS for increasing professional visibility through scholarship and service, increased student and faculty diversity, and increasing the number of Ph.D. students are appropriate. The energy of the administration and faculty members in pursuing these goals will help in achieving them.

Recommendations for assisting the SHSLS increase its level of excellence include the following. The rationales for these recommendations are included in the comment sections of this report.

1. The SHSLS program should petition the university to raise the required junior and senior undergraduate GPA to 2.8 on a 4.0 scale.

2. The SHSLS Curriculum Committee should consider the requests of the students for changes to the undergraduate program. These changes should include a course that includes clinic observation and an audiology course at the junior level.

3. Upgrade the computers in the Hearing, Speech and Language Clinic. These machines are the only ones available to the students for writing HIPAA sensitive documents. As such, these machines should be a high priority for updated computer equipment.
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ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW
Response from the School of Hearing, Speech and Language Sciences

Overall, the review report draft is highly complementary to the program. Substantive responses only to areas of concern are summarized below. Two of the items mentioned in the last paragraph of the report are erroneous; we have addressed those in the final section below.

I. General Program Information

3) Adequacy of Resources

The following statement is made about a concern with computers in the clinic:
The computers in the clinic appear to be older and signs on them indicate that they are not always in satisfactorily working condition. Since these machines are used for HIPAA sensitive documents, they need to be kept in better operating condition.
Response: This is a true statement, and we share the concerns about this situation. Dean Neiman and Assistant Dean Doug Franklin have agreed to address the situation and to have newer and more reliable computers in place during the Fall 2005 quarter.

II. Undergraduate Program Review

1) Program Goals and Curriculum

The following statement is made about graduation rates on page 3:
A significant percentage of the undergraduate students complete the program successfully in four (4) years.
Response: According to Institutional Research data, graduation rates of HSLS undergraduate majors are among the best at Ohio University in terms of time to completion. With averages ranging from 4.05 to a maximum of 4.16 during the seven-year period under review.

The following statement is made on page 3:
The total number of credit hours required for graduation was not specified in the self-study report.
Response: The total number of credit hours is 192, consistent with Ohio University and College of Health and Human Service graduation requirements.

2) Faculty
The following statement is made on page 3:
The self-study report does not include the overall outcomes of the student responses to such questions as the amount of learning and the level of difficulty.
Response: This information was not requested. We do, however, engage in extensive and multifaceted qualitative and quantitative outcomes assessment, both formative and
summative, as described in the review report, and we regularly use these data in programmatic improvement, including improvement in teaching within individual courses.

3) Students

The following statement is made on page 3:

During the interview the undergraduate students commented they would be interested in having opportunities to observe in the clinic during their senior year. Presently, the undergraduate students have no contact with the clinic at all, and they would like the opportunity to observe the graduate students providing therapy to clients.

Response: Undergraduate students regularly observe in the clinic; all HSLS majors are given the opportunity to acquire the 25 hours of observation experience required prior to enrollment in clinical practicum. The sophomore through senior Pre-Professional Practice course sequence requires a series of service experiences within diverse professional contexts, and all undergraduate majors are required to 1) discuss their observational and service experiences during class discussions and 2) include extensive written summaries of their observations in a capstone portfolio. Additionally, HSLS undergraduate students are provided ample additional co-curricular opportunities to engage in volunteer work with clinical populations through numerous community activities sponsored by the local chapter of the National Student Speech-Language-Hearing Association, HSLS clinical research experiences, and the Ohio University Respite Volunteer Program, all based in the School.

The following statement is made on page 3:

Interviewed students commented they would also like to have more audiology courses in the undergraduate program, particularly in the junior year. Such courses would be helpful to students in determining if they are interested in attending graduate programs in audiology.

Response: The reason students may have mentioned this is unclear to us. Perhaps some students in audiology feel overwhelmed by the large majority of students in their classes who wish to enter the field of speech-language pathology rather than audiology, and perhaps this flavors their perception of the curriculum. We offer more courses in and related to audiology than most undergraduate programs in our field, as ascertained through curriculum comparisons facilitated through the Council of Academic Programs in Communication Sciences and Disorders.

Undergraduate courses in HSLS directly addressing audiology include the following (numbers indicate corresponding credit hours):

- HSLS 108-Intro to Communication Disorders, 5
- HSLS 240-Professional Orientation, 3
- HSLS 253-Hearing Science, 4
- HSLS 300 Aging and Disorders of Communication, 4
- HSLS 313-Anatomy/Neurology of Speech, 4
HSLS 390 Introduction to Research in Hearing, Speech and Language Sciences, 4
HSLS 341 Intro to Professional Practice I, 2
HSLS 379 Basic Manual Communication, 4
HSLS 380 Basic Audiology, 5
HSLS 419 Organic Communication Disorders, 4
HSLS 442 Intro to Professional Practice II, 4
HSLS 471 Aural Rehabilitation, 4
HSLS 480 Advanced Manual Communication, 4

Undergraduate courses in HSLS indirectly addressing audiology include the following:
HSLS 208 Phonetics, 5
HSLS 252 Speech Science, 4
HSLS 310 Language Development, 5

Additionally, HSLS majors generally take elective courses in biology, psychics, psychology, and education that serve as excellent foundation in areas directly related to audiology. Furthermore, students wanting to further explore the field of audiology have the opportunity to join the Undergraduate Research Club. This allows a student to explore interests and topics in small group settings. Students are often very interested in clinically-based research; enrollment in the club exposes them to information on the clinical and research aspects of the field of audiology. Additional courses in audiology require graduate-level academic preparation.

4) Graduates

The following statement is made on page 5:
The SHSLS self-study report does not indicate the proportion of the undergraduate students who continue in graduate school. This information could be important to the program as the number of undergraduate students has increased over the period of this report.

For the period under review we do not have reliable data regarding the proportion of students who wished to enter graduate school and were not admitted. This is because many HSLS BS graduates choose not to enter graduate school in the fields of speech-language pathology or audiology, and yet are successful in other careers and/or graduate school options in other disciplines. New survey data collected through a special HSLS survey administered by Institutional Research will help us to study the rejection rate of OU HSLS grads who apply to graduate school in the field.

The following statement is made on page 5:
Since a graduate degree is required to practice as an audiologist or speech-language pathologist, it may be reasonable to restrict entry to the undergraduate program by requiring a 2.5 GPA of juniors and seniors. This GPA would be a minimum level for students to be successful in being admitted to a graduate program. If student awareness were increased by the higher GPA required to be retained in the program, they might select other related majors if they see that they cannot achieve the required GPA. This self selection may head off problems of students receiving the undergraduate degrees and
wanting to practice in the profession but not being able to gain admittance into graduate school.

We have one of the largest undergraduate programs in the world. Perhaps this is a nice feature of distinction for OU. At the same time, it drains essential resources that would better complement our graduate program and scholarly productivity goals. Given the competition for admission to MA/MS and AuD programs, it is true that a large proportion of our undergraduate student body graduating each year cannot be successful in gaining admission into a graduate program.

The HSLS faculty are in favor of raising the CPA standard so that 1) the overall quality of students in the major would be greater, 2) a larger proportion of graduates would be able to gain admission to graduate school, and 3) some of the resources now allocated to maintaining such a large and labor-intensive undergraduate program could be dedicated to priority areas in our graduate programs. However, we are not able to implement a GPA standard now due to the University’s goal of increasing enrollment and retaining undergraduates. To address this issue, we have been requesting additional full-time teaching positions to aid with our large undergraduate enrollments while we further enhance our graduate programs.

To address issues of undergraduate students who may not be competitive for entry into graduate school, we have implemented the following strategies:

- Ongoing reminders about graduate school requirements and CPA expectations at all group and individual advising sessions for students in every academic year,
- Advising handouts about viable career and graduate school options for those who do not wish to attend graduate school in the field or who will not be able to gain entry into graduate school
- Periodic faculty visits to the HSLS undergraduate student organization (NSSLHA) to discuss graduate school and career options
- Periodic HSLS advising workshops on strategies for the graduate school application process
- Discussion of graduate school admission requirements and discussion of academic and career alternatives in the sophomore Professional Orientation course and the junior and senior Preprofessional practice courses.

### III. Graduate Program Review

2) Faculty

The following statement is made on page 4:

> There is a great need for additional areas of representation in the Group I positions for Ph.D. study mentoring and recruitment, clinical education, and research productivity in the underrepresented areas.

This is true. We are currently searching for two Group I faculty members, and we continue to request additional positions (Group II) to address the need for additional help in teaching, mentoring, recruiting, advising, minority representation, research productivity, and external funding.
Graduate Executive Summary

Concerns

The following statement is made on page 8:

There has been a decrease in the enrollment of the MA program from 53 to 44 students by approximately 17%.

Response: This decrease is an artifact of the change from the MA program in audiology, which was discontinued, to the AuD program.

The following statement is made on page 8:

The Ph.D. enrollment has been low and remained steady over the review period by almost one (1) student per year.

Response: A major priority for the program is enhancement and expansion of the PhD program, and we expect to see a continued rise in the number of program graduate per year over the next seven years. With a new research-intensive faculty in place and the retirement of several faculty members who did not have sufficient research activity to support appropriate PhD-level research experiences and mentorship, we are now well-suited to make important gains in this priority area.

The following statement is made on page 8:

Scholarly publications and presentations have not been evenly distributed among the faculty.

Response: This was because of the disparity in research involvement among the individual faculty members present during the review period. Every one of the current faculty members publishes regularly, and 100% of the Group I faculty have federal research funding, pending federal grants, and/or a proposal in preparation for submission in the near future.

The following statement is made on page 8:

Although all HSLS doctoral students are required to maintain a B (3.0) or better GPA on a continuing basis, the school allows a Ph.D. student to have a grade of C (2.0) from a course to count toward degree requirements. The HSLS graduate committee should consider increasing this requirement from C to B for all the courses taken by the Ph.D. students almost one (1) student per year.

Response: This policy is simply based on the university requirements. We have not found this issue to be of concern, as it is extremely rare for a PhD student to have a grade of C. Also, most of our Ph.D. graduates accrue more than the required number of hours for the Ph.D. program.

The following statement is made on page 8:

Approximately 1% of the graduate students are male and 99% are female. A better recruitment plan should be able to make the graduate student enrollment uniformly distributed over male and female genders.

Response: This is an important concern throughout our profession. We have been actively involved in recruiting male students, in offering ample mentorship opportunities to male students in all of our degree programs, and in making specific targeted appeals to undergraduate males who are undecided majors. We welcome any suggestions for enhancing recruitment of males.

Weaknesses
The following statement is made on page 8:

Although the summative assessment for the Ph.D. program is the qualifying examination, there are no specific oral or written qualifying examination guidelines available for the students and faculty. No clinical data have been collected over the review period to indicate the effectiveness of the faculty and graduate students' involvement in clinical practice.

Response: These statements are false. This information was not part of what was requested or included in the original seven-year review report. Still, when the internal site visitor requested this information, we compiled numerous documents to demonstrate evidence in both of these specific areas of assessment. The reviewer in question was removed from the internal review process and thus no longer available to review the great deal of documentation we had made available. Our expert external reviewer did review those documents and had no concerns whatsoever about them. He did not mention either of these issues as concerns in his review report.

The summative assessment for the Ph.D. program is not the qualifying examination. What the internal reviewer called the “qualifying” examination is what we in HSLS call the “comprehensive examination.” This is summative only of the academic coursework component of the Ph.D. program. If occurs much earlier than the final summative assessment, which is the oral defense of the dissertation. The external site visitor complemented us on our Ph.D. program guidelines, on our comprehensive examination format, and on our means of assessing and providing formative feedback to Ph.D. students throughout their programs.

Ample guidance is given to each Ph.D. student regarding expectations and means of preparation for the comprehensive examination. Details about the examination are provided in the HSLS Ph.D. program guidelines. The comprehensive examination committee meets with each student to discuss the composition of the examination long (most often several months, depending on the student’s wishes) prior to the examination. We have verified with the former School director and have confirmed with all faculty who were here during the period under review that we have not had a single complaint from any Ph.D student about a lack of guidance for any of the Ph.D. examinations, including the comprehensive examination.

The statement about the lack of clinical data is false. Data pertaining to clinical effectiveness of our faculty and students were made available to the internal and external reviewers through the following substantial formats:

- ASHA accreditation documents, verifying our meeting all standards of professional clinical practice throughout the review period (The ASHA accreditation process requires ample evidence of clinical outcomes and client satisfaction);
- CVs including excellent clinical credentials, current state licensure, and national clinical certification, of all of our staff involved in clinical practice and clinical supervision;
- HSLS evaluations of students’ on-campus practicum performance;
- HSLS evaluation of students’ off-campus practicum performance;
- External supervisors’ evaluation of student preparation for clinical externships;
- HSLS student evaluation of supervision and clinical sites for externship experiences;
- Assessment of students within HSLS clinical courses;
- Results of two regional marketing surveys completed by the College of Business demonstrating positive impact of the clinic as measured by client/patient and community member feedback; and
• Evidence of competitively awarded clinical contracts in numerous clinical sites across nine counties in our region, many demonstrating lasting positive clinical relationships due to excellent service for periods of over 20 years.

The internal reviewer made the two statements in question here, despite the fact that he was removed from the review process prior to engaging in full examination of the requested evidence. The external reviewer, who did review this evidence, was highly complementary about our performance and did not share the internal reviewer's concerns. For these reasons, we have requested that those comments be removed from the final review report.

The following statement is made on page 8:

There is a great need for additional areas of representation in the Group I positions for Ph.D. study mentoring and recruitment, clinical education, and research productivity in the underrepresented areas.

Response: This is true. We plan to hire two additional group I faculty members this year, to begin in Fall 2006, and we will continue to request additional positions for Group II faculty.

Submitted by Dr. Brooke Hollowell, Director
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I. General Program Information

Computer Science Technology (CTCH) is a two-year program, first offered in 1985 at Ohio University-Lancaster campus and offered continuously since that date at Lancaster. Since the fall of 2000, Ohio University-Chillicothe and Ohio University-Southern (Ironton) campuses started to offer the CTCH. As a two-year program, CTCH leads to the Associate in Applied Business (A.A.B.) degree in computer science technology and prepares students for a professional career in information technology and related fields in the computer profession. The associate degree can be terminal or it can serve as the first two years of the Baccalaureate degree in either Business or Organizational Communications. Courses offered take a business approach to the functional areas of computer programming, system analysis, and network administration.

The Lancaster regional campus has two Group I faculty, one of which is the program coordinator. Chillicothe campus presently is in search of a program director. All other faculty are either adjunct or part-time instructors. The Southern campus has hired a full-time faculty in the last Fall quarter. The 7-year self study report was prepared by the director of Lancaster campus (David Collopy) prior to the hire of the Southern campus director (Pradeep Mohanty). Patricia Griffith and Eric Cunningham (administrative associates at Chillicothe campus) assisted him in the report preparation.

The CTCH program is administered independently by the Lancaster, Chillicothe, and Ironton campuses. There is no active advisory committee assigned to the program as a whole for planning, assessing, and overseeing its overall status in this rapidly growing field. Only the Lancaster and Southern campuses have their own local advisory committees. There is no any working relationship between the program and local businesses and industries. The Lancaster campus periodically invites community professionals into their classrooms.

The program director provides course syllabi and class materials as needed. He is also responsible for textbook selections, course scheduling, hiring adjunct or part-time instructors, and evaluating their classroom performance. He also resolves transfer credit issues. The Lancaster director also reviews credentials of the adjuncts for the other regional campuses. Directors of the Chillicothe and Ironton campuses work directly with the Lancaster program coordinator to assure consistency in course offerings and subject content. The recently hired director of the Ironton campus has the same responsibilities as the directors on the other campuses.

The CTCH program consists of 98 credit hours. Students are required to complete 98-credit hours of course work to earn the A.A.B. degree with 45 of those hours coming from outside the CTCH program. A full time student typically works 25 hours a week and takes between 14 - 16 credit hours per quarter. The CTCH program currently has 104 majors distributed among three campuses (Lancaster, Chillicothe, and Southern). Anecdotal evidence suggests that approximately 50% of the CTCH majors continue their education beyond the associate degree, and that the majority enrolls in the College of Business. Many current CTCH majors work either full or part time. As a result, approximately 30-40% of the majors take a part-time academic load. No statistics on the employment status of graduates is currently available.
1. Faculty Profile

Each regional campus has two Group I faculty, one of which is the program coordinator. Chillicothe campus presently is in search of a program director. All other faculty are either adjunct or part-time instructors. The Lancaster program, started in 1985, has been directed since its inception by David Collopy, a full time faculty member. The department hired Christine Wolfe as a second full time faculty member in Autumn 2001. The department has been managed well. The Ironton program, started in Autumn 2000, was directed until recently by the school administration with the guidance and support of David Collopy. This past summer, Prodeep Mohanty was hired as a full time faculty member and the director of the program. Prodeep seems to be an outstanding choice for the job. He possesses a good computer science background, much business experience in the field, a good grasp of the issues involved in running such a program, and enthusiasm for confronting this challenge. The Chillicothe program, initiated in 2000, has been directed by a school administrator under the guidance and support of David Collopy. The program is currently in search of a full time faculty member who will also serve as a program director. It is crucial for the program to hire a new faculty member who has both a strong computer science background and business experience in the field. Regretfully, the departments currently do not have a common supervisory committee or other working relationships with local businesses and industries.

Two faculty, out of the twelve part time faculty members, were interviewed in Lancaster, both having appointments in the university at other units. Recent teaching schedules suggest very limited need for, and contact with, external part time faculty members. Five of the seven part time faculty members at Ironton participated in the review process. The major complaint in Ironton was that the part timers were not actively involved in running the program and had limited involvement with the program. There is a strong expectation that the hiring of Prodeep as a program director will result in a major improvement in this respect. The self-study report lists two full time and nine part time faculty members for the Chillicothe program. The two faculty members listed as full time have their base at other units of the university, with part time appointments at the CTCH program. We met four faculty members. They expressed comments similar to those heard in Ironton. The faculty members seem to have very little interaction among themselves as well as with the faculty members at the other campuses.

It is reasonable to expect that many of these problems will be solved by hiring a full time faculty member as the CTCH program director for Chillicothe and an additional faculty for Ironton.

2. Programmatic Practices

The program director at Lancaster campus working in collaboration with full time staff is responsible for staffing all CTCH courses. Teaching assignments are made based on the faculty's area of interest and expertise. Computer Science majors are divided between the two full time faculty members for purposes of advising. No formal training in advising is given, but the faculty members meet with Student Services and Regional Higher Education personnel to discuss advising and graduation requirement issues. Normally, formal advising takes place prior to quarterly registration, and frequently throughout the quarter. Both faculty members advise approximately 20 to 25 students per quarter. The program director advises CTCH majors and works with academic advisors and coordinators on the other regional campuses in order to provide them with current information concerning the curriculum, class schedule, staffing, course selection sequences, and to resolve any problems experienced by the students.
At the Chillicothe campus, the CTCH majors are assigned to the administrative coordinator for advising. The administrative coordinator works closely with the program director at Lancaster and Student Services to track curriculum changes and content, transfer credit, and the University requirements for graduations. On a quarterly basis, email messages are sent to all majors to remind them of important upcoming dates and to encourage advising appointments prior to registering for upcoming quarters. The program is currently searching for a full-time faculty member with a strong computer science background who will also serve as a program director and has business experience in the field.

The Southern campus hired a Group I faculty member in fall 2003 to coordinate the CTCH program. The coordinator has taken over the responsibilities of advising, teaching, staffing, recruiting students, and collaborating with the other directors. Prior to this, Student Services is primarily responsible for advising the CTCH majors, and the Associate Dean has been scheduling the course offerings and staffing the courses. Both Student Services and the Associate Dean were working with the Lancaster program director to resolve course offerings, graduation, and curriculum issues.

3. Adequacy of Resources

The CTCH program has 4 computer labs on all there campuses which are used for dual (lecture/lab) purposes. There were no major complaints about the lack of resources. However, it appears that not all of the campuses have instructional database software and some students cannot afford a PC at home. Considering the very cheap cost of basic PCs, the program should plan loaning such machines to students in need in all regional campuses. The program branches should consider placing web pages in the public domain to include general information about the program, detailed descriptions of the course offerings, and pointers to web pages of the faculty members and students. In turn, the faculty members should be encouraged to put their vitas and much of their course material on their public sites. The web pages can help promote the departments and motivate the faculty members to prepare high quality material for possible scrutiny by anonymous readers.

II. Undergraduate Program Review

1) Program Goals and Curriculum

The CTCH leads to the Associate in Applied Business (A.A.B.) degree in computer science technology and prepares students for a professional career in information technology and related fields in the computer profession. The associate degree can be terminal or it can serve as the first two years of the Baccalaureate degree in either Business or Organizational Communications. Courses offered take a business approach to the functional areas of computer programming, system analysis, and network administration. The CTCH program consists of 98 credit hours. Students are required to complete 98-credit hours of course work to earn the A.A.B. degree with 45 of those hours coming from outside the CTCH program. A full-time student typically works 25 hours a week and takes between 14 - 16 credit hours per quarter.

The existing curriculum is somewhat outdated. The newly approved networking courses, developed across all campuses prior to the hire of Prodeep Mohanty, are expected to improve the curriculum considerably. The CTCH 125 course should provide for a test-out option. It is an entry-level course covering material that many students are expected to be familiar with from high
school or self study. The introductory programming courses probably would be better off moving to Java instead of Cobol. It should be clarified what are the implications of the proposed curriculum for students who are interested in pursuing a baccalaureate degree. Joint classes through teleconferencing should be considered for the different campuses to better utilize the expertise of the different faculty members. The Lancaster campus realizes the need to be more flexible and responsive to the ever-changing market. Hence, a 4-track system was proposed about a year and a half ago by the Lancaster campus to meet that need. More recently, the Southern and Chillicothe campuses have been involved in shaping the degree tracks, namely, Software Development and Testing, Network and System Administration, Database Systems, and Website Development and Management.

2) Faculty

The Lancaster teaching assignments of the past three years provided in the Appendix G of the self-study report show Christine Wolfe to be the most prolific faculty member. She taught ten different courses all across the program curriculum. Her resume attests to her qualifications. A recent M.S. degree in Computer Science, in 2000, a B.S. degree in Mathematics, and fifteen years of work experience in computer technology. Her resume does not list other services to the university and community but the self-study report offers a few details. The Lancaster teaching assignments for David Collopy show many sections of the entry level course of CTCH 125 and a few specialized introductory programming language courses classes to set the tone for the program and to recruit students into the program. In 2000-2001, the year before Christine was hired, the rest of the courses were assigned to other part-time faculty members to teach. David published a few introductory books in traditional programming languages related to his teaching assignments. His course assignments do not show professional development into more contemporary and advanced topics. His professional interest includes database management, artificial intelligence, computer viruses, compiler and assembler, networking, and data structures. David deserves a lot of service credits for directing the program in Lancaster and offering support and guidance to the Chillicothe and Ironton programs. Christine and David are full-time faculty members of the Lancaster program. The part-time faculty members of the past two years have been assigned only a few courses, and those faculty members were well qualified to teach the courses. The new hire Prodeep Mohanty at Ironton has fine academic and professional experience. The part-time faculty members probably are not fit for teaching most of the courses beyond the introductory level course CTCH 125. The Chillicothe program has a couple of good external part-time faculty members. However, the program is in critical need of a full-time faculty as a program director with good academic and business backgrounds in the computer technology field.

3) Students

The CTCH program currently has 104 majors distributed among three campuses (Lancaster, Chillicothe, and Southern). A anecdotal evidence suggests that approximately 50% of the CTCH majors continue their education beyond the associate degree, and that the majority enroll in the College of Business. Many current CTCH majors work either full or part-time. As a result, approximately 30-40% of the majors take a part-time academic load. No statistics on the employment status of graduates is currently available.

We had the opportunity to meet students at Lancaster and Chillicothe, but not at Ironton. We received course evaluation data only in Chillicothe. Many of the Lancaster students had jobs and are enrolled in the program to improve their prospects for better jobs. They expressed satisfaction
with the instructors. There were considerable claims that the curriculum does not provide sufficient hands-on training. The Chillicothe students expressed satisfaction with some of the instructors, and dissatisfaction with others, consistent with the data in the course evaluation forms. The students seemed to be very mature but in great need of guidance and mentoring. A new full time faculty member hire for the program should be able to address these problems. Students and faculty members mentioned their interest in occasionally having social gatherings, possibly with family members and friends also invited. The departments should consider organizing such events. The departments should also consider promoting and supporting club activities that focus on topics of computer technology that are of interest to the students.

4) Graduates

The CTCH program has granted a total of 93 A.A.B. degrees through all three campuses in the period from the AY of 1995-1996 through 2002-2003. The highest number of graduates was in AY 2002-2003 with 25 students, and the lowest was in AY 2000-2001 with 5 students. The data was compiled from information maintained by the Regional Higher Education office. There is no data available to assess the quality of graduates from the program.

III. Graduate Program Review

There are no graduate degree offerings in the program.

IV. Overall Evaluation

The CTCH offers a very important service to the local communities of Chillicothe, Ironton, and Lancaster. The curriculum is undergoing a desired revision. The program currently enjoys the benefits of having a new faculty member and the expectation of a second one to be hired soon. It is crucial for the Chillicothe branch to hire a full time faculty as the program coordinator with strong computer science background and desirable industrial experience. The program is administered independently by the Chillicothe, Ironton, and Lancaster campuses. Although the Lancaster and Ironton campuses have local advisory committees, the program as a whole does not have a committee to coordinate a close collaboration among the three regional campuses. There are no strong working relationships with the regional campuses and local businesses and industries. A support from the Athens campus is just initiated following this review. The self-study report was prepared by the Lancaster program director with some help from the Chillicothe campus. Although the report offers a good general overview of the program, it lacks depth. Important data is missing and when it is available much of it is provided without processing and interpretation. Vitas of faculty members, course descriptions, and course evaluations were received after the campus visits. Much of this material should accompany the self-study report. Admission statistics, first year undergraduate profiles, and enrollment data were provided in Appendix J as non-critical to the program. These should be summarized into a few tables and incorporated into the main body of the self-study document. Missing from the report are comparisons with similar programs nationally and competitor programs locally. Faculty development is required to ensure sustained effectiveness of the program. It requires making resource investments consistently over time so that the faculty have the time and opportunity to sustain professional growth. With the rapid change of computer technology, faculty background can quite quickly become outdated. The self-study report did not sufficiently address this issue. It is unrealistic to expect the faculty members to be able to perform serious research under the heavy teaching and service loads they carry. The university must ensure that the faculty members will not lose their technology edge.
Undergraduate Executive Summary

EVALUATION OF Computer Science Technology (CTCH)

DATE January 2004

Commendations:

CTCH offers a very important service to the local communities of Chillicothe, Ironton, and Lancaster. The CTCH leads to Associate in Applied Business (A.A.B.) degree in computer science technology and prepares students for a professional career in information technology and related fields in the computer profession. The associate degree can be terminal or it can serve as the first two years of Baccalaureate degree in either Business or Organizational Communications. Courses offered take a business approach to the functional areas of computer programming, system analysis, and network administration. The curriculum is undergoing a desired revision. The program currently enjoys the benefits of having hired a new faculty member and the expectation of a second one to be hired soon.

Concerns:

CTCH is administered independently by Chillicothe, Ironton, and Lancaster campuses. Regretfully, the program does not have an active supervisory committee. There are no working relationships with local businesses and industries. The Chillicothe program has two good external part time faculty members. However, this branch is in critical need of a full time faculty member with good academic and business backgrounds in the computer technology field. Faculty development requires making resource investments consistently over time so that the faculty have the time and opportunity to sustain professional growth. With the rapid change of computer technology, faculty background can quite quickly become outdated. The university must ensure that the faculty members will not lose their technology edge. The self-study report did not sufficiently address this issue. It is unrealistic to expect the faculty members to be able to perform serious research under the heavy teaching and service loads they carry. The regional branches should consider placing their web pages in the public domain to include general information about the program, detailed descriptions of the course offerings, and pointers to web pages of the faculty members for possible scrutiny by anonymous readers. The curriculum does not provide sufficient hands-on training and the students are in great need of guidance and mentoring. The part time faculty have limited involvement with the program. There is little interaction among the faculty themselves as well as with the faculty at the other campuses.

Weaknesses:

The existing curriculum is somewhat outdated. The newly approved networking courses and the 4-track system proposed recently are expected to improve the curriculum considerably. The CTCH 125 course should provide for a test-out option. It is an entry-level course covering material many students are expected to be familiar with from high school or self study. The introductory programming courses probably would be better off moving to Java instead of Cobol. It should be clarified what are the implications of the proposed curriculum for students who are interested in pursuing a baccalaureate degree. Joint classes through teleconferencing should be considered for the different campuses to better utilize the expertise of the different faculty members.
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Dear Dr. Reeves,

Please find enclosed my evaluation of the self-study of the Computer Technology program. I hope it will turn out to be useful for the program. Enclosed is also my expense report for the three travels I made for the site visits.
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gurari@cis.ohio-state.edu
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1 Background Information

The Computer Science Technology (CTCH) program is undergoing a seventh year review. A two-person team has been assigned to evaluate the program's self-study report according to its completeness, accuracy, and usefulness. The team consists of Dr. Mehmet Celenk from the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science of the Ohio University, and Dr. Eitan Gurari of the Department of Computer and Information Science of the Ohio State University. Mehmet represents the University Curriculum Council (UCC) and Eitan acts as an external reviewer.

The program is administrated independently by the Chillicothe, Ironton, and Lancaster campuses. We visited Lancaster on Nov 4th, Ironton on Nov 13th, and Chillicothe on Nov 18th.

2 The Self-Study Report

The self-study report offers a good general overview of the program, but lacks depth. In particular, important data is missing and when it is available much of it is provided without processing and interpretation.

Asides from the self-study report, following our requests we received vitas of faculty members, course descriptions, course evaluations, and a copy of the UCC five-year review of April 13, 1993. Much of this material should accompany the self-study report. On the other hand, most of the data of Appendix J should be summarized into a few tables and incorporated into the main body of the report.

Missing from the report are comparisons with similar programs nationally and competitor programs locally.

3 The Departments

The Lancaster program started in 1985. It has been directed since its inception by David Collopy, a full time faculty member. The department hired Christine Wolfe as a second full time faculty member in Autumn 2001. The department has been managed well.

The Ironton program started in Autumn 2000. It was directed until recently by the school administration, with the guidance and support of David Collopy. This past summer, Prodeep Mohanty was hired as a full time faculty member and director of the program. Prodeep seems to be
an outstanding choice for the job. He possesses a good computer science background, much business experience in the field, a good grasp of the issues involved in running such a program, and enthusiasm for confronting this challenge.

The Chillicothe program was also initiated in 2000, and directed by a school administrator under the guidance and support of David Collopy. The program is currently in search of a full time faculty member who will also serve as a program director. It is crucial for the program to hire a new faculty member who has both a strong computer science background and business experience in the field.

4 Advisory Committees

Regretfully, the departments currently do not have active advisory committees or other working relationships with local businesses and industries.

5 Part Time Faculty Members

We met only two of the twelve part time faculty members in Lancaster, both having appointments in the university at other units. Recent teaching schedules suggest very limited need for, and contact with, external part time faculty members.

We met five of the seven part time faculty members of Ironton. We heard complaints about their having had no say in the past as to how the program was being run. Consequently, in the past they had limited involvement with the program. There is a strong expectation that the hiring of Prodeep as a program director will result in a major improvement in this respect.

The self-study report lists two full time and nine part time faculty members for the Chillicothe program. The two faculty members listed as full time have their base at other units of the university, with part time appointments at the CTCH program. We met four faculty members. They expressed comments similar to those we heard in Ironton. The faculty members seem to have very little interaction among themselves as well as with the faculty members at the other campuses. It is reasonable to expect that many of these problems will be solved by the hiring of a full time faculty member and director for the local program.
6 Faculty Profiles

The Lancaster teaching assignments of the past three years provided in Appendix G show Christine Wolfe to be the most prolific faculty member. She taught ten different courses all across the program curriculum. Her resume attests to her qualifications. A recent M.S. degree in Computer Science, in 2000, a B.S. degree in Mathematics, and fifteen years of work experience in computer technology. Her resume does not list other services to the university and community but the self-study report offers a few details.

The Lancaster teaching assignments for David show many sections of the entry level course of CTCH 125 and a few specialized introductory programming language courses. In 2000-2001, the year before Christine was hired, the rest of the courses were assigned to other part time faculty members to teach. David published a few introductory books in traditional programming languages related to his teaching assignments. His course assignments and resume do not show professional development into more contemporary and advanced topics. David deserves a lot of service credit for directing the program in Lancaster and offering support and guidance to the Chillicothe and Ironton programs.

Christine and David are full time faculty members of the Lancaster program. The part time faculty members of the past two years have been assigned only a few courses, and those faculty members were well qualified to teach the courses.

The new hire Prodeep at Ironton has fine academic and professional experience. The part time faculty members probably are not fit for teaching most of the courses beyond the introductory level course of CTCH 125.

The Chillicothe program has a couple of good external part time faculty members. However, the program is in critical need of a full time faculty member with good academic and business backgrounds in the computer technology field.

7 Faculty Development

Faculty development is required to ensure sustained effectiveness of the program. In turn, faculty development is an ongoing process that requires making resource investments consistently over time so that the faculty have the time and opportunity to sustain professional growth.
The program currently enjoys the benefits of having hired two new faculty members, and the expectation of a third one to be hired soon. However, with the rapid change of computer technology, faculty background can quite quickly become outdated.

Unfortunately, the self-study report and the comments we got during our visits did not sufficiently address this issue. In particular, it is unrealistic to expect the faculty members to be able to perform serious research under the heavy teaching and service loads they carry.

8 Program Curriculum

The existing curriculum is somewhat outdated. A proposal for a new more improved curriculum is under consideration. The following are a few related comments.

- The CTCH 125 course should provide for a test out option. It is an entry level course covering material many students are expected to be familiar with from high school or self study.

- The introductory programming courses probably would be better off moving on Java instead of C and Fortran.

- It should be clarified what are the implications of the proposed curriculum for students who are interested in pursuing a baccalaureate degree.

- Joint classes through teleconferencing should be considered for the different campuses to better utilize the expertise of the different faculty members.

9 Students

We had the opportunity to meet students at Lancaster and Chillicothe, but not at Ironton. We received course evaluation data only in Chillicothe.

Many of the Lancaster students had jobs, and are enrolled in the program to improve their prospects for better jobs. They expressed satisfaction with the instructors. There were some claims that the curriculum does not provide sufficient hand-on training.
The Chillicothe students expressed satisfaction with some of the instructors, and dissatisfaction with others, consistent with the data in the course evaluation forms. The students seemed to be very mature but in great need of guidance and mentoring. A new full time faculty member hire for the program should be able to address these problems.

10 Socialization and Enrichment Activities

Students and faculty members mentioned their interest in occasionally having social gatherings, possibly with family members and friends also invited. The departments should consider organizing such events.

The departments should also consider promoting and supporting club activities that focus on topics of computer technology that are of interest to the students.

11 Web Pages

The program branches should consider placing web pages in the public domain to include general information about the program, detailed descriptions of the course offerings, and pointers to web pages of the faculty members and students. In turn, the faculty members should be encouraged to put their vitae and much of their course material in their public sites.

The web pages can help promote the departments, and motivate the faculty members to prepare high quality material for possible scrutiny by anonymous readers.

12 Adequacy of Resources

We did not hear complaints about a lack of resources. However, it is strange not all of the campuses have instructional database software.

It looks like some students cannot afford a PC at home. Considering the very cheap cost of basic PC's the program should consider loaning such machines to students in need.

13 Conclusion

The Computer Science Technology program offers a very important service to the local communities of Chillicothe, Ironton, and Lancaster. The curriculum
is undergoing a desired revision. It is crucial for the Chillicothe branch to hire a full time faculty member. The university must ensure that the faculty members will not lose their technology edge.
DATE: November 12, 2004

TO: Scott Sparks, Chair
UCC Program Review Committee

FROM: William R. Willan
Assistant Vice President for Regional Higher Education

SUBJECT: Review of Associate of Applied Business in Computer Science Technology

Regional Higher Education and the Lancaster, Chillicothe, and Southern Campuses would like to thank the Program Review Committee, particularly external reviewer Eitan Gurari and lead reviewer Mehmet Celenk for their responses to the Computer Science Technology (CTCH) Program Self-Study; and thank you for this opportunity to respond to the report. The process of self-study had led to several changes to program policies and practices.

I am pleased that the reviewers recognized the importance of the program to the Southeastern Ohio business community, and that they commended the recent curricular revisions. Those curricular changes have resulted in a program that is better able to respond to the changing business climate and to student interests, and should result in more CTCH majors. The four tracks initiated by Lancaster CTCH Director David Collopy, Professor Christine Wolfe, and Chillicothe Computer Services Director Patty Griffith, as detailed in the Collopy letter to Mehmet Celenk, have been approved by the Regional Higher Education Curriculum Committee (RHECC) and are being instituted at the campuses. Other concerns expressed by the reviewers have been addressed as well: 1) a fulltime faculty member has been hired to direct the program on the Chillicothe campus; 2) an annual orientation process for adjunct faculty has been instituted at the Lancaster and Southern campuses, a practice that Chillicothe’s new director has endorsed; 3) COBOL has become a curricular option rather than a requirement, with Java as the primary programming language in introductory courses; 4) the RHECC has amended the Self-Study processes on regional campuses so that several of the reviewers’ specific suggestions regarding content and format may be incorporated into the self-studies of other technology programs; 5) a test-out option is being developed for CTCH 125, Introduction to Computers; and 6) the program faculty has begun to explore technology-enhanced delivery of CTCH courses in order to enable individual faculty members to teach in their areas of greatest expertise and to lessen the number of course preparations required of each, thereby providing more opportunity for scholarship. Students on all three campuses also will benefit from having more classes with fulltime faculty members.
The report does, however, raise two concerns that I feel compelled to address. The first is the impression one might take from the statement “the part time faculty members probably are not fit for teaching most of the courses beyond the introductory level course CTCH 125” the impression that unqualified part-time faculty are being used. That is not the case. We require both an appropriate master’s degree and relevant business experience and/or certifications in the subject area.

My second concern is that a level of program coordination exists that the report’s authors have not recognized. When the report says that “the program as a whole does not have a committee to coordinate a close collaboration among the three regional campuses,” it does not take into account the RHECC, which demands a signoff by the program directors on all three campuses before any curricular or course change can be made. Further, the three directors and I are in effect the CTCH program steering committee, meeting to discuss any initiatives brought forward from a campus. The directors often meet face-to-face on one of the campuses to discuss the program or at events such as the Regional Campus Faculty Conference. They participate in the searches for their counterparts on other campuses, so have a say in the hiring of their fellow directors. In my view it is a misunderstanding of the processes that are in place not to recognize the coordination that occurs among campuses. As the person responsible for that activity, I would have appreciated the chance to discuss these matters with the reviewers, but was not contacted.

The self-study and review process has augmented the change dialogue and activity, making the CTCH program more responsive to student and business needs and providing a reservoir of ideas for further program planning. We are pleased to have participated in this necessary and productive process.

Cc: Vice President Charles Bird
Dean Richard Bebee, Chillicothe Campus
Dean Dan Evans, Southern Campus
Interim Dean John Furlow, Lancaster Campus
Mehmet Celenk, UCC Review Committee
CTCH Campus Program Directors
File

[Signature]
Hi Mehmet,

I appreciate your patience while we reviewed the draft of your evaluation of Computer Science Technology.

We recognize that we omitted some information. I hope it is not too late for these items to be incorporated into your report.

1) Patty Griffith and Eric Cunningham were involved in preparing the 7-Year self study report. They contributed various comments and information. Pradeep Mohanty wasn't hired until after the study was completed. Patty reviewed and critiqued the report before it was submitted.

2) We do have an advisory committee at Lancaster. We meet annually at the campus wide advisory committee breakfast. In addition we consult with the members during the year as needed. Periodically we invite community professionals into our classrooms to speak to the students and provide real life examples of the topics discussed. The Southern campus also has an advisory committee.

3) I teach introductory classes to set the tone for the program and to recruit students into the program. In brief, my profession development includes the following: database management, artificial intelligence, computer viruses, compiler/assembler design and construction, engaged teaching and learning strategies, networking, and data structures.

4) The enrollment across the regional campuses for the CTCH program is 104 not 75 as was reported.

In addition to the above, there were a few minor misunderstandings:

1) Page 1 Paragraph 4 states: "The recently hired director of the Ironton campus assumed the responsibility of developing computer network-related courses." Pradeep has the same responsibilities as the directors on the other campuses and the development of computer network-related courses is shared across all campuses.

2) Page 6 under Weaknesses is stated: "The newly approved networking courses, developed by the Ironton program director,...". The four networking courses that were approved by the UCC this year were not developed by the director at Southern. They were written and submitted from the Lancaster campus prior to the hiring of the director at Southern. The confusion probably came about because Pradeep was responsible for writing some of the courses for our new four track system. However, the writing of the new courses was a collaborative effort that was shared among the Lancaster, Southern, and Chillicothe campuses.

3) Fortran is not taught and has not been part of the CTCH program. In any event, with the anticipated approval of the new four track system, the Software Development and Testing track will demote COBOL to an elective and promote Java in its place.
Suggestion: Where you mention, "The existing curriculum is somewhat outdated.", it would be useful to give some details about the changes, such as... Lancaster realized the need to be more flexible and responsive to the ever changing IT market. Hence the 4 track system was developed about a year and a half ago to meet that need. More recently, the Southern and Chillicothe campuses have been involved in shaping the degree tracks. The new tracks currently being considered for approval include:

1. **Software Development and Testing**: Prepares students for entry level programming and systems testing positions.
2. **Network and System Administration**: Prepares students for entry level networking administration, system administration and IT support positions.
3. **Database Systems**: Prepares students for entry level positions in database administration and application development.
4. **Website Development and Management**: Prepares students for entry level positions in Web development applications.

I really appreciate the effort you invested in reviewing our program. We have already begun implementation of some of your suggestions. Specifically:

We are writing test-out options for the introductory courses and the intention that they be available to students by Spring Quarter.

Dr. Chang Liu of EECS has agreed to serve on our advisory committee.

We spoke to Dean John Furlow about the possibility of loaning computers to our students. He told us that there is an active plan in place to buy laptops that students can borrow from the library.

Thanks,

Dave
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I. General Program Information

The Individualized Interdisciplinary Program (IIP) was created in Fall, 1978 to offer individually designed "interdisciplinary" post-baccalaureate degrees to students whose career objectives cannot satisfactorily be met through a standard Master's or Ph.D. degree within one department. Each individual program is finalized, with the close collaboration of the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies and Graduate Directors, between the student and a committee of three faculty members from as many departments. Department composition depends on the needs of each student. One faculty member serves as the major advisor in the "lead" department. The major advisor is responsible for facilitating the progress of the student through the defined degree program. For the 107 Master's degrees and 39 PhD degrees awarded thus far, the program has served those students with very narrowly defined career objectives that have required multiple disciplines represented in their education and training. For a few students it has proven to be the only means of receiving highly specialized interdisciplinary training for a particular job awaiting the student. Approximately two-thirds of the students who initiate an IIP complete the program and receive the degree. Many students have been OU employees or their dependents.

At the MA level, the criterion stipulates a 3.3 undergraduate average for admission consideration. At the doctoral level, the criteria stipulate a 3.3 undergraduate average and a 3.6 MA average.

Student enrollment is small relative to most departmental degree programs, which varies typically from a few (lowest in 2001 with 3 MS and 1 Ph.D. students) to several (highest in 1998 with 4 MS and 7 Ph.D. students). Education and Communication appear to have the greatest number of enrollees during the review period. Although there has been a continuous stream of students passing through the program since its inception in 1978, the overall enrollment has dropped significantly since the last review period. This may be attributed to the fact that there has been no offering of tuition scholarships to those who would need them to help pay for their enrollment.

Between the last review period and present time, the office and responsibility for the program has shifted markedly. The Director of Graduate Student Services recently retired, and the responsibility for directing the IIP shifted from that position and office to the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies.

1. Faculty Profile

There are no specific faculty associated with the IIP because the curriculum is composed of graduate-level courses selected from the existing programs within the departments, colleges, and schools of OU.

2. Programmatic Practices

Since the IIP has no specific graduate faculty designated for it, students initiate inquiries concerning the possibility of enrolling in a master's or Ph.D. program. The IIP Director discusses the program requirements, reviews the students' rationales and qualifications, helps students prepare a program of study (POS), and coordinates the admission process with the
director of each program involved. The POS is designed so that one program becomes the "lead" program. This is normally the POS committee chair's school or department. In practice, the student is asked to comply with the admission requirement of each program. The student's final course work for the master's degree, and comprehensives and dissertation for the doctoral degree are usually governed by the choice of lead program. The student's progress through the program and final approval is the responsibility of the lead program's college.

The key value of the IIP lies in its status as a program of study that a student could not achieve in a discipline specific degree-granting program. By involving at least three schools or departments, the student has the opportunity to create a cohesive and meaningful set of courses that would contribute to knowledge and skill development not possible within the requirements of a discipline specific program.

3. Adequacy of Resources

There is no specific budget allocated for the IIP. The program director does not receive any compensation for his services. Because the program draws its courses and faculty from existing Ohio University departments, facilities and services are taken care of by those departments and schools.

II. Undergraduate Program Review

There are no undergraduates in the program.

III. Graduate Program Review

1) Program Goals and Curriculum

The IIP offers students the opportunity to design master and doctoral level degrees with the close collaboration of the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies, and Graduate Directors and faculty in specific degree-granting programs. The key criterion is that the degree goals are not available through an existing advanced degree program at Ohio University. Further, the course work should represent a cohesive whole and provide sufficient depth in order to meet the knowledge and/or skill acquisition for the degree requirement. There are no specific guidelines for the IIP with respect to time to degree. In this sense, the program is similar to others with adherence to the general expiration of a student's program at 6 (MA) and 7 (Ph.D.) years from matriculation.

2) Faculty

The IIP does not have a specific graduate faculty because the curriculum is selected from existing graduate-level courses within all of the departments and schools.

3) Students

Within the 1995 - 2001 review period, the IIP enrollment has been very steady on the average of 9 to 11 students except the past two years in which the enrollment (3 MA and 3 Ph.D. in 2000, and 3 MA and 1 Ph.D. in 2001) was lowest. Education and Communication appear to
have the greatest number of enrollees during the review period. It also would appear that the overall enrollment has dropped significantly since the last review period, when enrollment averaged closer to 15 - 20 students across MA and Ph.D. levels in a given year. This might be a function of no longer offering tuition scholarships to those who would need them to help pay for enrollment. During 2001-02, there were 10 MA and 9 Ph.D. students in the program.

The entering GPA of MA students over the review period reveals some rather startling data: The average entering GPA is 3.30, consistent with the minimum requirement. However, 18% of those enrolled had GPA's between 3.0 and 3.3, and another 15% had GPA's between 2.4 and 2.99. At the Ph.D. level, the average GPA on admission is 3.66, with lowest at 3.4. Currently, the program relies on the requirements of individual schools and departments. In the case of international students, a TOFEL is required, and the minimum level is determined by the individual departments.

4) Graduates

At the master's level, the ending GPA ranged from 3.1 to 4.0, with the vast majority at 3.6 or higher. At the Ph.D. level, the ending GPA ranged 3.18 to 3.89, with the majority at 3.7 and higher. There were a significant number (8) of "no degree awarded" after the expiration of the 6 - 7 year provision for completion across both master's and doctoral level study. Otherwise, the time to degree appears to follow norms for disciplinary practice (master completion within 1 - 3 years and doctoral completion within 3 - 5 years). During the review period, 1995 - 2001, 25 MA degrees were awarded and 6 Ph.D.'s were granted.

IV. Overall Evaluation

The impression conveyed via discussions with the faculty, graduates, and current students involved with IIP is that this program is performing an important function for the university by providing master's and doctoral students with the opportunity to creatively design a degree program that meets individual interests and needs. The program was consistently described as being high in quality and best suited for students who are self-directed and seeking a unique educational experience. The program provides training for students who do not see themselves as easily fitting into an existing program, either because multiple areas of study cannot be incorporated into the course work and research training of an individual department or because the student wants to acquire multiple credentials to support a particular career goal (e.g., the medical student who wanted training in business and teaching to enhance his skills as a family medicine practitioner and academic). The IIP also allows the university to provide master's or doctoral training in areas not currently offered as a program, especially to students who have no mobility and cannot seek a program elsewhere, and offers the university an opportunity to develop programs in response to repeated IIP student interest. In these ways, the IIP meets the university's mission of holding the intellectual and personal growth of the individual as a central purpose.

Faculty noted the creativity and innovation that is possible when a student brings an interdisciplinary perspective to problem solving. Essentially, the IIP student has the potential to offer an employer the advantage of 3 disciplines rolled into a single individual. While the data available with respect to employment was not as complete as might be ideal, the reports from faculty and former students suggest that IIP graduates are competitive with respect to the job market. The former and current students interviewed expressed a great deal of satisfaction with their decision to pursue graduate education via the IIP route. With few exceptions, the students
were also clear with respect to the fact that, had IIP not existed, they would either have had to pursue their educational ambitions at a different university or "make do" with a less than satisfactory approach to their career goals. The students who were interviewed were articulate and mature spokespeople for IIP. To all appearances, they would have succeeded had they selected a more traditional route to graduate education.

In comparison to established programs, IIP challenges the student to actively engage in program design. While the IIP degree is actually conferred within the lead College of the student's program, the student plays a more active role in the selection of POS, faculty on the program committee, and presenting possible program outcomes than is often experienced in a traditional program of study. Prior to acceptance, the student must develop a proposal that not only articulates the objectives he/she wishes to pursue via graduate education but must also outline the curriculum that will accomplish those objectives. Through this process, a more informed assessment can be made concerning the appropriateness of the IIP approach to the accomplishment of the goals articulated by the student. However, faculty within the IIP program of study presented by a student are members of three different programs on campus, and this leads to less contact than is traditionally expected. The current 3.3 undergraduate GPA requirement for admission to the IIP Master's and 3.3 undergrad GPA and 3.6 Master's GPA requirements for admission to the IIP PhD is more than sufficient, and likely thwarts some sciences students from applying. Maintenance of this GPA is stipulated as a criterion for retention in the program. The admission or retention of certain students with less than the GPA is both troubling and unacceptable. The GPA criteria need to be enforced, if academic standards are going to be maintained by the IIP program. The IIP Director must address this problem directly by informing students under the GPA minimum that they have two quarters to correct the problem or will be discontinued from the program. The student applicant is expected to devise a statement of objectives and degree program, and identify the three departments participating in the individual degree, prior to the first meeting with a potential advisor and committee. It is clearly necessary to have some initial information in order to evaluate whether a student qualifies to participate in the program and whether their career goals are best met with an IIP degree, and to determine which departments would best suit the student's needs. Having the student produce a complete degree program without the advice of faculty appears completely backwards. In fact, nearly every graduating undergraduate student needs a substantial amount of interaction and counseling, and often research or internship experience, before he or she is capable of defining one particular area of interest to pursue for graduate studies.

Although the students were pleased to have participated in the IIP, all of them expressed concerns about the program's lack of integration into the graduate programs of the University more generally and less-than ideal direction and monitoring by the faculty who supervised their courses of study. Although a lead program is designated for each student, the lead program does not provide funding, office space, mailbox, participation in a listserv, or any other means of integrating students into the units represented by the areas combined to create the individualized programs. Some of the students also expressed frustration with difficulties gaining entrance to the classes they needed to complete their programs. The issues of ownership and integration are serious problems and would need to be corrected if the IIP is to continue.

Related to the lack of ownership is an apparent absence of full participation by the faculty committee in the direction of the student's program. Most students felt that their primary faculty advisor was involved, but at least one student indicated that even this level of guidance was absent. There was less agreement that the rest of the faculty committee contributed significantly to overseeing the student's plan of study. Several faculty members also were concerned that
committee involvement was not provided or was less than ideal. There was disagreement about whether the entire committee even met with the student when he or she was initially accepted into the program. This is a long-standing problem with the program. In the first review of the program between 1983 and 1986, information on programmatic weaknesses included the directive that more direction and monitoring of students were needed. It appears that nearly 20 years later this is still a problem. This difficulty in providing adequate student mentoring might be related to the program's previous leadership. The new program director, Interim Associate Provost for Graduate Studies, has only been in place slightly more than a year and the self-study he prepared fully acknowledges this problem and offers suggestions for improvement.

The apparent difficulty with faculty participation after the student is admitted may be exacerbated by the absence of faculty participation in developing the student's plan of study from the point of application. The graduate directors are simply asked to review and approve or modify the plan. Faculty "buy-in" may be improved if faculty members participate in the development of the application, write letters of recommendation for the student, and pledge their sponsorship of the student from the very beginning. Without faculty commitment, students are left to fend for themselves. Certainly self-directed graduate students are appreciated; however, the ability to attract faculty interest in one’s work should not be the central criterion for student success in the program. Several faculty members when asked what they or the University would lose if the program were discontinued responded "nothing."

Some of the students noted that involving faculty might be difficult because faculty don't know much about the program or what is expected of students. This concern was also included in the review of the program in 1983-1986. The observation was made that there were no guidelines for minimum and maximum expectations in course work and research. This problem is a concern at any point, but even more so when it has been noted for nearly 20 years. More generally, both students and faculty observed that the program is not promoted and students are not actively recruited into it.

Students do not receive funding through the program. This has a number of negative consequences. First, only students who have other means of support can participate. All of the students interviewed were either University employees, full-time employees elsewhere, or supported by a fellowship in some other program. The number of students in the program is small and has apparently decreased over the years. It is hard to identify exactly why this trend has occurred; however, it is likely that funding has played a role. Second, without funding as a teaching or research assistant, students are denied access to professional development as a teacher or a researcher. Both skills are critical, at least among Ph.D. students, for high-level professional positions appropriate for doctoral recipients. Third, without the opportunity to participate in a faculty member’s research program as a research assistant, it is less likely that the student will be able to publish. Indeed, none of the students who participated in the campus interview had publications. Student productivity data were not included in the self-study, so it is not clear if other students in the program have or have not published. Some had conference presentations, but here too, the lack of funding, in the form of travel support, prevented them from either presenting at all or presenting as often as they wanted to and were capable of doing. Fourth, time to degree is extended. Several students indicated that they did not take more than a course a quarter. When compared against standard criteria for quality doctoral programs (which include student publications, grants and awards, conference presentations, participation of students drawn from a national pool, full-time financial support, time to degree and student mentoring) the program does not appear to be meeting the needs of the students. Faculty criteria that are relevant to evaluating
programs are unknown. Summaries of the records of faculty who have directed the students' programs (or the records themselves) were not included in the self-study. Professional activities such as conferences, publications or performances, and grant-writing experience, are regarded as additional key components of a properly implemented advanced degree. Only one or two students indicated participation in these activities. While a number of students expressed the desire to attend conferences and workshops, most students expressed little or no interest in obtaining publication or performance experience, and no student interviewed mentioned grants. A major concern exists with respect to the format leading to the conferral of "Master's" and "PhD" degrees. It is troublesome that there is the general lack of interest on the part of the students to participate in most standard professional development activities. More disturbing is the absence of at least partial guaranteed support for conference participation and other essential professional activities, especially at the PhD level. There is no information available regarding the relative career success of IIP degree holders. It might be true that the majority get the academic or professional development they need for the career they are pursuing without needing access to these additional experiences. However, it is questionable whether this "minimalist" strategy, forced by fiscal circumstances or not, or related to disinterest on the part of the students or not, provides the students with an adequate degree experience. The lack of student interest (except for some students) in attending conferences might relate to inadequate mentoring by the lead advisor. This could be remedied by encouraging faculty to promote professional activities to the students and facilitate their participation. However, the second part to the problem appears to stem from the lack of financial commitment for professional activities at all levels for an entire advanced degree program. Intended or not, this conveys the undesirable image of short-shifting IIP students—not at all a satisfactory endorsement of an entire advanced degree-granting program by OU. The university must take steps to generate funding for the professional development of students admitted into IIP if it intends to continue the program. Maintaining an advanced degree program in name and process but leaving it without the fiscal means to fully implement its objectives is irrational.

Students heartily endorsed the open nature and inherent flexibility of the program, giving them and their advisory committee the ability to build a degree that best meets the individual needs of the student. The very capable and motivated students interviewed were competent subjects of the cross-departmental format. In some cases, students were pursuing degree programs that covered multiple disciplines at an expectedly less deep level than the standard single-department degree, but that would be appropriate for a Master's degree. Others have formulated programs that foster depth of thought and knowledge at the intersection of three traditionally separately maintained fields. The latter approach would lend itself to the design of a worthy PhD degree, if depth and intensive professional training are indeed retained in pursuit of the degree. Sacrificing depth and intensity for dabbling in a few different fields would run counter to the premise of a Ph.D. degree. Certainly, a substantial level of flexibility needs to be retained in the program in order for it to continue as a non-traditional degree mechanism. However, a major concern is the absence of explicitly stated expectations for typical degree milestones. All social and physical science and some social science Master's and PhD degrees involve minimal requirements for foundational course work and production of a culminating experience such as a thesis or dissertation, performance or its equivalent. Some schools and departments do voluntarily enforce similar expectations on IIP students to produce a thesis/dissertation or similar capstone product that non-IIP students in the lead department adhere to. This is commendable. However, the absence of built-in expectations of key components commensurate with those of other post-baccalaureate degrees raises questions of academic rigor and development of critical thinking for individual IIP
degree programs. However, without explicit guidelines in a "modus," the degree framework remains the whim of the student and the advisory committee. The minimal levels of rigor, training and critical thinking that should accompany every advanced degree, however formulated, are contingent on the ingenuity, motivation and dedication of the student, the advisor and advisory committee, the lead department in some cases, or parts of all of these. It is not wholly convincing that the "format" of IIP programs learned of through interviews and documents actually meets the rigor and training demanded by single-department degree programs.
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Commendations:
In its objective, the IIP is consistent with the recommended directions on collaborative, inter- or multi-disciplinary approaches to research and graduate training. The IIP has long incorporated ideals that only recently have been recognized as critical for the future of research and graduate education. The program provides training for students who do not see themselves as easily fitting into an existing program, either because multiple areas of study cannot be incorporated into the course work and research training of an individual department or because the student wants to acquire multiple credentials to support a particular career goal. The IIP also allows the university to provide master's or doctoral training in areas not currently offered as a program, especially to students who have no mobility and cannot seek the program elsewhere, and offers the university an opportunity to develop programs in response to repeated IIP student interest. In these ways, the IIP meets the university’s mission of holding the intellectual and personal growth of the individual to be a central purpose.

Concerns:
The IIP does not adequately meet some of the objectives thought to be critical to a successful graduate degree program, and currently has almost no structure. The admission or retention of certain students with less than the required GPA is both troubling and unacceptable if academic standards are going to be maintained by the IIP. Although, a substantial level of flexibility needs to be retained in the program to be a non-traditional degree mechanism, the absence of built-in expectations for key components commensurate with those of other post-baccalaureate degrees raises questions of academic rigor and development of critical thinking for individual IIP degree programs. A major concern exists with respect to the format leading to the legitimate conferral of "Master's" and "PhD" degrees. A troubling issue is the general lack of interest on the part of the students with respect to participating in most standard professional development activities, especially at the PhD level. There is no information available regarding the relative career success of students who obtained an IIP degree. Although it might be true that the majority get the academic or professional development they need for the particular career they are aiming for without access to these additional experiences, this "minimalist" strategy is of concern as it provides the students with an inadequate degree experience. If the IIP is considered to be integral to OU's mission, and unless OU will make a commitment to support and strengthen the IIP to meet its objectives most effectively within a reasonable period of time (e.g., two years), then this lack of commitment at various levels in the university can only be construed as a refusal to endorse the IIP as a university program.

Weaknesses:
The present organization lacks clear policies and procedures for the coordinator, faculty, and students involved in the IIP. More effort for contact with the student and program committee members must be made. Students should not be expected to negotiate all the difficult terrain of a dissertation with such limited contact. The student's full committee needs to operate more actively, not only in approving the student's program of study but in guiding the student with respect to the selection and execution of his/her capstone project. The student's primary advisor functions almost exclusively with respect to decision-making, and that the student's committee operates more to approve (i.e., rubber stamp) the advisor's recommendations.
Individualized Interdisciplinary Program (IIP)
External Reviewer's Report

Hilary H. Ratner, Associate Provost and Dean of the Graduate School
Wayne State University
Detroit, MI

Introduction

There is a rapidly growing emphasis on collaborative, inter-or multi-disciplinary approaches to research and graduate training. For example, when making awards, funding agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health, have moved toward a problem-focused approach that draws on solutions from multiple disciplines and multiple investigators. Similarly, research training for graduate students is closely following these trends. For example, the National Science Foundation in 1997 initiated the Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) program to create a cultural change in graduate education by establishing new models for training that transcends traditional disciplinary boundaries. This program is intended to better prepare students as problem-focused researchers, either within the academy or in industry, business or government, to develop interdisciplinary backgrounds and deep knowledge in chosen disciplines. Finally, the Re-envisioning the Ph.D. project funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts provides a number of recommendations for re-engineering doctoral education within the United States. Among the recommendations is the call for a balance between the deep learning of the disciplinary doctorate with interdisciplinary challenges. Specific suggestions include providing more opportunities for students to work across disciplinary lines and to continue development of inter-disciplinary, multi-disciplinary, and cross-disciplinary programs.

Although there seems to be convergence among researchers, educators, employers, and funding agents that interdisciplinary training is increasingly necessary for graduate students, there is not always agreement concerning how best to deliver this type of training. Should interdisciplinary training be fostered within interdisciplinary programs, provided by broader training within the disciplines, or some combination of the two? The ultimate challenge for Ohio University, as for any research extensive or intensive university, is deciding which approach best fosters the goal of interdisciplinary training for the greatest number of students. Moreover, when making any strategic decision, a related question is whether the benefits derived from resources expended to support a particular program exceed the benefits that might occur from re-investing elsewhere. It is with respect to these issues that I offer perspectives on the strengths and weaknesses of the program and possible courses of action that the University might undertake.

Strengths of the program

In its objective, the IIP is consistent with the recommended directions for graduate education as outlined above. It is impressive that the program, which began in 1978, has a long history and reflects an extended interest in interdisciplinary graduate training. The University can be proud that the IIP program has long incorporated ideals that only recently have been recognized as critical for the future of research and graduate education.
In addition, the program provides training for students who do not see themselves as easily fitting into an existing program, either because multiple areas of study cannot be incorporated into the coursework and research training of an individual department or because the student wants to acquire multiple credentials to support a particular career goal (e.g., the medical student who wanted training in business and teaching to enhance his skills as a family medicine practitioner and academic). The IIP also allows the University to provide master's or doctoral training in areas not currently offered as a program, especially to students who have no mobility and cannot seek the program elsewhere, and offers the University an opportunity to develop programs in response to repeated IIP student interest. In these ways, the IIP meets the University's mission of holding the intellectual and personal growth of the individual to be a central purpose.

The review committee met with several master's and Ph.D. IIP students who were articulate, bright, and accomplished. Each student we spoke with was enthusiastic about the program and believed that his or her intellectual needs were met within the context of the IIP. Faculty members who had directed students in the program were pleased with the students they had worked with, although faculty who had themselves been students in the IIP were most enthusiastic.

Finally, the IIP has a new director, Associate Provost McKerrow, who clearly recognizes the strengths and weaknesses of the program, has already improved student mentoring, has good ideas about how to further improve the IIP, and is committed to making program changes, if consistent with the future directions chosen for the program.

Weaknesses of the program

Although the students were pleased to have participated in the IIP, all of them expressed concerns about the program's lack of integration into the graduate programs of the University more generally and less-than-ideal direction and monitoring by the faculty who supervised their courses of study.

Many of the students used phrases such as "stepchild," "orphan," and "second-class" to describe how they believed the program is viewed by faculty, other students, and administrators. Although a lead program is designated for each student, the lead program does not provide funding, office space, participation in a listserv, or any other means of integrating students into the units represented by the areas combined to create the individualized programs. All but one of the students didn't even have a mailbox. Again and again in research on graduate education, student productivity and program completion are related to integration of students into their departments (e.g., Lovitts, 2001). Some of the students also expressed frustration with difficulties gaining entrance to the classes they needed to complete their programs. They were told that only after students "in the program" were served could the IIP students be enrolled. As one administrator noted, "no one wants to take responsibility. There is no ownership of this program." The issues of ownership and integration are serious problems and would need to be corrected if the IIP is to continue.

Related to this lack of ownership is an apparent absence of full participation by the faculty committee in the direction of the student's program. Most students felt that their primary faculty advisor was involved, but at least one student indicated that even this level of guidance was absent. There was less agreement that the rest of the faculty committee contributed significantly to overseeing the student's plan of study. Several
faculty members also were concerned that committee involvement was not provided or less than ideal. There was disagreement about whether the entire committee even met with the student when he or she was initially accepted into the program. Some said this did occur and others said it did not. This is a long-standing problem with the program.

In the first review of the program between 1983 and 1986, information on programmatic weaknesses included the directive that more direction and monitoring of students were needed. It appears that nearly 20 years later this is still a problem. This difficulty in providing adequate student mentoring might be related to the program's previous leadership. The new program director, Associate Provost McKerrow, has only been in place slightly more than a year and the self-study he prepared fully acknowledges this problem and offers suggestions for improvement.

This apparent difficulty with faculty participation after the student is admitted may be exacerbated by the absence of faculty participation in developing the student's plan of study from the point of application. One graduate director noted that "one day in campus mail a program of study arrives." The director is simply asked to review and approve or modify the plan. Faculty "buy-in" may be improved if faculty members participate in the development of the application, write letters of recommendation for the student, and pledge their sponsorship of the student from the very beginning. Without faculty commitment, students are left to fend for themselves. One former student remarked: "You need to line up and lobby faculty who believe in you as a person. The program is not for the faint-hearted or those who need structure." Certainly all of us appreciate self-directed graduate students; however, the ability to attract faculty interest in one's work should not be the central criterion for student success in the program. Several faculty members responded when asked what they or the University would lose if the program were discontinued said, "nothing." (Please note, however, that when others were asked the same question they responded that talented, creative students would not be served and that the University would lose an opportunity to benefit from their innovative work.)

Some of the students noted that involving faculty may be difficult because faculty don't know much about the program or what is expected of students. This concern was also included in the review of the program in 1983-1986. The observation was made that there were no guidelines for minimum and maximum expectations in course work and research. This problem is a concern at any point, but even more so when it has been noted for nearly 20 years. More generally, both students and faculty observed that the program is not promoted and students are not actively recruited into it.

As mentioned earlier, students do not receive funding through the program. This has a number of negative consequences. First, only students who have other means of support can participate. All of the students we talked with were either University employees, full-time employees elsewhere, or supported by a fellowship in some other program. The number of students in the program is small and has apparently decreased over the years. It is hard to identify exactly why this trend has occurred; however, it is likely that funding has played a role. Second, without funding as a teaching or research assistant, students are denied access to professional development as a teacher or a researcher. Both skills are critical, at least among Ph.D. students, for high-level professional positions appropriate for doctoral recipients. Third, without the opportunity to participate in a faculty member's research program as a research assistant, it is less likely that the student will be able to publish. Indeed, none of the students we talked with had publications. Student productivity data were not included in the self-study, so it is not clear if other students in the program have or have not published. Soma had
conference presentations, but here too, the lack of funding, in the form of travel support, prevented them from either presenting at all or presenting as often as they wanted to and were capable of doing. One student specifically said that she stopped attending conferences because she simply couldn’t afford it. Fourth, time to degree is extended. Several students indicated that they did not take more than a course a quarter.

Thus, when compared against standard criteria for quality doctoral programs (which include student publications, grants and awards, conference presentations, participation of students drawn from a national pool, full-time financial support, time to degree and student mentoring) the program does not appear to be meeting the needs of the students. Faculty criteria that are relevant to evaluating programs are unknown. Summaries of the records of faculty who have directed the students’ programs (or the records themselves) were not included in the self-study.

Possible Courses of Action

There are at least four possible directions, offered in no particular order, that the University could choose for the IIP: (1) strengthen the program, (2) eliminate the doctoral component of the program, but retain the master’s program, (3) eliminate both components of the program, or (4) allow the program to continue as it is.

(1) Strengthen the program

Ideally, if the program is going to continue, especially at the level of the Ph.D., steps must be taken to improve faculty and department “ownership” of the IIP, student mentoring, funding, and recruitment. The following are some suggestions for strengthening these areas:

(a) Faculty who will be working with the student (or at least a subset of the eventual committee) should be involved in designing the student’s program before a final application is submitted. Faculty who are potential mentors could be identified on a website describing the program, with contact information available, in order to facilitate student communication with faculty. Faculty would work with the student to develop the plan of study, identify the general area of dissertation research, and generate professional objectives. Faculty would also be required to provide a letter of recommendation. From the information in the self-study faculty involvement sometimes occurs at this point, but not always or perhaps even often. Faculty involvement and commitment might be improved if engagement always begins at the outset of the student’s work. Creating structure at the beginning of the student’s program is also important because the student is not a part of an established program with clear cultural norms, socialization practices, and expectations that will facilitate student development. Initial structure might help the student by clarifying goals and objectives and allow the student to demonstrate whether he or she is likely to be successful in a more ambiguous interdisciplinary context.

(b) Given that there seemed to be questions concerning expectations of students in the program, a committee might be formed to develop specific guidelines for IIP plans of study, professional objectives, milestones, and time lines that faculty and students could use to help them develop the individualized programs.
(c) The faculty committee, along with the IIP director, should meet together with the student after the student is admitted. A review of the student’s progress should be developed and discussed at an annual meeting thereafter with the student’s committee and the IIP director. Goals for the next year should be identified and agreed upon, along with the progress review, and both should be given to the student in writing, and copied to the student’s file in the IIP office. Problems should be discussed and resolved. Of course, more frequent meetings should be encouraged; however, an annual meeting among committee members and the IIP director would be a minimum expectation. Before the final project is submitted to the appropriate college for review, the IIP director should also provide approval.

(d) IIP students should be considered as a student in the lead program and count in the total number of students admitted and funded in the particular program. In other words, if a particular department typically admits 5 new students and it agrees to serve as a lead program for an IIP student, then it would only admit 4 more students. The IIP student would compete for funding in the same way as the other students in the program and have all other privileges of department membership afforded to him or her (e.g., office space, mailbox, e-mail account, travel money, dissertation support etc.). Students might also be asked to submit GRE scores and GPA/TOEFL requirements might be increased so that their competitiveness for a funded place could be evaluated in relation to other students in the lead program. If departments are not willing to make this commitment to IIP students, then the Provost’s Office needs to identify resources that can be provided to IIP students.

(e) Once the program is strengthened, recruitment efforts, either by a central administrative office or the lead programs, should be initiated. Funds for recruitment should be made available by the colleges and the Provost’s Office.

(2) Eliminate the doctoral component of the program, but retain the master’s program

The decision may be made that additional resources are not available for strengthening the Ph.D. component of the IIP. Even current resources dedicated to the program might be better invested elsewhere. Few students are being served by the program, it is a weak program and substantial resources would be required to improve it, and there may be better ways to achieve the goal of providing interdisciplinary Ph.D. training to doctoral students than the IIP. Indeed, if the decision were made to discontinue the Ph.D. IIP, interdisciplinary approaches to doctoral training need to be expanded to meet the needs of doctoral students in the twenty-first century. This expansion may be required even if the doctoral IIP were retained.

With respect to present resources, the director of the IIP already dedicates at least a full day every one to two weeks to the IIP and if the program were strengthened even more time would be required. Additional faculty time would also be needed, along with financial resources. The following question needs to be asked: What other initiatives could be developed using the time and funds saved if the doctoral IIP were discontinued? For instance, programs for professional development of Graduate Teaching Assistants might be considerably expanded, providing necessary training for future doctoral-level professionals and improving delivery of instruction to the
undergraduates they teach. Many more students would be reached by such an initiative than the number currently served in the IIP. There are undoubtedly many other initiatives that could be supported and University administrators will need to decide priorities for the institution.

Although mentoring would still need to be strengthened for master's students, these students expressed fewer concerns about the program than Ph.D. students. In addition, enrollment in the master's program and the number of awarded degrees are higher in the master's program than for the Ph.D. component of the IIP, suggesting that the master's program is more successful in meeting the needs of students. Finally, issues related to funding and student publication are less critical for master's than doctoral programs. Research training is certainly a critical part of master's education; however, professional training is often the primary (although certainly not only) educational objective.

(3) Eliminate both components of the program

Although the master's component of the IIP may be more successful, it will still require additional resources. Again, the decision may be made that these resources would be better directed to some other program or initiative.

(4) Allow the program to continue as it is

The decision may be made that the IIP is achieving the goal of providing interdisciplinary training to the students who desire it and that the resources dedicated to it are appropriate to meet this goal. If this decision is made, however, the University needs to acknowledge that the program will continue to be weak, especially at the doctoral level.
Academic Program Review: Individualized Interdisciplinary Program (IIP)

Strengths noted in the Program review:

In its objective, the IIP is consistent with the recommended directions on collaborative, inter- or multi-disciplinary approaches to research and graduate training. The IIP has long incorporated ideals that only recently have been recognized as critical for the future of research and graduate education. Additionally, the IIP allows Ohio University to provide master's or doctoral training in areas not currently offered as a program, especially to students who have no mobility and cannot seek the program elsewhere. It also offers the university an opportunity to develop programs in response to repeated IIP student interest. In these ways, the IIP meets the university's mission of holding the intellectual and personal growth of the individual to be a central purpose.

Concerns noted in the Program review:

The IIP does not adequately meet some of the objectives thought to be critical to a successful graduate degree program, and currently has almost no structure. The admission or retention of certain students with less than the required GPA is both troubling and unacceptable if academic standards are going to be maintained by the IIP. The absence of built-in expectations for key components commensurate with those of other post-baccalaureate degrees raises questions of academic rigor and development of critical thinking for individual IIP degree programs. A major concern exists with respect to the format leading to the legitimate conferral of "Master's" and "PhD" degrees. A troubling issue is the general lack of interest on the part of the students with respect to participating in most standard professional development activities, especially at the PhD level. If the IIP is considered to be integral to OU's mission, and unless OU will make a commitment to support and strengthen the IIP to meet its objectives most effectively within a reasonable period of time (e.g., two years), then this lack of commitment at various levels in the university can only be construed as a refusal to endorse the IIP as a university program.

Weaknesses:

The present organization lacks clear policies and procedures for the coordinator, faculty, and students involved in the IIP. More effort for contact with the student and program committee members must be made.

Recommendations of the Graduate Council Curriculum Committee: The Interim Associate Provost for Graduate Studies, Raymie McKerrow, agreed with the review and was taking steps to address the concerns and weaknesses. The committee recommends accepting the program review.
March 8, 2006

David Ingram
Chair, University Curriculum Council
Campus

Dear David Ingram

At its November meeting Graduate Council approved the recommendation of our Curriculum Committee to accept the program review of the Individual Interdisciplinary Programs.

Michael Mumper, was present to represent these programs at our meeting.

Please find attached the summary report of Graduate Council’s Curriculum Committee.

In a lengthy discussion Graduate Council expressed considerable concern that the doctoral component of this program supplied limited support for students enrolled in it. While some students enrolled in the program have produced work of very high quality much of the responsibility for the program falls on the student. There is also no funding to support it. In academic areas where a coherent field of study exists in other universities, but is not currently available at Ohio University, the program can work well.

Graduate Council agreed that, while they believe the IIP program makes an important contribution to graduate studies at Ohio University there is a need for a greater commitment by the university to this program. Clearer mechanisms for mentorship are needed together with a strategy for identifying precisely which college and/or school and department requirements a student must satisfy.

Sincerely,

Duncan H. Brown, Ph.D
Chair, Graduate Council
Associate Professor
School of Telecommunications

Phone: (740) 593-0008
Fax: (740) 593-9184
E-Mail: dbrown2@ohio.edu
January 2, 2003

To: Prof. Mehmet Celenk, Chair, IIP Review Committee
From: Raymie E. McKerrow, Interim Associate Provost for Graduate Studies
Re: IIP Review

I am responding to the Committee’s review of the IIP program. I appreciate the Committee’s serious consideration of the issues raised in the Self-Study. As the third director of the Interdisciplinary Individualized Program in the current review period, I am aware of the issues raised by the review. My intent in this response is that these comments serve as guidelines for considering future changes.

There is only one small correction to the current review: the requirement to submit GRE/GMAT test scores is not restricted to the “lead” department. In practice, the student is asked to comply with the admission requirements of each program. Beyond this one issue, the review accurately captures the past and present status of the program.

I agree with the review’s concern with respect to admission of student’s with less than the requisite grade point average; I will review the current GPA’s of all enrolled students, and will take appropriate action with respect to making sure all students are making satisfactory progress with respect to graduation requirements. With respect to future admissions, I will be taking a more proactive approach in evaluating the student’s initial qualifications. While exceptions to minimum standards are possible, the problem in the past is that such waivers, especially at the master’s level, have been well below an acceptable norm. In the future, serious inquiries will be shared in advance with respective graduate directors and associate deans, including information relative to GPA and academic background. Their response will be the key factor in any decision to move forward. This strategy should help avoid future ‘low GPA admission’ issues.

The integration of students into programs is rightly recognized as a continuing problem. As in the case of part-time graduate students, and others who are not funded as assistants, the IIP students can feel “left out” of departmental events and support. IIP students may not be seen as “belonging” to any one program, especially when a student seeks support to attend a conference. As one remedy, I have made travel funds available to IIP students who have presented at conferences. This support is not contingent on support from a
department or college, though I have worked with programs to see if additional support can be made available to IIP students. This fund needs to be formalized, with information made more readily available to all IIP students. The presence of the fund may also assist in increasing the research profile of students involved in the program, as they will know some support will be available for conference presentations.

The issue concerning faculty participation in a student’s program is an important one. I have been more active on some student’s committees, in terms of meeting with the student to see how their program is going. Given the current size of the program, it may be useful to monitor progress on a more systematic basis—this may assist in locating problems and seeking remedies before they become major concerns. Increasing attention by faculty to a student’s initial application, as recommended in the report, is another strategy that should increase faculty involvement over time.

Student funding is a major drawback to both the research productivity of student’s (partly responded to above) as well as to program size. In the past, as near as I can discern from the records, students who were not already funded, or supported via OU employment, were granted tuition waivers. I suspect that stopped as we changed fee waiver practices, and initiated the OGS stipend/scholarship as the replacement. While it is still possible for programs to fund an IIP student, and at least one master’s student is on such funding now, that is less likely given the option of funding a student whose major will be in the program providing the funds. It would be appropriate for the Graduate Council to consider this issue when they consider the report; it would be helpful to have their support in seeking funding for those students who otherwise might not enter the program. If it were possible for Graduate Studies to provide the funding, the work commitment could be tied to a faculty member’s research within one of the student’s programs.

Once the review process is completed, it would be appropriate to convene an ad hoc group of faculty who have been involved with the program. Their charge would be to consider the recommendations approved by the Graduate Council and UCC, especially as these relate to program expectations, and to provide the director with advice on how best to improve the program. It may be useful for such a group to meet at least twice a year to review admissions, interview students in the program, and serve as an informal advisory committee to the director.

In closing, I want to reiterate my thanks to the review team for their participation in this process. In writing the self-study, I raised several questions about the program, and the review has been responsive to my initial concerns. Hopefully, this response will assist in moving the discussion forward, and result in a stronger program.
Date: October 5, 2006

To: Kathy A. Krendl, Provost

From: David O. Thomas, Chair, University Curriculum Council

CC: Michael J. Mumper, Associate Provost for Graduate Studies
    Martin T. Tuck, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs

Subject: Review of the Individualized Interdisciplinary Program (IIP)

As you will note, the review of the Individualized Interdisciplinary Program (IIP) raised several concerns. You will note from the attached response to the Academic Assessment Report, written by Michael Mumper, some progress has been made in addressing these concerns. However, several issues remain.

Accordingly, after consulting with Associate Provost Mumper and Associate Provost Tuck, I am recommending that:

1. The IIP program be reviewed again during the 2007 – 2008 academic year.
2. In the meantime Dr. Mumper, Dr. Tuck, and I will meet to study other ways to enhance the program.

Pending the 2007 – 2008 review, the University Curriculum Council will either endorse the program or, in accordance with Regents Advisory Committee on Graduate Study (RACGS), recommend that the program be suspended. As you know, a suspended program that is not reinstated within seven years will be automatically removed from the curriculum.
Response to the Academic Assessment Report for the Individualized Interdisciplinary Program (IIP)

The review of the IIP program raised important concerns. In response to these concerns, we have made several important changes in the administration and operation of the program. Most important, we completely revised the admission process to include the faculty involved in each program PRIOR to admitting an applicant. We no longer admit any student until we have three faculty members who are willing to serve on the student’s committee and one who has agreed to serve as chair or director. New applicants are also required to meet with the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies to review some of the difficulties that previous students have faced and to develop strategies to avoid/overcome them.

In additions, we have revised (or more precisely, developed for the first time), an information packet about the program that goes to faculty regarding the program. Each potential student is required to give the information to the faculty members at the first point of contact. This information lays out the responsibilities of each faculty member and the student. Faculty are also required to have a face-to-face meeting with the full committee and the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies at the very beginning of the program of study. The purpose again is to clarify roles and to answer questions about how the program will proceed.

The Office of Graduate Studies has also devoted an administrative staff member to coordinate the program. This person serves as the central point of contact for all IIP students and to work with the Associate Provost to solve problems as they arise.

Two sets of problems that are identified in the review remain. The first is that there is still no dedicated financial support available for students in the program. For those students who do not need or desire financial support, this is not a problem. But those students who need financial support to complete their programs, the Associate Provost for Graduate Studies works with Associate Deans and Graduate Chairs to try to find an appropriate position. When one cannot be found, the student is advised that finding funding is unlikely and that this might not be the appropriate program for them.

Finally, IIP students still feel isolated from other students in more conventional programs. The Graduate Chair of the lead department is informed whenever a new IIP student is admitted to their unit. The committee chair, and other committee members, is also asked to try to find ways to better integrate this student in their departmental activities. But this separation is an almost inevitable by-product of the structure of the program. The best way to overcome this problem is to admit only those students who understand the benefits AND limitations of individualized study.

In the period before the review of 2003, admission to the IIP program was a fairly routine matter. Since that time the admission process has become much more selective. This is not just admitting more highly qualified students, but admitting students who have the right experience and temperament to succeed in the program. This has made the IIP a much smaller program, but it has reduced the problems and increased the success rate for those students who are in the program.

Michael Mumper
Associate Provost for Graduate Studies
Thursday, October 5, 2006
WHEREAS, Ralph and Luci Schey first inspired the creation of The Sales Centre at Ohio University within the College of Business to enhance sales education and

WHEREAS, Ralph and Luci Schey were honored with the first Lifetime Friend of The Sales Centre award and Ralph was a founding member of the Professional Sales Advisory Board at The Sales Centre and

WHEREAS, Ralph and Luci Schey have supported Ohio University through their generous service...Ralph was a member of the Board of Trustees and both are emeriti trustees of the Ohio University Foundation Board...and through their generous financial commitments to Ohio University and to The Sales Centre.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Sales Centre at Ohio University be named The Ralph and Luci Schey Sales Centre at Ohio University.
APPOINTMENT TO REGIONAL COORDINATING COUNCILS

RESOLUTION 2006 - 2072

BE IT RESOLVED BY the Board of Trustees of Ohio University that the following person be appointed to membership on the Coordinating Council at the Regional Campus of Ohio University Southern.

Ohio University Southern

Sandra L. Carroll	 For a three-year term beginning November 1, 2006, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2009, vice Patricia Schultz, whose term expired.
Sandra L. Carroll

Owner/CEO

- Services the business and promotional needs of more than 1,800 customers in the Ohio, Kentucky and West Virginia region
- Supervises sales staff and provides leadership for office management
- Represents Safeguard Corporate by serving on various national sales boards and by mentoring new distributors
- Received numerous “Top Dollar” national sales awards

Community Involvement

2002-2005 Ohio University Proctorville Center Campaign Committee
- Assists Assistant Dean for Development and center director with identifying prospective donors
- Calls upon prospective donors resulting in multiple gifts to the university
- Served on committees to initiate and implement two annual fundraising events (Bernard L. Edwards Memorial Golf Tournament and Celebrity Waiter)

Family

- Married to Michael Carroll since 1970
- Mother of two sons, Michael (OU alum) and Gabe and grandmother of Samuel

Interests

Family, church, international travel, education, community development
WHEREAS, the continued review of academic programs is essential to the maintenance of quality within an educational institution, and

WHEREAS, Ohio University has had for many years a rigorous program of internal review.

WHEREAS, Section 67 of House Bill 694 provides for the review and evaluation of all programs of instruction conducted by state institutions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University accepts the 2006 Reviews of Centers and Institutes, which recommend that the following centers and institutes be continued or discontinued.

* Institute for Quantitative Biology – Continue
* WOUB Center for Public Media – Continue
* Center for Advanced Software Systems Integration – Continue
* Avionics Engineering Center – Continue
* Institute for Corrosion and Multiphase Technology – Continue
* Child Development Center – Continue
* Tropical and Geographical Disease Institute - Continue

* Center for eBusiness – Discontinue
* Institute for Telecommunication Studies – Discontinue
DATE: September 20, 2006
TO: Roderick J. McDavis, President
FROM: John A. Bantle, Vice President for Research
SUBJECT: Review of Centers and Institutes – 2006

Attached are nine five-year reviews conducted during the 2005-2006 fiscal year for the following Centers and Institutes. The report includes a brief summary for each Center, concur with the recommendation associated with each reviewed Center and Institute and suggest that these recommendations be presented to the Board of Trustees for action at their Autumn meeting.

Institute for Quantitative Biology—continue
Center for eBusiness—discontinue
Institute for Telecommunication Studies—discontinue
WOUB Center for Public Media—continues
Center for Advanced Software Systems Integration—continue
Avionics Engineering Center—continue
Institute for Corrosion and Multiphase Technology—continue
Child Development Center—continue
Tropical and Geographical Disease Institute—continue

Additionally, I recommend that a new center be started titled “Ohio Center for Ecology and Evolutionary Studies” based on the recommendation of the dean of the college of Arts and Sciences.
Criteria for Center and Institute Selection at Ohio University

Mission- Newly proposed Centers and Institutes must fit the mission and goals of Ohio University.

Strengths areas- A newly proposed Center or Institute must come from an area of established expertise that has an established reputation in teaching, research, service or in a strong combination of at least two of the three areas. The reputation and productivity of participating faculty are important determinants of future Center or Institute success. In cases of exploiting a new academic areas, a strong case must be made that existing faculty and programs can convert and be successful in the new area. If new faculty are to be added to achieve a disciplinary reputation, their funding lines must be identified in advance.

Leadership- The Center or Institute proposal must identify a strong and effective leader who can unite faculty on campus and succeed in establishing a reputation for the Center or Institute externally. Skill at fund raising via grants or gifts must be clearly demonstrated.

Opportunity- The acquisition of extramural funds through grants, gifts and student fees and tuition is extremely important in Center or Institute success. The opportunities for such funding must exist or be newly emerging. The Center or Institute must be positioned to take advantage of these opportunities. The external opportunity must be one that promises to last.

Funding model- The funding model must be assure the survival and success of the Center or Institute. Funds supporting the Center or Institute must stable and ample so that the Center or Institute can advance and seek additional monetary help extramurally.

Peers- The proposed Center or Institute must be able to compete against other Centers or Institutes from peers institutions. It may succeed by exploiting a strong niche area or by taking a dominant position in the market.

Vision Ohio- Centers and Institutes must be able to address the requirements of Vision Ohio.
REVIEW OF CENTERS AND INSTITUTES
2005-2006

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Institute for Quantitative Biology: The Institute was established in 2000 to stimulate and focus interdisciplinary research and training efforts in Quantitative Biology at Ohio University. The review committee reports, “it is a unique program in the state of Ohio and is an asset to the research and education missions of the university.” The review committee and the Dean recommend continuance of the Institute. Vice President Bantle concurs with their recommendation.

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

Center for eBusiness: The College requested termination of the Center. Vice President Bantle concurs with this recommendation.

SCRIPPS COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATION

Institute for Telecommunication Studies: Following a special 2-year review of the Institute, the Dean recommends discontinuance of the Institute. Vice President Bantle concurs with this recommendation.

WOUB Center for Public Media (formerly Telecommunications Center): The Center was established in 1970. The mission of the Center is to provide broadcasting services to Southeastern Ohio, to teach students through experience, to disseminate educational programming to primary and secondary schools, to provide facilities and technical assistance for instruction in Athens and among campuses, and to perform contact work with clients who need production assistance. The Dean recommends continuance of the Center. Vice President Bantle concurs with this recommendation.

RUSS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

Center for Advanced Software Systems Integration: Established in 1995, the Center is dedicated to solving fundamental problems concerning the integration of engineering design software, and the estimation of costs to improve and speed the design and manufacture of new products, and to disseminating these results. The Dean recommends continuation of the Center. Vice President Bantle concurs with this recommendation.

Avionics Engineering Center: The Center was established early 1963. It conducts research in advanced communications, navigation, and surveillance systems to improve the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System. AEC is focused on educating undergraduate and graduate students in Avionics Engineering for industry and government. The Dean recommends continuance of the Center. Vice President Bantle concurs with this recommendation.
Institute for Corrosion & Multiphase Technology: Established in 1998, the Institute is a unique resource for the study of problems that arise in the transport of oil and gas in pipelines. The Institute is the umbrella for four major research centers: The Corrosion in Multiphase Systems Center, the Center for Ultrasonic Multiphase Flow Metering, the Center for Flow Improvement, and the Center for Proprietary Projects. The Dean recommends continuation of the Institute. Vice President Bantle concurs with this recommendation.

COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Child Development Center: The Center provides a clinical site for students majoring in Early Childhood Education as well as for students from other disciplines, serves as a site to support scholarly activity and research in the field of child development and early childhood education, and serves as a resource center to the early childhood community in this region. The Dean recommends continuation of the Center. Vice President Bantle concurs with this recommendation.

COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE

Tropical & Geographical Disease Institute: Established in 1989, the institute’s mission is to promote understanding of emerging and re-emerging infectious diseases that primarily afflict populations in tropical regions, and constitute a threat to populations in both developing and developed nations. The Dean recommends continuation of the Center. Vice President Bantle concurs with this recommendation.
To: Jack Bantle, Vice President for Research

From: Ben Ogles, Dean, and Howard Dewald, Associate Dean

Date: June 6, 2006

RE: QBI 5 year review

We are pleased to submit the self-study document, review committee report, and our comments for the Institute for Quantitative Biology (QBI).

Williams Holmes, QBI Director, prepared a self-study document in March 2006. A review committee was constituted and provided with copies of the self-study document. Mary Chamberlin, Professor of Biological Sciences, chaired the review committee. Allan Showalter, Professor in the Department of Environmental and Plant Biology and Michael Prudich, Professor and Chair of the Department of Chemical Engineering were the two other internal members of the committee. Additionally, Professor David Terman, Department of Mathematics at Ohio State University served as an external reviewer.

We concur with the review committee that the QBI should be continued. The review committee has offered six recommendations for furthering the purpose and strengthening QBI. I firmly believe that these recommendations are useful, helpful, and worth further discussions. Success in implementation of some or all the recommendations is likely to have a pronounced impact on the institute that will propel it into more prominence and with greater funding resources.

We remain committed to working with Director Holmes and the institute members to build QBI into a stronger position in the next five years. If after that time period there has been only minimal measurable improvement in the institute's achievements then further consideration of the program would be necessary.

cc: William Holmes, Associate Professor and Director, Institute for Quantitative Biology
May 24, 2006

Dr. Jack Bantle
Vice President for Research
120 RTEC

Dear Jack:

Attached is the committee report on the review of the WOUB Center for Public Media (formerly the Telecommunications Center). The Center is, as the review states, "in many ways, the cultural and educational hub of the region." It is also plays a key role in the research and educational mission of the College, partnering with our academic schools on research and creative projects and providing broadcast training for many students in areas of journalism and media production. According to the Annual Awards Report, Fiscal Year 2005, the Center received $2,181,112 in external awards last year, making it the third most productive Center or Institute on campus.

The Center does face funding challenges in the future, but I am confident we can meet them. I have this year committed more than $500,000 in funds for the construction of a new newsroom for the Center and believe we have opportunities to raise funds for other needed renovations. Rapidly changing technology requirements in the broadcast industry will demand that we continue seeking additional sources of revenue for the Center.

I strongly endorse the Committee's recommendation that the WOUB Center for Public Media be continued.

Sincerely,

Gregory J. Shepherd
Dean

C: Carolyn Bailey Lewis
The Center for Advanced Software Systems Integration (CASSI) has historically been involved in the integration of cost estimation capabilities into manufacturing design software, mainly in the manufacture of aircraft and other turbine engines. The funding for these efforts has been stable and is expected to continue or increase as the integration of design with cost estimation becomes recognized as effective by other industries.

The leadership of the center has recently changed from former Director, Dr. Charles Parks to the current Director, Dr. Robert Judd. This change is seen as positive since Dr. Judd has been the leader of the most significant research team in the center for at least five years.

The center has a very good funding record and the outlook for funding opportunities is outstanding. I support, without reservation, the continuance of the Center for Advanced Software Systems Integration.
Date: April 25, 2006
To: Jack Bantle, Vice President for Research
From: Dennis Irwin, Dean and Moss Professor of Engineering Education
Re: Review and Renewal of the Avionics Engineering Center
Copy: A. Bukley, S. Ostermann, J. Rankin

Please accept this as my enthusiastic support for the renewal of the Avionics Engineering Center in the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science. The center has, since 1963, overseen almost $100M in external research funding, currently works with eleven affiliated faculty members of the Russ College of Engineering and Technology, employs around thirty-four full-time staff, and affords professional opportunities for almost forty undergraduate and graduate students.

The center is Ohio University's oldest and most successful venture of its kind and serves as a model for future research endeavors. It accounts for one-fourth of the university’s research funding and is world recognized as the leader in the area of avionics research. As Brad Parkinson, Draper Prize winner for the development of the Global Positioning System and Stanford University professor and alumnus recently told me, “there are only two or three organizations in the world doing quality work in the GPS area...one is Ohio University and the other is Stanford.”
Date: May 16, 2006
To: Jack Bantle, Vice President for Research
From: Dennis Irwin, Dean and Moss Professor of Engineering Education
Re: Review and Renewal of the Institute for Corrosion and Multiphase Technology
Copy: A. Bukley, M. Prudich

The Institute for Corrosion and Multiphase Technology is a unique resource for the study of problems that arise in the transport of oil and gas in pipelines. Almost all of the oil and gas industry, world-wide, participates in the Institute’s research programs as sponsoring partners and/or as sponsors of proprietary agreements (contracts). The Institute is now under highly competent and energetic leadership and its funding is increasing at a healthy rate.

The Institute now has a realistic business model and a plan for paying the university’s investment in operating costs. The Russ College has also invested heavily in the Institute, primarily by funding the cost of the building and capital equipment, and I consider this investment to be well spent.

The Institute can improve by effectively involving more faculty and encouraging graduate students to become more involved in the intellectual product of the Institute by authoring or coauthoring papers and/or by developing research proposal. I am confident these issues will be resolved.

I fully support the continued existence of the Institute as part of the Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering.
To: John Bantle, Vice President for Research  
From: Gary S. Neiman, Dean  
Date: June 5, 2006  
Subject: Child Development Center Review

I am pleased to endorse the positive review of the Child Development Center and recommendation for its continuation. The review appropriately portrays the Center as one meeting critical community needs and providing an important training site for a number of academic majors, the largest segment being early childhood education majors. The Center was recently awarded accreditation from the National Association for the Education of Young Children.

The Child Development Center is just that, a development center. As such, it models the most current methodologies of education in a developmentally appropriate environment. CDC will continue to develop synergies with the early childhood education program and serve as a setting in which educational hypotheses can be tested and in which students can gain exemplary, pre-professional experiences.

The staff of the CDC should be commended for their fine efforts in reaching for excellence in this facility. Likewise, I applaud the efforts of the review committee for its insightful and thoughtful review.

Sincerely,

Gary S. Neiman, Ph.D.
Dean

xc: Cathy Waller, Director, CDC  
Ann Paulins, Director, HCS  
Review Committee:
- Michele Morrone, Review Committee Chair  
- Davida Parsons, Coordinator of Clinical Services, OUTA  
- Chiharu H. Uchida, Assistant Professor, HCS  
- Maureen Boggs, Early Care and Education Division Director, COSAD  
- Joan McMath, Professor of Early Childhood Education, College of Education
Interoffice Memorandum

June 16, 2006

TO: John A. Bantle, Ph.D.
    Vice President for Research

FROM: John A. Brose, D.O., Dean
      College of Osteopathic Medicine

SUBJECT: 5-Year Review, Tropical & Geographical Disease Institute (TDI)

Attached for your review and referral to the Ohio University Board of Trustees are three reports generated from the examination of TDI: (1) TDI Self-Study Executive Summary; (2) TDI Five-Year Self-Study; and (3) Report of the Five-Year Review Committee.

As reported by the Review Committee, TDI's unique role in tropical disease research brings national and international prominence to Ohio University. TDI programs provide outstanding teaching and learning opportunities both for OU graduate and undergraduate students and for OU-COM medical students. The Institute has generated over $1 million in funding over the last five years. Recommendations from Dr. Christopher Schofield, an international expert in the area of tropical disease medicine and organization, are consistent with the Review Committee to strengthen current collaborations and expand programs into areas of disease study. I concur with the Review Committee's recommendation that TDI continue as an Institute of Ohio University, within the College of Osteopathic Medicine.

If you have questions regarding these reports, or if you need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Date: October 6, 2005
To: Jack Bantle, Vice President for Research
From: John Day, Chair, MIS Department
Subject: Center for eBusiness

We have received your request for the self-study of the Center for eBusiness for the Review of Centers and Institutes this year. This center was created when the idea of eBusiness was a hot topic. Since that time, however, the interest in eBusiness has diminished quickly and topics in this area have simply become incorporated into the general MIS field. As a result, this center never grew as proposed and we have basically let it die. Therefore, I would request that we abolish this center at this time.
May 24, 2006

Dr. Jack Bantle
Vice President for Research
120 RTEC

Dear Jack:

Attached is the committee report on the review of the Institute for Telecommunications Studies (ITS). As the reviewers' report makes clear, ITS has been a modest enterprise initiated to serve the interests of a particular School. Over time, however, the interests of the School of Telecommunications have changed significantly and we now think of institutes as organizations that fulfill broader purposes and constituencies. I concur with the report's finding that the future viability of the Institute is "limited" and that what potential for it exists is dependent upon rather severe reconceptualization (including a change in focus and name), restructuring (including a relocation out of the School of Telecommunications), and reenergizing (including the recruitment of new faculty and leadership). In essence, the review committee is suggesting the creation of what would amount to a new Institute rather than the continuation of ITS. But, if faculty interest in an Institute like that suggested by the review committee exists, those faculty are free to plan and propose approval of a new Institute. In my opinion, the more honest and prudent approach would be to discontinue ITS and see if its elimination leads to the proposal of a new center or institute, rather than continue the Institute with the expectation that it will undergo radical change and morph into something very different.

In sum, this review, coupled with my own analysis of the Institute, leads me to recommend the discontinuance of ITS. I make this recommendation with some reluctance and considerable sadness, because the head of ITS, Professor Don Flournoy, is an outstanding member of my faculty and has been a very effective leader of the Institute. Still, I do not believe that continuing support for the Institute is in the best interest of the College or University.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gregory J. Shepherd
Dean

C: Professor Don Flournoy
Mr. Schey presented the resolution. Mr. Lawrie seconded the motion. All voted aye.

Prior to the motion, President McDavis asked Provost Krendl to review the status of alleged plagiarism occurring in the College of Engineering.

Establishment of an Academic Honesty Hearing Committee and Procedures

Resolution 2006 – 2074

WHEREAS, Ohio University is facing the issue of alleged plagiarism and academic misconduct in the Russ College of Engineering and Technology by a few of its former graduate students, and

WHEREAS, the Ohio University Board of Trustees want to adopt policies and procedures to address dealing with former graduate’s academic honesty issues, and

WHEREAS, the Ohio University Board of Trustees clearly expects academic honesty to be a critical part of Ohio University and affirms its belief that academic integrity is a core value of the University.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees adopts the Ohio University Student Code of Conduct Section 3.A. I Academic Honesty Rule (attached) as applicable to former students who have graduated from Ohio University; and also adopts the Ohio University Academic Honesty Hearing Committee Procedures For Former Graduates Students (attached), and authorizes the President to amend these procedures as necessary, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the President, upon the recommendation of the Academic Honesty Hearing Committee to the Provost, in accordance with the adopted procedures, may, upon further recommendation of the Provost, revoke a former graduate student’s degree.
Date: October 5, 2006

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Kathy A. Krendl, Provost

Subject: Adoption of Rules for Former Graduate Students

I would like to update you on the efforts Ohio University has taken to address the issues of plagiarism in the Russ College of Engineering and Technology; and I will have a more detailed update at the upcoming board of trustees meeting. The Academic Honesty Hearing Committee has been appointed, which is made up of three Full Professors; we had a very successful "Day of Discourse" on Academic Honesty on September 28, 2006; and the Ohio University Academic Honesty Hearing Committee Procedures For Former Graduate Students have been created.

In order for Ohio University to proceed to have the hearings, which could possibly lead to a revocation of a degree for former graduate students, I am requesting the Ohio University Board of Trustees adopt the Academic Honesty rule applicable to current students and the above noted procedures to deal with the former graduate students. The three (3) current graduate students whose Master's Thesis were involved in the review have all had their cases adjudicated by the Office of University Judiciaries.

The adoption of the Academic Honesty rule and the procedures for former graduate students is similar to the steps and legal requirements for sanctions to be taken regarding current students by the Office of University Judiciaries; but for the former graduate students we will address the issues using the Academic Honesty Hearing Committee for the current and any future similar cases.

I have attached the Academic Honesty rule, the procedures, and a proposed resolution to be adopted by the Ohio University Board of Trustees to authorize the possible sanction of a revocation of a degree.

Thank you and I will be available at the Academic Quality Committee and at the full board meeting to provide a more detailed update on the plagiarism issues.

Enclosures

Cc: President Roderick J. McDavis

Dr. Alan H. Geiger, Secretary to the Board of Trustees
**Academic Misconduct** – Dishonesty or deception in fulfilling academic requirements. It includes, but is not limited to cheating, plagiarism, un-permitted collaboration, forged attendance (when attendance is required), fabrication (e.g., use of invented information of falsification of research or other findings), using advantages not approved by the instructor (e.g., unauthorized review of a copy of an exam ahead of time), knowingly permitting another student to plagiarize or cheat from one’s work, or submitting the same assignment in different courses without consent of the instructor. Note: An instructor may impose a grade penalty for academic misconduct and/or file a judicial referral.
Hearing Procedures

The purpose of the hearing before the Ohio University Academic Honesty Hearing Committee (Hearing Committee) is to hear the cases and render sanctions related to the charge of alleged academic misconduct against accused former graduate students (accused) brought forward by the faculty of their academic programs (the complainant) at Ohio University (University). The specific charges are based on the allegation of a Violation of Section 3:A.1. Academic Misconduct currently part of the Ohio University Student Code of Conduct. The Hearing Committee will decide by a preponderance of evidence whether the charge is proven and, if proven, what the appropriate sanctions will be. The Hearing Committee will be composed of three (3) Full Professors. The Provost will be responsible for appointing members of the Hearing Committee for each case or group of possible cases.

A. Standard of Proof

The standard of proof is preponderance of the evidence. Preponderance of the evidence is defined as the greater weight of the evidence; that is evidence that outweighs or overbalances the evidence opposed to it. A preponderance means evidence that is more probable or more persuasive. It is the quality of evidence that is weighed. Quality may or may not be identical with quantity. If the weight of the evidence is equally balanced, the complainant has not proven the charge. The burden for proving an alleged violation rests with the University.

B. The Ohio University Academic Honesty Hearing Committee

In cases where the complainant determines the charge may warrant sanctions, for example, a rewrite of a thesis or dissertation (rewrite) or a revocation of a degree, the accused after written notice of the charge from the Hearing Committee may opt to have the Hearing Committee hear the case; the Hearing Committee may agree a rewrite is an appropriate sanction and not have a hearing if the accused agrees. A date for a hearing will be determined within a reasonable period of time after notification of the Academic Misconduct charge to the accused by the Office of Legal Affairs. If the accused fails to appear at a scheduled hearing and the absence is not excused, the hearing may proceed in the accused's absence.

C. Guidelines for Hearings

1. Introduction

a. The chairperson of the Hearing Committee will explain the accused rights and options and assure that fairness and due process will be observed throughout the hearing.

b. Hearings are closed to the public. The accused may also request a telephone/video hearing, which may be granted by the chairperson in accordance with the rules adopted by the Hearing Committee.
c. The accused may ask for the removal of a member of the Hearing Committee, prior to a hearing, by showing written evidence of bias.

d. In cases before the Hearing Committee, if the charge of bias is made to the chairperson who will determine whether it is valid. If bias is shown, the chairperson will excuse the Hearing Committee member and the Provost will appoint an alternate. If the charge of bias is against the chairperson, the Provost shall decide whether it is valid. If bias is found, the chairperson will be excused and the Provost will appoint a member of the board as chairperson and appoint an alternate. The chairperson may exclude participants from the hearing if they are disruptive, or postpone the hearing because of disruptive behavior of participants or observers.

2. Case Presentation

a. Both the University Representative, speaking on behalf of the complainant, and accused will be given the opportunity to make an opening statement highlighting the main points of their case. This presentation will be made by the University’s Office of Legal Affairs, as the University Representative, on behalf of the complainant; and may be made by the accused, the accused’s advisor or legal counsel.

b. The University Representative will then present its side of the case followed by a presentation by the accused. These presentations may include testimony, evidence, and witnesses.

c. Both sides may be questioned by members at the Hearing Committee. The University representative, and the accused or the accused’s advisor or legal counsel will have an opportunity to question the witnesses.

d. Following the presentations, the University Representative and then the accused may orally summarize their case, which can be made by the accused or the accused’s advisor or legal counsel.

e. Further, as part of the accused’s summary, the accused will be given the opportunity to submit an oral or a written Statement of Impact to be considered in the event the accused is found in violation of the offense as part of the summarization, and the Statement of Impact will include an opportunity to provide written personal recommendations.

D. Deliberation and Findings

1. The Hearing Committee will go into closed session to determine by the preponderance of evidence whether the accused will be found in violation of the charge. The Hearing Committee will determine its findings by majority vote, when the Hearing Committee completes its determination.

2. If the Hearing Committee finds that the accused is not found in violation, the case will be dismissed. If the accused is found in violation, the Hearing Committee will proceed to decide on a sanction.

3. The Hearing Committee will consider the following in determining a sanction: i) statements and evidence presented at the hearing; ii) seriousness of the violation; iii)
the complainant's oral and written Statement of Impact; iv) the accused personal recommendations.

4. After the Hearing Committee determines the sanction, the chairperson will orally notify the accused, as well as send the accused written notification of the final decision, subject to the appeal process set forth in F.

5. Generally, the sanctions imposed may require the Master's Thesis or Dissertation to be a rewrite, a revocation of a degree, and an appropriate notation regarding the accused's academic transcript. If the final sanction is a rewrite, a "flag" will be placed in the convicted former graduate student's academic file that will detail the finding of a rewrite, which can be removed only upon request by the Provost. Where the sanction is a revocation of degree, the academic transcript will be removed from the convicted former graduate student's academic record and a "flag" will be placed on the file that the Master's Thesis and degree have been revoked. If the sanction is a rewrite, the sanction will include compliance with all of the University and appropriate academic standards.

E. Role of Advisor or Legal Counsel

1. In cases before the Hearing Committee, the University Representative will formally present the case, and the accused will be given adequate notice in order to seek an advisor or legal counsel. The accused will be allowed to use an advisor or legal counsel to represent them at the hearing in accordance with the above noted and following procedures.

2. The advisor or legal counsel may make the opening statement, or the Statement of Impact; however, the University Representative or the accused, the accused's advisor or legal counsel may not conduct direct or cross-examination of witnesses as hostile witnesses, which essentially involves engaging in unprofessional behavior.

3. The accused, the accused's advisor or legal counsel may also provide the Hearing Committee with any written information on behalf of the accused.

F. Appeals

If the accused is found in violation by the Hearing Committee, the accused may file a written appeal to the Provost within ten (10) days of the written notification of the sanction from the chairperson of the Hearing Committee. The Provost will review the written appeal and make a final decision within thirty (30) days and notify the accused in writing if, after reviewing the record of the hearing, the Provost determines that the appropriate sanction is a rewrite. If the appeal involves a revocation of a degree, based on a recommendation from the Hearing Committee, the Provost and President determine the appropriate sanction should be a revocation of a degree rather than a rewrite, the President will notify the accused of the final decision in writing.
Audit, Finance, Facilities and Investment Committee
Thursday, October 19, 2006
Walter Hall Governance Room

Present: C. Daniel DeLawder, J. Michael Lawrie, Micah Mitchell and Norman Dewire
Absent: C. Robert Kidder

Board Action: None taken in committee due to the absence of Mr. Kidder

Committee Action:

Grosvenor Fire Alarm Renovation – Approval of Construction Documents and Award of
Contracts (Tab 3 or 15)
- Current system does not meet life-safety requirements
- New system design has been completed
- University is prepared to issue bids for construction services
- Budget is $350,000

Bush Airport Relocation of NAVAID System – Approval of Construction Documents and Award
of Contracts (Tab 4 or 16)
- Elimination of airport beacon which is no longer necessary
- Project is 90% federally funded, with 5% University match, and 5% State of Ohio/Department of
Transportation match
- University is ready to proceed into construction phase
- Budget is $430,000

Bush Airport Snow Removal Equipment Storage Facility – Approval of Consultant Selection (Tab
5 or 17)
- Project will expand the existing storage facility to three times the current size
- Project is 90% funded by the FAA; University portion is $19,000
- University is ready to proceed into a design phase, select consultants and prepare construction
documents with a fall start date for construction
- Budget is $380,000

Lancaster Regional Campus and Pickerington Center Storm Sewer and Parking Lot Repairs –
Approval of Consultant Selection (Tab 6 or 18)
- Project will expand, improve and resurface parking lot
- Project is being funded in part (50%-$200,000) with a 2005 US EPA grant and University
Outreach and Regional Campuses matching funds
- Total project budget is $400,000
- Previous construction at the Lancaster campus is progressing very well; the Front Door is
complete and the building can be utilized in 10 days.
Amerihost Lease Extension (Tab 7 or 19)

- Lease originated in 1989 and has changed hands twice—current lessee is Sunburst Hospitality Corporation who wishes to sell its interest to Focus Lodging Group and requests an additional twenty-year lease to assist them in obtaining financing.
- Original lease = basic rent $16,000 per year for the first twenty years, and $24,000 for the renewal period, and a percentage rent of 5% of gross annual room rentals over $400,000 per year for the first 20 years and 5% over $500,000 per year for the renewal period.
- New terms under extension = basic rent of $24,000 for the first three years of the proposed second renewal (2029-2032), with a 5% inflation escalator every three years thereafter, and percentage rent of 5% of gross annual room rentals over $500,000 per year for the second renewal period.

Fiscal Year 2005-06 Audited Financial Statements and Reports on Federal Awards (A-133)

- Inappropriate to accept audit until the Foundation Board has had an opportunity to review it.
- The Ohio University Board of Trustees will “accept” rather than “approve” the audit contingent upon the Foundation accepting the audited financials.
- The “draft” financial statement is missing due to changes that could occur in the next two weeks.
- Total assets ($794,437,976) less liabilities ($288,148,114) = Total Net Assets ($506,289,862)—see page 6.
- Net Assets for the years ending June 2004 – 2006 are further displayed divided into: 1) Invested in capital assets—net of related debt, 2) Restricted nonexpendable, 3) Restricted expendable, and 4) Unrestricted with definitions for each listing—see page 7.
- Ohio University statements of net assets; statements of revenues, expenses, and changes in net assets; and statements of cash flows as of June 30, 2005 and 2006—see pages 14 – 19 (Ohio University Foundation listed separately).
- Operating loss does not include state subsidies.
- Focus on the Income (Loss) before other revenues, expenses, gains or losses ($44,147 for 2006 compared to $4.3M last year)—see middle of page 17.
- Detailed Ohio University Foundation notes—see page 40.
- Audit Reports will continue to be presented at the Fall Board meeting in the future.

Audit Scope and Organization (Deloitte & Touche LLP) (Spiral bound booklet)

- Audit Scope and Organization.
- Communications to the University’s Board of Trustees as Required by SAS No. 61, as Amended by SAS No. 89 and SAS No. 90.
  o Standards require obtaining an understanding of the University’s internal control structure; accounts payable was tested and certain errors found and identified in Appendix A; however the projection of potential additional unrecorded amounts of $227,801 (statistical number) is not included in such.
No significant changes in accounting policies
No disagreements with management

Summary of Constructive Service Comments and OMB Circular A-133 Findings
- Management Letter Comments produced a 17 page letter with no weakness, reportable conditions, or alert items; an * indicates a repeat from the prior year. The 4-6 errors from last year have been corrected, but are not noted here; some items will require years to correct due to the length of time needed to implement the changes; however the plans are underway.
- Twenty-five student aid files were pulled and only eight errors found as compared to 10 previously

The board approved a report from the external audit firm Deloitte, and accepted the audited financial statements and the report on federal awards issued in accordance with OMB Circular A-133 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006. The board's approval of the Deloitte report is subject to the acceptance by the Ohio University Foundation Board of Trustees of the Ohio University Foundation audited financial statements in early November.

Status of Other Reports
Emerging Issues
Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) changes/new pronouncements include sales and pledges of receivables and future revenues, elements of financial statements, (definition of assets and liabilities) and whether derivatives should be displayed among other

Appendices – A—Schedule of Uncorrected Misstatements
- Reclassification from cash to accounts receivable
- Monomoy Theater difference
- Accrual for portion of electric and water bills
- Summer session entry
- Depreciation expense
- Senate Bill 140 effect
- Parking Fine Revenue
- Seven entries are very good for an institution this size—only two were over $100,000
- The “Iron Curtain” approach versus the “Roll Over Approach”

B—Material Communications
Questions and Answers

Treasurer's Report (Tab 9 or 23)
- Schedules presented according to investment policies on a quarterly basis are:
  - Investment Performance Report
  - Investment Loan Fund Detail
  - Bond Principal Outstanding as of August 31, 2006

Internal Audit Annual Report (Tab 8 or 22)
- Prior year performance and FY 06 Work Plan presented (audits, follow-up audits, and limited scope audits and investigations)
- Ethics Hotline implemented; issues included:
  - misuse of institutional resources
• financial matter
• employee misconduct
• employee benefit abuses
• inappropriate communication

• Internal Audit Office Budget (94% allocated to personnel costs) and historical expenditures shared

February Board Meeting

- Ten-year capital plan, as well as a financing plan will be presented
- Schedule an AFFI committee meeting prior to the February meeting BOT meeting
Committee Chairman DeLawder reported, in addition to matters before the Committee and Board, presentations were received by Internal Auditor Kathryn Gilmore, Treasurer William Decatur, and External Auditors Deloitte & Touche LLP W. Michael Fritz, Partner, and Lisa A. Plaga, Senior Manager.

Chairman DeLawder thanked Ms. Gilmore and Mr. Decatur. Mr. DeLawder noted the report of the External Auditors was a "clean one" with recommendations for improvement in various systems controls. He noted the audit was of the University and The Ohio University Foundation and as such would not be formally accepted or released until the Foundation Board meets on November 4, 2006. Mr. DeLawder commented the only carryover item from the previous audit dealt with the timely notification to the Federal Government of student withdrawals.

A copy of all audit material will be included with the Official Minutes once The Foundation Board accepts the audit reports.

Committee Chairman DeLawder reviewed and presented matters before the Committee. He presented and moved approval of the following resolutions. Dr. Dewire seconded the motion. All voted aye.

Resolution 2006 — 2075 — Approval of Construction Documents and Authority to Receive Bids and Enter Into Construction Contracts, Grosvenor Hall and Grosvenor West Annex Fire Alarm System

Resolution 2006 — 2076 — Approval of Construction Documents and Authority to Receive Bids and Enter Into Construction Contracts, Bush Airport Relocation of Beacons and Navigation Controls

Resolution 2006 — 2077 — Approval to Hire Consultants and Develop Construction Documents, Bush Airport Storage Facility for Snow Removal Equipment

Resolution 2006 — 2078 — Approval to Hire Consultants and Develop Construction Documents, Ohio University Lancaster Campus and Pickerington Center Storm Sewer and Parking Lot Repairs

Resolution 2006 — 2079 — Providing for the Authorization, Issuance and Sale of Not to Exceed $6,350,000 General Receipts Bond Anticipation Notes of the Ohio University

Resolution 2006 – 2081 – Approval of Extension of the Amerihost Inn Lease Amendment
APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS AND AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE BIDS AND ENTER INTO CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

RESOLUTION 2006 - 2075

WHEREAS, the existing fire alarm system at Grosvenor Hall and Grosvenor West Annex has been plagued with numerous false alarms, and does not meet current life-safety requirements,

WHEREAS, a capital improvement project for replacement of the fire alarm system at Grosvenor Hall and Grosvenor West Annex has been planned, designed and funded,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby approve the plans and specifications for the Fire Alarm Replacement project at Grosvenor Hall and Grosvenor West Annex.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby authorize the advertisement for and receipt of bids for this project, and does empower the President or his designee to accept and recommend award of construction contracts, providing the amount of the total bids does not exceed the available funds.
Interoffice Communication

Date: October 3, 2006

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: William Decatur, Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer

Re: RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS, RECEIVE BIDS AND AWARD CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS.

University Planning and Implementation has developed two capital projects through design and are ready to proceed into construction phase. Implementation would like to advertise for bids and award construction contracts for the following two projects.

Fire Alarm Replacement project for Grosvenor Hall & Grosvenor West: Authority to perform this project’s design was granted as part of the 2006 Basic Renovations program, and subsequently the Associate was hired for this design effort in May 2006. The contract for design services totals $28,750.00. The design has been completed and the University is prepared to issue bids for construction services. The estimate for construction is $316,115.00.

Relocation of Beacons and Navigation Controls at Bush Airport: This project is 90% federally funded, with 5% local match and 5% State of Ohio. Department of Transportation match per the Airport Improvements Program (AIP). Design Services for this project were previously approved as part of FY 2006 AIP, so only approval for construction services is required. This project relocates off-site beacons which are no longer required by FAA (thereby terminating ongoing lease payments), and upgrades on-site airfield navigation aids to bring the operating surfaces into compliance with current standards. The estimated cost for construction is $430,000, of which $21,500 is the University match.

I have enclosed a separate resolution for each of the above projects for consideration by the Board of Trustees at their regular meeting on October 20, 2006, for approval to advertise for construction services and award construction contracts for these projects. A separate resolution is specific to the Bush Airport project because of the role of the FAA in the approval process, which should not be confused with the funding and approval authority being used to implement the Grosvenor Hall project.

If I can be of further assistance or provide additional information regarding this matter, please respond.

Cc: Dr. Alan H. Geiger, Secretary to the Board of Trustees
Mr. John Kotowski, Associate Vice President Facilities
APPROVAL OF CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS AND AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE BIDS AND ENTER INTO CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

RESOLUTION 2006 - 2076

WHEREAS, a continuing series of capital improvement projects have been planned and programmed for Ohio University Airport in partnership with the Federal Aviation Administration, and

WHEREAS, discussions between appropriate University personnel and federal regulatory agents have identified and provided funding approval through a matched grant process, and

WHEREAS, the regulatory requirements for including the specified projects on Airport Layout Plan (ALP) for Federal Fiscal Years 2006-2007 funding has been met,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby authorize the advertisement for and receipt of bids for construction services in support of Relocate Beacons and Navigation Aids project at Ohio University Bush Airport, and does empower the President or his designee to accept and recommend award of construction contracts, providing the amount of the total bids does not exceed the available funds.
Interoffice Communication

Date: October 3, 2006

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: William Decatur, Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer

Re: RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS, RECEIVE BIDS AND AWARD CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS.

University Planning and Implementation has developed two capital projects through design and are ready to proceed into construction phase. Implementation would like to advertise for bids and award construction contracts for the following two projects.

**Fire Alarm Replacement project for Grosvenor Hall & Grosvenor West**: Authority to perform this project’s design was granted as part of the 2006 Basic Renovations program, and subsequently the Associate was hired for this design effort in May 2006. The contract for design services totals $28,750.00. The design has been completed and the University is prepared to issue bids for construction services. The estimate for construction is $316,115.00.

**Relocation of Beacons and Navigation Controls at Bush Airport**: This project is 90% federally funded, with 5% local match and 5% State of Ohio, Department of Transportation match per the Airport Improvements Program (AIP). Design Services for this project were previously approved as part of FY 2006 AIP, so only approval for construction services is required. This project relocates off-site beacons which are no longer required by FAA (thereby terminating ongoing lease payments), and upgrades on-site airfield navigation aids to bring the operating surfaces into compliance with current standards. The estimated cost for construction is $430,000, of which $21,500 is the University match.

I have enclosed a separate resolution for each of the above projects for consideration by the Board of Trustees at their regular meeting on October 20, 2006, for approval to advertise for construction services and award construction contracts for these projects. A separate resolution is specific to the Bush Airport project because of the role of the FAA in the approval process, which should not be confused with the funding and approval authority being used to implement the Grosvenor Hall project.

If I can be of further assistance or provide additional information regarding this matter, please respond.

Cc: Dr. Alan H. Geiger, Secretary to the Board of Trustees
    Mr. John Kotowski, Associate Vice President Facilities
APPROVAL TO HIRE CONSULTANTS AND DEVELOP
CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS

RESOLUTION 2006 - 2077

WHEREAS, a continuing series of capital improvement projects have been
planned and programmed for Ohio University Airport in partnership with the Federal
Aviation Administration, and

WHEREAS, discussions between appropriate University personnel and federal
regulatory agents have identified and provided funding approval through a matched grant
process, and

WHEREAS, the regulatory requirements for including the specified projects on
Airport Layout Plan (ALP) for Federal Fiscal Years 2006-2007 funding has been met,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of
Trustees does hereby approve the hiring of consultants for the design of a Snow Removal
Equipment (SRE) Facility at Ohio University's Bush Airport.
Interoffice Communication

Date: October 3, 2006

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: William Decatur, Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer

Re: RESOLUTION FOR PROJECT APPROVAL AND AUTHORIZATION TO HIRE CONSULTANTS & DEVELOP CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS.

University Planning & Implementation has established two capital improvement projects and are ready to proceed into a design phase. University Planning and Implementation would like to select consultants and prepare construction documents for each of the two projects.

**Storage Facility for Snow Removal Equipment** at the Bush Airport, Athens Campus: This project is also programmed as part of the Airport Improvements Program (AIP) for federal fiscal year 2007 funding for design services and FY 2008 for construction services. The estimated cost for design services has been established at $39,500, as a percentage of total project costs (including construction) of $380,000. This project will result in expanding the existing snow removal equipment storage facility at Bush Airport to approximately twice the current size and will bring this facility into compliance with current FAA guidelines.

**Storm Sewer and Parking Lot Repairs** at Ohio University’s Lancaster Regional Campus and Pickerington Center: This project has been programmed to address necessary repairs and safety conditions at both locations. This project is being funded in part (50%) with 2005 US EPA grant for storm water pollution prevention measures and university funds through University Outreach and Regional Campuses. The UORC portion more than satisfies the local match requirement. The existing parking lot at the Lancaster campus is in desperate need of repairs, and both locations require upgrade to the storm sewer inlets and discharge openings. Total project budget has been established at $400,000, with the eventual design to direct subsequent allocations between the two campuses.

I have enclosed a separate resolution for each of the above projects for consideration by the Board of Trustees at their regular meeting on October 20, 2006, for approval to hire consultants and prepare construction documents for these projects. A separate resolution is specific to the Bush Airport project because of the role of the FAA in the approval process, which should not be confused with the funding and approval authority being used to implement the Lancaster Regional Campus project.

If I can be of further assistance or provide additional information regarding this matter, please respond.

Cc: Dr. Alan H. Geiger, Secretary to the Board of Trustees
Mr. John Kotowski, Associate Vice President Facilities
APPROVAL TO HIRE CONSULTANTS AND DEVELOP CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS

RESOLUTION 2006 - 2078

WHEREAS, a capital improvement project for necessary improvements for storm water management at Ohio University's Lancaster Campus and Pickerington Center has been planned and programmed and is ready for commencement of the design phase and the development of construction documents, and

WHEREAS, discussions with appropriate Legislators and staff and with the approval of federal EPA, special funding has been appropriated to address this need,

WHEREAS, other, previously approved construction activities at both locations are sufficiently completed and will not adversely impact addressing these storm water deficiencies,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby approve the hiring of consultants for a project to plan and design storm water improvements and landscape repairs at the Ohio University Lancaster Campus and Pickerington Center.
Interoffice Communication

Date: October 3, 2006

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: William Decatur, Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer

Re: RESOLUTION FOR PROJECT APPROVAL AND AUTHORIZATION TO HIRE CONSULTANTS & DEVELOP CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS.

University Planning & Implementation has established two capital improvement projects and are ready to proceed into a design phase. University Planning and Implementation would like to select consultants and prepare construction documents for each of the two projects.

**Storage Facility for Snow Removal Equipment** at the Bush Airport, Athens Campus: This project is also programmed as part of the Airport Improvements Program (AIP) for federal fiscal year 2007 funding for design services and FY 2008 for construction services. The estimated cost for design services has been established at $39,500, as a percentage of total project costs (including construction) of $380,000. This project will result in expanding the existing snow removal equipment storage facility at Bush Airport to approximately twice the current size and will bring this facility into compliance with current FAA guidelines.

**Storm Sewer and Parking Lot Repairs** at Ohio University’s Lancaster Regional Campus and Pickerington Center: This project has been programmed to address necessary repairs and safety conditions at both locations. This project is being funded in part (50%) with 2005 US EPA grant for storm water pollution prevention measures and university funds through University Outreach and Regional Campuses. The UORC portion more than satisfies the local match requirement. The existing parking lot at the Lancaster campus is in desperate need of repairs, and both locations require upgrade to the storm sewer inlets and discharge openings. Total project budget has been established at $400,000, with the eventual design to direct subsequent allocations between the two campuses.

I have enclosed a separate resolution for each of the above projects for consideration by the Board of Trustees at their regular meeting on October 20, 2006, for approval to hire consultants and prepare construction documents for these projects. A separate resolution is specific to the Bush Airport project because of the role of the FAA in the approval process, which should not be confused with the funding and approval authority being used to implement the Lancaster Regional Campus project.

If I can be of further assistance or provide additional information regarding this matter, please respond.

Cc: Dr. Alan H. Geiger, Secretary to the Board of Trustees
Mr. John Kotowski, Associate Vice President Facilities
Mr. DeLawder presented and moved approval of the resolution. Mr. Schey seconded the motion. All voted aye.

RESOLUTION 2006 - 2079

PROVIDING FOR THE AUTHORIZATION, ISSUANCE AND SALE OF NOT TO EXCEED $6,350,000 GENERAL RECEIPTS BOND ANTICIPATION NOTES OF THE OHIO UNIVERSITY

WHEREAS, by authority of Sections 3345.11 and 3345.12 of the Ohio Revised Code (the “Act”), The Ohio University (hereinafter called the “University”), a state university of Ohio created and existing under Chapter 3337 of the Ohio Revised Code, is authorized to acquire and construct “facilities”, as therein defined, to issue its obligations to pay all or part of the costs of such facilities or to reimburse itself for such costs which it has paid from its own funds, and to refund obligations previously issued, in accordance with the applicable provisions of Section 3345.12 of the Act, and to secure said obligations by a pledge of and lien on all or such part of the “available receipts” of the University (as defined in such section) as may be provided for in the proceedings authorizing such obligations, excluding moneys raised by taxation and state appropriations; and

WHEREAS, the University, pursuant to Section 3345.12 of the Act and a General Bond Resolution adopted by this Board of Trustees (hereinafter called the “Board”) on April 14, 1972, entered into a Trust Agreement (the “Indenture”) dated as of June 1, 1972 (of which a resolution of the Board known as the “General Bond Resolution” constitutes a part), providing for the issuance from time to time of General Receipts Bonds of the University and pledging such available receipts as security for such bonds; and

WHEREAS, the University has previously issued general receipts bond anticipation notes in the principal amount of $7,050,000 (the “Prior Notes”) for the purpose of acquiring administrative information management systems including expenses necessary or incident to such acquisition of these systems and the placing of them in use and operation, and costs of issuance of such notes (collectively, the “Project”), which notes were issued in anticipation of the issuance of General Receipts Bonds of the University under and pursuant to Section 3345.12 of the Act and Resolution No. 2005-2022, adopted by the Board on December 14, 2005; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary and desirable to refund the Prior Notes in the principal amount of $7,050,000 by issuing general receipts bond anticipation notes pursuant to Section 3345.12 of the Act in anticipation of the issuance of General Receipts Bonds of the
University under the Indenture and the General Bond Resolution, and which such bond anticipation notes are to be secured as hereinafter provided;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE PRESIDENT AND TRUSTEES OF THE OHIO UNIVERSITY, AS FOLLOWS:

In order to obtain funds for the purpose of refunding the Prior Notes, the Board hereby determines that (i) it is necessary and in the best interests of the University to issue General Receipts Bonds of the University in a principal amount not to exceed $6,350,000 bearing interest at the rate not to exceed six per cent (6%) per annum, maturing in substantially equal annual or semiannual installments of principal and interest over a period not exceeding thirty (30) years after their issuance, and having an estimated annual principal and interest payment of approximately $470,000, (ii) it is necessary and in the best interests of the University to issue notes in anticipation of the issuance of such bonds in a principal amount not to exceed $6,350,000 (herein the “Notes”) pursuant to the laws of the State of Ohio, and particularly the Act, upon the terms set forth herein; and (iii) the Project will constitute “auxiliary facilities” or “education facilities” as defined in the Act.

The Notes shall (i) be issued in a principal amount not to exceed $6,350,000 in one or more series; (ii) be of the denominations, dated and numbered; (iii) bear interest at a rate or rates not exceeding six per cent (6%) per annum, based on a 360-day year comprised of twelve 30-day months, payable at maturity; and (iv) mature on a date not exceeding one year from the date of issuance; all as determined by the Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer of the University (herein the “Treasurer”). The Notes may be subject to call for redemption prior to maturity, upon such terms as the Treasurer may determine. The principal of and interest on the Notes shall be payable upon presentation at maturity in lawful money of the United States of America at the office of the Treasurer or at such bank or trust company as may be designated by the Treasurer (herein the “Paying Agent”). The Notes may be issued in bearer or fully registered form, without coupons, as determined by the Treasurer, and the Paying Agent shall serve as Note registrar and transfer agent for any Notes issued as registered obligations. If the Notes are issued in registered form, principal and interest shall be paid only to the registered owner thereof as shown on the Note registration records maintained by the Paying Agent on behalf of the University.

Notes issued in registered form shall be transferable by the registered holder thereof in person or by his attorney duly authorized in writing at the principal office of the Paying Agent upon presentation and surrender thereof to the Paying Agent. The University and the Paying Agent shall not be required to transfer any registered Note during the 15-day period preceding any interest payment date or preceding any selection of Notes to be redeemed, or after such Note has been selected for partial or complete redemption, and no such transfer shall be effective until entered upon the registration records maintained by the
Paying Agent. Upon such transfer, a new Note or Notes of authorized denominations of the same maturity and for the same aggregate principal amount shall be issued to the transferee in exchange therefor. The University and the Paying Agent may deem and treat the registered holders of registered Notes as the absolute owners thereof for all purposes, and neither the University nor the Paying Agent shall be affected by any notice to the contrary.

The Notes shall bear such designation to distinguish them from other obligations of the University as shall be made by the Treasurer, shall be negotiable instruments and shall express upon their face the purpose for which they are issued and that they are issued pursuant to general laws of Ohio, particularly the Act, and to this Resolution. The Notes shall bear the manual or facsimile signatures of the Chairman of the Board or the President of the University and the Treasurer and may bear the official seal of the University or a facsimile thereof, and shall bear the manual authenticating signature of the Paying Agent or an authorized representative of the Paying Agent.

The Notes shall be awarded and sold to a registered municipal securities dealer, selected by the Treasurer, experienced in underwriting state and local bond issues (the "Original Purchaser"), at a price determined by the Treasurer provided that such price shall be not less than 97% of the principal amount thereof, plus accrued interest on the aggregate principal amount of the Notes from their date to the date of delivery to and payment by the Original Purchaser, all in accordance with, and subject to the terms and conditions of, the Original Purchaser's proposal contained in the hereinafter-described note purchase agreement. The determinations and designations to be made by the Treasurer pursuant to this Resolution and such award and sale shall be evidenced by the execution of a certificate of award (the "Certificate of Award") by the Treasurer setting forth such award and sale, the other matters to be set forth therein referred to in this Resolution, and such other matters as the Treasurer determines are consistent with this Resolution, including without limitation, restrictions on the issuance of additional notes on a parity with the Notes and requirements for payments into the Note Payment Fund. That the matters contained in the Certificate of Award are consistent with this Resolution shall be conclusively evidenced by the execution of the Certificate of Award by such officer.

The Treasurer is hereby further authorized and directed to execute and deliver, in the name and on behalf of the University, a note purchase agreement with the Original Purchaser upon such terms as approved by such officer not inconsistent with this Resolution, and not substantially adverse to the University. The approval of such officer, and that such note purchase agreement is consistent with this Resolution and not substantially adverse to the University, shall be conclusively evidenced by the execution of such note purchase agreement by such officer. The Treasurer is hereby authorized to make arrangements with Carlile Patchen & Murphy LLP to serve as bond counsel and
underwriter’s counsel for the Notes, and such firm is hereby appointed to serve in such capacities.

The Treasurer, and any other appropriate officers of the University, are each hereby separately authorized to make arrangements for the delivery of the Notes to, and payment therefor by, the Original Purchaser, to give all appropriate notices and certificates and to take all actions necessary to effect the due authorization, execution and delivery of the Notes pursuant to the provisions of the note purchase agreement. It is hereby determined that the price for and the terms of the Notes, and the sale thereof, all as provided in this Resolution, are in the best interest of the University and in compliance with all legal requirements.

The proceeds from the sale of the Notes shall be deposited and allocated as follows:

$6,350,000 shall be deposited in the Note Payment Fund referred to in the Prior Resolution and used, along with other moneys deposited by the University in the Note Payment Fund, to pay the principal of and interest on the Prior Notes at their maturity.

Such proceeds shall be used for the purposes set forth above and for no other purpose. Pending such use, the proceeds of sale of the Notes may be invested in lawful University investments approved by the Treasurer. Any of such proceeds remaining after the completion of the Project shall be transferred to the Note Payment Fund and used to pay the principal of and interest on the Prior Notes at their maturity.

The Notes shall be payable from a special fund previously created in the custody of the University or the Paying Agent, as determined by the Treasurer (the “Note Payment Fund”) which shall be used solely for the payment of the principal of and interest on the Notes. Moneys for the payment of the principal of and interest on the Notes, but only from the hereinafter-described sources, shall be deposited in the Note Payment Fund not later than the date on which payment of the Notes is payable. Interest on such moneys shall be deposited in such fund or account of the University as the Treasurer shall determine.

Principal of and interest on the Notes, together with the principal of and interest on any other notes that may currently be outstanding or that may hereafter be issued by the University on a parity therewith, shall be equally and ratably payable from and secured by a pledge of and a lien on, the “General Receipts” of the University as defined in Section 1 of the General Bond Resolution, but subject to the existing pledges thereof in favor of the University’s General Receipts Bonds heretofore or hereafter issued pursuant to the General Bond Resolution and the Indenture. The principal of and interest on the Notes shall also be equally and ratably payable from, and secured by a pledge of and lien on, the moneys and investments in the Note Payment Fund and the proceeds of the sale of bonds or notes issued pursuant to the Act or other authorizing provisions of law to refund or retire the
Notes which shall be deposited in the Note Payment Fund; provided that neither the State of Ohio, the University nor the Board shall be obligated to pay the principal of or interest on the Notes from any other funds or source, nor shall the Notes be a claim upon or lien against any property of the State of Ohio or any other property of or under the control of the University, and the Notes, as to both principal and interest, shall not be debts or bonded indebtedness of the State of Ohio, shall not constitute general obligations of the State of Ohio or the University, the full faith and credit thereof are not pledged thereto, and the owners of the Notes shall have no right to have any excises or taxes levied by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio for the payment of such principal or interest.

In consideration of the loan evidenced by the Notes, the University covenants and agrees that (i) it will use its best efforts to do all things necessary to effect the authorization, issuance and delivery, prior to the maturity of the Notes, of bonds or notes to refund or retire the Notes, pursuant to the Act, or other authorizing provisions of law, in such principal amount as shall be necessary together with other lawfully available funds, if any, to pay the principal of and interest on the Notes, (ii) it will do all things necessary to sell such bonds or notes at the time provided above and will accept such price and such interest rate or rates as shall be necessary in order to effect such sale, and (iii) it shall apply the proceeds of such bonds or notes to the extent necessary to make full payment of the principal of and interest on the Notes; such obligations are established as duties specifically enjoined by law upon the University and its officers, and resulting from their respective offices, trusts or stations within the meaning of Section 2731.01 of the Ohio Revised Code. In connection with the aforesaid covenant, it is the present intention of the University that such bonds as may be issued to retire the Notes will be issued as “General Receipts Bonds” pursuant to the General Bond Resolution.

The foregoing pledges in favor of the Notes shall be released upon the deposit by the University, in the Note Payment Fund, of cash or noncallable direct obligations of the United States of America, or a combination thereof (which United States government securities mature on or before the maturity date of the Notes) in an amount sufficient fully to discharge the principal and interest requirements of the Notes at and prior to maturity.

In the event any of the Notes shall not be presented for payment when the principal thereof becomes due, if moneys for the purpose of paying, and sufficient to pay, such Note shall have been made available to the Paying Agent therefore, it shall be the duty of the Paying Agent to hold such moneys in trust, without liability to the University or the owner of the Note for interest thereon, for the benefit of such owner, who shall, subject to the provisions of this Section, thereafter be restricted exclusively to such moneys for any claim of whatever nature on his part under this Resolution or on, or with respect to, such Note. Any moneys which shall be so held by the Paying Agent, and which remain unclaimed by the owner of the Note not presented for payment, for a period of three years after the date on which such Note shall have become payable as provided above, shall, upon request in
writing by the University, be paid to the University, and thereafter the owner of such note shall look only to the University for payment and then only to the amounts, or to the extent of amounts, so received by the University without any interest thereon, and the Paying Agent shall have no further responsibility with respect to such moneys.

The moneys paid to the University pursuant to this Section shall be credited by it to a special fund of the University, as a trust fund separate and apart from other funds of the University, to be maintained in an account or accounts with a bank or banks that are members of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The University shall keep a record of the amounts so deposited in said special fund, and moneys in such fund shall be applied to payment of principal of the Note or Notes with respect to which such money is transferred to the University. Moneys in such special fund unclaimed for fifteen years after such moneys are paid to the University shall become the absolute property of the University free from all claims of any kind.

The Board hereby covenants, for and on behalf of the University, that the University will not take any action, or fail to take any action, if any such action or failure to take action would adversely affect the exclusion from gross income of the interest on the Notes under Section 103(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and regulations promulgated thereunder (the "Code"). Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the University hereby covenants as follows:

The University will not directly or indirectly use or permit the use of any proceeds of the Notes or any other funds of the University, or take or omit to take any action that would cause the Notes to be "arbitrage bonds" within the meaning of Sections 103(b)(2) and 148 of the Code. To that end, the University will comply with all requirements of Sections 103(b)(2) and 148 of the Code to the extent applicable to the Notes, including any expenditure requirement, investment limitations or rebate requirements. The Treasurer, or any other officer having responsibility with respect to the issuance of the Notes, is authorized and directed to give an appropriate certificate on behalf of the University, on the date of delivery of the Notes for inclusion in the transcript of proceedings, setting forth the facts, estimates and circumstances and reasonable expectations pertaining to the use of the proceeds thereof and the provisions of such Sections 103(b)(2) and 148, and to execute and deliver on behalf of the University an IRS Form 8038G in connection with the issuance of the Notes.

Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the University agrees that there shall be paid from time to time all amounts required to be rebated to the United States pursuant to Section 148(f) of the Code. This covenant shall survive payment in full or defeasance of the Notes. The University specifically covenants to pay or cause to be paid to the United States at the times and in the amounts determined under such section.
Notwithstanding any provision of this sub-section (a), if the University shall obtain an opinion of nationally recognized bond counsel to the effect that any action required under this Section is no longer required, or to the effect that some further action is required, to maintain the exclusion from gross income of the interest on the Notes pursuant to Section 103(a) of the Code, the University may rely conclusively on such opinion in complying with the provisions hereof.

So long as any of the Notes, or any obligations issued to refund the Notes, remain unpaid, the University will not operate or use, or permit the operation or use of, the Project or any part thereof in any trade or business carried on by any person within the meaning of the Code which would cause the Notes to be “private activity bonds” within the meaning of Section 141 of the Code.

For purposes of this Resolution, the following terms shall have the following meanings:

“Book entry form” or “book entry system” means a form or system under which (i) the beneficial right to payment of principal of and interest on the Notes may be transferred only through a book entry, and (ii) physical Note certificates in fully registered form are issued only to the Depository or its nominee as registered owner, with the Notes “immobilized” to the custody of the Depository, and the book entry maintained by others than the University is the record that identifies the owners of beneficial interests in those Notes and that principal and interest.

“Depository” means any securities depository that is a clearing agency under federal law operating and maintaining, together with its Participants or otherwise, a book entry system to record ownership of beneficial interests in Notes or principal and interest, and to effect transfers of Notes, in book entry form, and including and means initially The Depository Trust Company (a limited purpose trust company), New York, New York.

“Participant” means any participant contracting with a Depository under a book entry system and includes security brokers and dealers, banks and trust companies, and clearing corporations.

Upon a determination by the Treasurer, all or any portion of the Notes may be initially issued to a Depository for use in a book entry system, and the provisions of this Section shall apply to such Notes, notwithstanding any other provision of this Resolution. If and as long as a book entry system is utilized with respect to any of the Notes: (i) there shall be a single Note of each maturity; (ii) those Notes shall be registered in the name of the Depository or its nominee, as registered owner, and immobilized in the custody of the Depository; (iii) the beneficial owners of the Notes in book entry form shall have no right to receive Notes in the form of physical securities or certificates; (iv) ownership of beneficial interests in any Notes in book entry form shall be shown by book entry on the system.
maintained and operated by the Depository and its Participants, and transfers of the
ownership of beneficial interests shall be made only by book entry by the Depository and its
Participants; and (v) the Notes as such shall not be transferable or exchangeable, except for
transfer to another Depository or to another nominee of a Depository, without further
action by the Board of Trustees. Debt service charges on the Notes in book entry form
registered in the name of a Depository or its nominee shall be payable in the manner
provided in the University’s agreement with the Depository to the Depository or its
authorized representative.

The Paying Agent may, with the approval of the Treasurer (if the Paying Agent is an
entity other than the Treasurer), enter into an agreement with the beneficial owner or
registered owner of any Note in the custody of a Depository providing for making all
payments to that owner of principal and interest on that Note or any portion thereof (other
than any payment of the entire unpaid principal amount thereof) at a place and in a manner
(including wire transfer of federal funds) other than as provided in this Resolution, without
prior presentation or surrender of the Note, upon any conditions which shall be satisfactory
to the Paying Agent and to the officer executing the same. That payment in any event shall
be made to the person who is the registered owner of that Note on the date that principal is
due, or, with respect to the payment of interest, as of the applicable date agreed upon as the
case may be. The Paying Agent shall furnish a copy of each of those agreements, certified
to be correct by the Paying Agent, to other paying agents for Notes and to the Treasurer (if
the Paying Agent is an entity other than the Treasurer). Any payment of principal or
interest pursuant to such an agreement shall constitute payment thereof pursuant to, and for
the purposes of, this Resolution.

The Treasurer is authorized and directed to execute, acknowledge and deliver, in the
name of and on behalf of the University, a letter agreement with The Depository Trust
Company, as Depository, to be delivered in connection with the issuance of the Notes to
the Depository for use in a book entry system.

If any Depository determines not to continue to act as Depository for the Notes for
use in a book entry system, the University and the Paying Agent may attempt to establish a
securities depository/book entry relationship with another qualified Depository under this
Resolution. If the University and the Paying Agent do not or are unable to do so, the
University and the Paying Agent, after the Paying Agent has made provision for notification
of the beneficial owners by the then Depository, shall permit withdrawal of the Notes from
the Depository and authenticate and deliver Note certificates in fully registered form to the
assigns of the Depository or its nominee, all at the cost and expense (including costs of
printing definitive Notes), if the event is not the result of action or inaction by the
University or the Paying Agent, of those persons requesting such issuance.
This Resolution and the pledges and covenants of the Board made herein shall constitute a contract between the University and the owners of the Notes, and no alteration or variation of any of the provisions of this Resolution, which shall have, in the opinion of the Treasurer, a material adverse effect on the then current holders of said Notes shall be made so long as any of said Notes remain outstanding and unpaid, except with the written consent of all of such owners.

The officers of the University and of the Board are hereby authorized to take any and all action necessary or proper to comply with the terms of this Resolution and to effect timely delivery of the Notes, and to execute all necessary and appropriate certifications with respect to the Notes and the disposition of the proceeds of sale thereof.

This Board hereby finds and determines that all formal actions relative to the passage of this Resolution were taken in an open meeting of this Board, and that all deliberations of this Board and of its committees, if any, which resulted in formal action, were taken in meetings open to the public, in full compliance with applicable legal requirements, including Section 121.22 of the Revised Code.

The proper and appropriate officers of the Board and of the University, to the extent authorized by law, are hereby authorized to take such actions, and to execute and deliver appropriate closing certificates, and such other documents, certificates and statements, as may be required in connection with sale and delivery of the Notes. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Treasurer and other appropriate officers of the University are hereby authorized to apply to the Ohio Board of Regents for any required approvals with respect to the Project or the Notes, and any such actions heretofore taken are hereby approved, ratified and confirmed. Should all the Project or the Notes not receive such approvals by the time the Notes are sold, the Treasurer shall set forth in the Certificate of Award the portions of the Project and the amount of Notes that have received such approvals. Thereupon, the Notes shall be issued in a principal amount not exceeding the amount approved by the Ohio Board of Regents and the Project shall include only the portions approved by the Ohio Board of Regents. In addition, the Treasurer is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with the Paying Agent for its services if the Paying Agent is an entity other than the Treasurer.

The Treasurer is hereby authorized to execute and deliver preliminary and final official statements on behalf of the University, in such forms as such officer may approve, and to deem such official statements to be “near final” and “final” for purposes of Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 15c2-12, if such officer determines that doing so is in the best interests of the University, such officer’s execution thereof on behalf of the University to be conclusive evidence of such authorization, determination, approval and deeming, and copies thereof are hereby authorized to be prepared and furnished to the Original Purchaser for distribution to prospective purchasers of the Notes and other interested persons.
The Treasurer on behalf of the University is hereby authorized to execute and deliver a continuing disclosure certificate or agreement dated as set forth in the Certificate of Award (the "Continuing Disclosure Certificate") in connection with the issuance of the Notes in such form as such officer may approve. The University hereby covenants and agrees that it will execute, comply with and carry out all of the provisions of the Continuing Disclosure Certificate. Failure to comply with any such provisions of the Continuing Disclosure Certificate shall not constitute a default on the Notes; however, any holder or owner of the Notes may take such action as may be necessary and appropriate, including seeking specific performance, to cause the University to comply with its obligations under this paragraph and the Continuing Disclosure Certificate.

The Treasurer on behalf of the University is hereby authorized to furnish such information, to execute such instruments and to take such other actions in cooperation with the Original Purchaser as may be reasonably requested to qualify the Notes for offer and sale under the Blue Sky or other securities laws and regulations and to determine their eligibility for investment under the laws and regulations of such states and other jurisdictions of the United States of America as may be designated by the Original Purchaser; provided however, that the University shall not be required to register as a dealer or broker in any such state or jurisdiction or become subject to the service of process in any jurisdiction in which the University is not now subject to such service.

The Notes are hereby designated as "qualified tax-exempt obligations" to the extent permitted by Section 265(b)(3) of the code. This Board finds and determines that the reasonable anticipated amount of qualified tax-exempt obligations (other than private activity bonds) which will be issued by the University during the calendar year in which the Notes are issued does not, and the Board hereby covenants that during such year, the amount of tax-exempt obligations issued by the University and designated as "qualified tax-exempt obligations" for such purpose will not exceed $10,000,000. The Treasurer and other appropriate officers, and any of them, are authorized to take such actions and give such certificates on behalf of the University with respect to the reasonably anticipated amount of tax-exempt obligations to be issued by the University during the calendar year in which the Notes are issued and with respect to such other matters as appropriate under Section 265(b)(3).

This Resolution shall take effect and be in force from and after its adoption.

Adopted: October 20, 2006
Mr. DeLawder presented and moved approval of the resolution. Mr. Schey seconded the motion. All agreed. Copies of all related documents are included with the official minutes.

FISCAL YEAR 2005-06 TREASURER’S AUDITED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND FISCAL YEAR 2005-06 AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL AWARDS IN ACCORDANCE WITH OMB CIRCULAR A-133

RESOLUTION 2006 - 2080

WHEREAS, the Ohio University Board of Trustees has reviewed the fiscal year financial statements of the Treasurer, and audit reports,

WHEREAS, the Ohio University Foundation financial statements are included as a discretely presented component unit in the Ohio University audited financial statements, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees of the Ohio University Foundation are not meeting until November 4 to vote on accepting the Foundation’s audited financial statements,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ohio University Board of Trustees hereby accepts the Treasurer’s audited financial statements for fiscal year 2005-2006 ending June 30, 2006, contingent upon acceptance by the Ohio University Foundation Board of Trustees of the Ohio University Foundation audited financial statements, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board hereby accepts Deloitte’s Audit Report issued pursuant to OMB Circular A-133 for the fiscal year 2005-2006 ending June 30, 2006.
Interoffice Communication

Date: October 2, 2006

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: William R. Decatur, Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer

Re: Fiscal Year 2006 Audited Financial Statements, Federal Awards Audit Report and Management Comments

Representatives from the audit firm Deloitte will attend the October meeting of the Board of Trustees to present their report on the recently completed audit for the 2006 fiscal year.

The Ohio University Financial Statements as of and for the Years Ended June 30, 2006 and 2005, and Independent Auditors’ Report, and the Federal Awards Audit Report issued pursuant to OMB Circular A-133 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2006, and the Management Comments will be mailed prior to or distributed at the meeting.
Mr. DeLawder presented and moved approval of the resolution. Mr. Dewire seconded the motion. Approval was unanimous.

APPROVAL OF EXTENSION OF THE AMERIHOST INN LEASE AMENDMENT

RESOLUTION 2006 -- 2081

WHEREAS, Ohio University entered into a lease with Athens Motel Associates Limited Partnership II in 1989 to construct a motel facility on University property on Home Street, now known as the Amerihost Inn, and

WHEREAS, the original term of the lease was for twenty (20) years, renewable for one further twenty (20) year period ending in 2029, and

WHEREAS, the leasehold interest has changed hands twice since 1989. The current lessee, Sunburst Hospitality Corporation, plans to sell its leasehold interest to Focus Lodging Group LLC; and has asked for an additional twenty (20) year lease renewal to help them obtain permanent financing, and sell their interest, and

WHEREAS, the original lease included basic rent of $16,000 per year for the first twenty (20) years, and $24,000 per year for the renewal period, and percentage rent of 5% of gross annual room rentals over $400,000 per year for the first twenty (20) years, and 5% of the gross annual room rentals over $500,000 per year for the renewal period, and

WHEREAS, the office of the Vice President for Finance and Administration has worked to reach an agreement to extend the current lease renewal option for an additional twenty (20) years and negotiated new terms as follows:

Basic rent of $24,000 for the first three years of the proposed second renewal, from 2029 until 2032, with a 5% inflation escalator every three (3) years thereafter, and percentage rent of 5% of gross annual room rentals over $500,000 per year for the second renewal period.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ohio University Board of Trustees hereby approves the second renewal of the Amerihost Inn lease for an additional twenty (20) years and the terms noted above, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOVED, that the President or his designee is hereby authorized to give final approval to the terms and conditions of the amendment to the lease and to authorize his designee to arrange for execution in accordance with Ohio law.
The Amerihost Inn on Home St. was developed under Section 123.77 ORC in 1989 for a twenty (20) year term, renewable for another twenty (20) years, and it has been a successful hotel and addition to the Athens Community since 1989. Further, and importantly, it has been paying Ohio University significant percentage rent since 1991, totaling $781,659.00 to date.

The leasehold interest has been assigned twice during this period, and the current lessee, Sunburst Hospitality Corporation, wants to sell its interest to Focus Lodging Group LLC of Columbus, Ohio. Sunburst Hospitality Corporation has requested that the Lease be amended to allow a second renewal period of another twenty (20) years to possibly extend the lease to 2049 in order to obtain its permanent financing and sell its interest.

The office of the Vice President for Finance and Administration has negotiated an increase of the $24,000/yr lease rent in consideration for the second renewal option with a 5% inflation escalator starting in 2032, with the percentage rent remaining at 5% of gross annual room rentals over $500,000 per year, which is the same percentage rent formula from 2009 – 2029. The current gross annual room rental in 2005 was $2,036,155.30, and percentage rent was $81,967.00.

The attached resolution has been prepared for your review and consideration, and the university staff will be available to answer questions at the board meeting.

Thank you.

JFB:tjp

Enclosures

Cc: Dr. Alan H. Geiger, Secretary to the Board of Trustees
    Mr. William R. Decatur, Vice President For Finance and Administration,
    CFO and Treasurer
    Mr. John K. Kotowski, Associate Vice President For Facilities
    Mr. Larry A. Corrigan, Associate Vice President for Finance
    Ms. Janelle Gellermann, Assistant Treasurer
Present: Norman "Ned" Dewire, Acting Chair; Micah Mitchell, Student Trustee; Roderick McDavis, President; Kathy Krendl, Provost; Kent J. Smith, Jr., Vice President for Student Affairs; Bill Decatur, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Soni Williams, Director, Student Financial Aid; Kirby Hocutt, Director, Athletics; Morgan Allen, President, Student Senate

The meeting was called to order by Acting Chair, Ned Dewire at 4:15 p.m.

ACTION ITEM: Naming of The University Center

A quorum was not realized at the meeting. Therefore, the resolution will be presented to the Board at its meeting on Friday, October 20, 2006.

INFORMATION ITEMS:

ERIP – Early Retirement Incentive Program – Bill Decatur

- program offered last year as part of budget reduction plan
- 316 eligible employees for plan
- 79 enrolled to date
- 69 retired by July 1, 2006 and received a $10,000 bonus
- 10 retired after July 1, 2006
- 49 positions abolished
- 30 positions to be filled
- reviewed number of retirees by unit
- Vice President for Finance and Administration had largest number of 30 since that area has the largest number of eligible employees
- library was high with 9 retiring and also had a high rate of participation when ERIP was offered in 2003-04
- ERIP open to employees until August 31, 2007
- slight increase expected in December; large increase in May and June
- total of 111.5 university-wide position eliminations: 49 ERIP abolishments; 29.5 layoffs occurred among staff (10.5 administrators; 5 classified staff; 14 Group II and IV faculty), and 33 vacant position abolishments
- feel confident that more people will take advantage of ERIP, but no way at this time to determine if we will meet our goal
Health Benefits Cost Analysis – Bill Decatur

- benefits budget components discussed
- supplemental benefits excluded since they are 100 percent employee paid
- university’s medical, dental and drug benefits are self-insured
- benefits plan design features traditional in nature
- university has approximately 4,000 staff and over 8,000 total covered lives
- costs have slightly increased below national trends: on a per insured employee basis, we follow national trends
- discussed statistics on medical and drug utilization during fiscal year 2006
- strategies for 06-07 – theme is “Health Promotion”
  - strategy #1: effective collaboration with the Health Benefits Committee
  - strategy #2: establish and review benchmarks in collaboration with Health Benefits Committee
  - strategy #3: pursue health promotion/wellness opportunities in collaboration with Wellworks and potentially local providers to create a culture of health – continue and improve current “Health Risk Reduction” program with Wellworks

Trustee Dewire would like a report at the next Board of Trustees Meeting from the Health Benefits Committee on the programs and plans they are working on.

HR Metrics – Bill Decatur

- employee count by campus for benefit eligible groups and non-benefits eligible groups
- benefits eligible headcount statistics from 2002-2006: tracks employee/position growth/reduction over time
- track turnover statistics to determine if any trends or issues requiring intervention develop
- tracking retirement eligible staff can assist in monitoring potential staffing issues
- diversity can be tracked over time
- average age for administrators is down while the average age for faculty is up

Learning Communities Update – President McDavis

- new project with School of Accountancy where nine students are working with Deloitte & Touche accounting firm reviewing the internal control structure within Ohio University Foundation accounts
- this opportunity gives the students a professional boost
- we firmly believe that this type of hands-on experience is essential to students’ learning
- program also beneficial to OU Foundation Office because it monitors their internal control structure
- report on project to be given at the next OU Foundation Board Meeting
Intercollegiate Athletics Update – Kirby Hocutt

- Athletic Department is interested in the academic growth and success of student athletes
- their goal is that every student athlete graduate
- academic success rate is 82 percent – 5 percent above national Division I average
- 16 of OU sports programs have an 88 percent graduation rate
- men’s basketball program has highest rate at 83 percent
- student athletes are expected to show personal growth and development realizing they have responsibility to serve as role models and tomorrow’s leaders in the state and nation
- athletic programs prepare young people for success
- vital that student athletes be held to highest standard of behavior
- student athletes must abide by Ohio University Student Code of Conduct and OU’s Athletics Code of Conduct
- OU’s Athletics Code of Conduct is currently under review – report and updated version of Code to be given to President McDavis in a couple of weeks
- input on revisions sought from: ICA Committee, head coaches, student athletes, Provost Kathy Krendl, Vice President for Student Affairs Kent Smith, and the Interim Director ofJudiciaries Malcolm Smith, and others
- the new policy will be in place and effective at the beginning of winter quarter 2007 and will contain different levels of offenses with corresponding sanctions
- policy will allow situational flexibility as no two cases are alike
- Mr. Hocutt and the Athletic Department will continue to have conversations and seek feedback from campus leaders, student athletes, etc.
- confident that the new policy will be very effective – everyone seems pleased with the direction in which they are headed
- so far the revisions have been well received and embraced by coaches and athletes
- student athletes at Ohio University have always been held accountable to the Student Code of Conduct and OU’s Athletics Code of Conduct

Financial Aid Update – Soni Williams

- overview of Federal, State and Institutional financial aid programs available to students
- summary of amount of money given in financial aid to students
- student completes application – aid based on family incomes – statistics shown for 2005-06 of gross family incomes
- explanation given on Gateway Awards Program
- comparing nine of the universities in the Inter-University Council of Ohio, Ohio University ranks in the middle (or fifth) of indebtedness of undergraduate students who graduated in 2005-06
• OU tied with Miami in 2004 of Ohio four year public cohort default rates
• Student Financial Aid Office works with the President's Office on Urban Scholars Program; Appalachian Scholars Program; Templeton Scholars; and the King/Chavez/Parks Scholarships
• of 13 state assisted schools, Ohio University ranks eighth in current tuition costs
• awards given cover main and regional campuses
• the average loan for fulltime freshman in 2003-04 was $4,018, which was higher than the national average
• a recent copy of USA Today newspaper listed OU as fifth from the bottom of list in giving financial aid to students which is incorrect information
• in actuality, two-thirds of Ohio University students get financial aid
• Board concerned that a different data source was used for the USA Today article

Proposed Revisions to Student Trustee Nomination Process – Micah Mitchell

• copies of the original resolution from 1988 and new resolution with proposed changes were distributed
• students were appointed to Ohio Boards of Trustees as a result of the 1970 Kent State shootings
• there is a network of student trustees in the State of Ohio
• privileges for student trustees vary depending on the institution
• it isn't feasible to have a student representative from the regional campuses on the Nomination Committee because it would be difficult for them to attend meetings, interview sessions, etc.
• it isn't necessary for the president of the student governing body of the College of Osteopathic Medicine to be represented on the committee because there is a COM Senator on Student Senate that provides a voice for the college
• President McDavis noted that Trustee Mitchell did an excellent job of providing a summary of changes. He suggested that Morgan Allen, President of Student Senate, provide feedback.
• Morgan agreed with changes to resolution and doesn't think anything else needs to be added
• challenge to get more students interested in applying for position
• supposed to be pool of five finalists and last year's initial search only yielded three. The search was reopened to identify two additional finalists.
• President McDavis has been impressed with the quality of student trustees since he has been President of OU. Student trustees make decisions based on what is best for the university and its students.
• Trustee Dewire commented on how helpful the student trustees were last year in orientating him when he became a member of the Board.
• Trustee Dewire asked that Vice President for Student Affairs, Kent Smith, highlight the proposed changes to the resolution and present it at the next Board of Trustees meeting.

**Update on High Risk Drinking Reduction Strategy – Kent Smith**

- statistics on alcohol-related violations of Student Code of Conduct for week six of fall quarter were distributed – numbers on hand out change weekly
- the table of statistics summarized the cases resolved in a given time period and how each was resolved
- mandate from President McDavis to hold students responsible for their actions
- the number of alcohol related cases is down due to education and stricter enforcement of Code which indicates we are not ignoring alcohol cases on campus and we are getting tougher
- President McDavis has stressed the importance of paying attention to our “town/gown” relationships
- seeing a trend in some cases where we're not getting adequate information in police reports
- focus on getting correct information so we can determine what cases get dismissed
- Trustee Dewire wanted to know if new alcohol policy has had a negative effect on recruiting students
- President McDavis responded that this year’s enrollment was higher than last year’s which indicates there has been no adverse effect from the new policy. He wants students to understand their civic responsibilities so the new policy and student expectations are discussed with new students during Precollege orientation
- across the board, we’re doing a good job – tough policy using discipline when necessary and ongoing education
- finding ways to help students who have alcohol or drug related problems
- the policy affects the entire university so it is important to get the message out to everyone
- taking it one step further to a cultural shift in student behavior – students need to take it upon themselves to change their behavior patterns
- considering creating a creed for students to take – they must feel they can own it before we’ll see changes
- Trustee Dewire thinks this is a critical matter as far as the Board is concerned and likes the idea of a creed for students

**Student Senate Goals for 2006-07 – Morgan Allen**

1. Having the student voice represented in shared vision of OU – administration values student input
2. Increase transparency of university budget – students want clarification of where their money is spent and more input in how money is spent
3. Look at OU retention rates especially for minority and high performance students

4. Create a community environment for students – this is a priority for Student Senate

President McDavis complemented Morgan and Student Senate for meeting with him, the Provost and the Vice President for Student Affairs and presenting issues and concerns in such a professional manner.

President McDavis would like Morgan to attend Board meetings and give updates.

Collaborative On Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) – Kathy Krendl
- national survey of tenure-track faculty job satisfaction sent to all probationary faculty
- need to understand, at a systematic level, how to support probationary faculty
- we don’t have sufficient space for development
- need to know what faculty needs are and COACHE will help with that
- will also help with retention rate of faculty – those who leave are primarily probationary faculty
- will help us address issues and provide a supportive environment
- surveys are sent to Harvard and summary data returned to us
- many different categories of support
- need to bring resources together to help faculty
- establishment of Faculty Learning Commons in Alden Library next to Student Learning Commons
- faculty members are to contact Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, Marty Tuck, with questions
- Provost Krendl thinks we will see a tremendous difference in faculty morale with these changes

The meeting was adjourned by Trustee Ned Dewire at 5:50 p.m.
Committee Chairwoman Perry thanked Trustee Dewire for chairing the committee meeting in her absence. She thanked those giving reports, commenting on the efforts of Athletics Director Hocutt to reconsider how best to deal with student athletes' behavior; Vice President Smith's follow through on programs to reduce high risk drinking; and reports of numbers of students receiving financial aid, and the health and related benefits enjoyed by members of the University community. Ms. Perry thanked Student Senate President Morgan Allen for her comments to the committee and the statement of Senate goals. Copies of these reports are included in the Official Minutes.
Committee Chairwoman Perry presented the resolution. Dr. Dewire moved approval. Mr. DeLawder seconded the motion and approval was by acclamation.

NAMING OF THE UNIVERSITY CENTER

RESOLUTION 2006 - 2082

Whereas, on June 7, 1952, the Ohio University Board of Trustees named the new Student Center in honor of the University's Fourteenth President, John Calhoun Baker (1895-1999), and

Whereas, in doing so wished to recognize President Baker's loyalty, generosity, enthusiasm, leadership, and respect for others as well as the body of work contributed by numerous individuals serving the University who were responsible for the 1953 facility, and

Whereas, the Ohio University Board of Trustees had authorized in 2002 the construction of a new University Center designed to replace and expand the space of the original Baker University Center in order to meet the increasing needs and desires of our growing community, and

Whereas, the University has held high the memory of Dr. Baker, who retired in 1961 and is credited as the “father of the modern Ohio University,” and

Whereas, Ohio University presidents, who succeeded Dr. Baker, value his legacy of engaging the social, intellectual, and cultural minds of those in our community, and

Whereas, the Ohio University Board of Trustees on behalf of the past, present and future students, faculty, and staff wish to continue the legacy of John Calhoun Baker.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the new University Center be named the John Calhoun Baker University Center with the appropriate inscriptions in keeping with the building’s aesthetics.
Dr. Phyllis Bernt, Chair of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and Professor, Communication Systems Management, reported to Trustees on the Senate’s email to faculty asking “What should your Faculty Senate address this year?” A copy of Dr. Bernt’s presentation is included with the official minutes.

Dr. Bernt stated that 88 responses were received to the email request with faculty salaries, shared governance, and healthcare being primary issues. In addition to these issues, the survey respondents noted their concern with faculty recruitment and retention, academic quality and standards, and the resources necessary to their support.
September 6, 2006

Dear Ohio University Faculty:

Welcome back from what we hope was a rejuvenating summer break!

As we begin this academic year, we are focused on enhancing academic excellence and building on our considerable strengths as a University. We hope to achieve these shared priorities by focusing on the following four key areas:

- Faculty retention and recruitment are critical to academic excellence. Our planning efforts this year will focus on these two issues by setting goals for increasing faculty salaries, reviewing benefits to assure that they are competitive, and assuring that faculty workload expectations are clear and reasonable.

- General Education continues to be an important issue for faculty, students, and staff, and is even more important now that the Board of Regents is requiring that all universities in Ohio identify their General Education learning outcomes. A committee, jointly appointed by the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost, will be working to implement a process to assess our General Education program.

- Information technology resources are increasingly important in the classroom and to our research efforts. As the IT area undergoes significant reorganization this year, the Faculty Senate will work with the current CIO, and with his successor, to assure that meaningful faculty input is a part of the new organizational structure.

- Academic integrity is critical to our mission as a university. A committee of faculty, students, and staff is examining ways to provide the policies, infrastructure, and resources needed to sustain academic honesty. The Faculty Senate will work with the Provost and Vice President for Student Affairs to determine how best to implement the committee’s recommendations.

It will take the hard work of all to accomplish these priorities. We look forward to working with you and wish you the best as we begin another rewarding and productive year!

Cordially,

Roderick J. McDavis  Phyllis Bernt
President  Chair, Faculty Senate
Faculty Issues and Concerns

Faculty Senate Presentation to the Board of Trustees, October 2006

Phyllis Bernt, on behalf of the Faculty Senate
Request for faculty input

- Email asking:
  - "What issues do you want your Faculty Senate to address this year?"

- 88 responses
Responses in descending order of frequency—mentioned 4 times or more

- Faculty salaries
- Shared Governance / Health Care
- Budget issues and priorities
- Comments about administrative salaries & practices
- Faculty workload
- Support & resources for faculty work
- Academic standards & plagiarism
- IT issues
- Faculty morale / Academic calendar
- Vision Ohio
- RHE issues / Group II issues / Other benefits
Over-arching themes

- Faculty recruitment and retention
- Shared governance
- Resources to support academic quality
- Academic standards
Faculty salaries

- Compared to other universities in Ohio
  - 7th for professors; 4th for associates; 4th for assistants

- Compared to Presidential peers
  - 10th for professors; 10th for associates; 11th for assistants

- Comparisons by discipline—vary

- Pay raises
  - 6th in state over past 7 years
Faculty retention

- From 04/05-05/06 lost 54 full-time tenure track Athens faculty (7.3%)
  - 15 retired, 6 took administrative positions, 4 were not tenured
  - 29 resigned (3.9%)

- 3 of 202 professors resigned (1.5%)
- 9 of 284 associates resigned (3.3%)
- 17 of 250 assistant professors (6.8%) resigned
What is being done or needs to be done?

- Faculty recruitment and retention
  - Has been identified as a strategic priority
  - Greater efforts made to track faculty recruitment and retention
  - Workload policies are being clarified
  - Need to assure that benefits are competitive
What is being done or needs to be done?

- Shared governance
  - Meetings and communication
  - Joint message to faculty
  - Clarification of Handbook procedures

- Response to Senate resolution regarding shared governance
- Formalized process for Faculty Senate to gather information for input into annual review of administrators
What is being done or needs to be done?

- Resources to support academic quality
  - Academic priorities identified for investment
    - Undergraduate education, graduate education and research, faculty
  - Faculty Advisory Committee on Academic Technology created
  - Broad based education about the new approach to budgeting
  - Identification of quality metrics
  - Monitoring of results of resource allocation to assure that academic quality remains central
What is being done or needs to be done?

- Academic Standards
  - Committee is in place to explore an honor code and to identify needed resources
  - Hearing committee to deal with suspect theses is in place
  - Continued commitment and attention to academic integrity
Report on the Spelling Commission on the Future of Higher Education

Distinguished Professor of Economics, Dr. Richard Vedder, and a member of the Spelling's Commission on the Future of Higher Education, presented snippets from the Commission’s Report. A copy of his remarks are included with the minutes.

Dr. Vedder, reading selected passages from the Report’s preamble, noting while there’s much to applaud, there’s much needing reform, and highlighted issues of literacy, accessibility, accountability, and loss of international ranking.

Dr. Vedder concluded by posing questions for Trustees dealing with and identifying matters of function, operating efficiencies, affordability, transparencies and auditing.
It is time to be frank. Among the vast and varied institutions that make up U.S. higher education, we have found much to applaud but also much that requires urgent reform...

Among high school graduates who do make it on to postsecondary education, a troubling number waste time – and taxpayer dollars – mastering English and Math skills that they should have learned in high school. And some never complete their degrees at all, at least in part because most colleges and universities don’t accept responsibility for making sure that those they admit actually succeed.

As if this weren’t bad enough, over the past decade literacy among college graduates has actually declined. Unacceptable numbers of college graduates enter the workforce without the skills employers say they need.

The consequences of these problems are most severe for students from low-income families and for racial and ethnic minorities. But they affect us all.

Compounding all of these difficulties is a lack of clear, reliable information about the cost and quality of postsecondary institutions, along with a remarkable absence of accountability mechanisms to ensure that colleges succeed in educating students.

American higher education has become what in the business world would be called a mature enterprise: increasingly risk-
averse, at times- satisfied, and unduly expensive. It is an enterprise that has yet to address the fundamental issues of how academic programs and institutions must be transformed to serve the changing educational needs of a knowledge economy.

Troubling signs are abundant. Where once the United States led the world in educational attainment... our nation is now ranked 12th in higher education attainment.
A few statements from the summary and recommendation sections of the report.

4 areas --- access, cost/affordability, transparency/accountability, quality

1. On Access

We found that access... is unduly limited by the complex interplay of inadequate preparation, lack of information about college opportunities, and persistent financial barriers. While about one-third of whites have obtained bachelor's degrees by age 25-29... just 18 percent of blacks and 10 percent of Latinos in the same age cohort have earned degrees by that time.

Students must have clearer pathways among educational levels and institutions and we urge colleges to remove barriers to student mobility and promote new learning paradigms (e.g., distance education, adult education, workplace programs) to accommodate a fare more diverse student cohort.

2. On Cost, Affordability, and Financial Aid

In our view, affordability is directly affected by a financing system that provides limited incentives for colleges and universities to take aggressive steps to improve institutional efficiency and productivity... we proposed a focused program of cost-cutting and productivity improvements in U.S. postsecondary institutions. Higher education institutions should improve institutional cost management through the development of new performance benchmarks, while also lowering per-student educational costs by reducing barriers for transfer students... An important benchmark, for example, would be that the growth in college tuition, not exceed the growth in median family income over a five-year period... Our financial aid system is confusing, complex, inefficient, duplicative, and frequently does not direct aid to students who truly need it... We recommend that the entire student financial aid system be reconstructed and new incentives put in place to improve the measurement of management of costs and institutional productivity...

3. On Transparency and Accountability

Colleges and universities must become more transparent about cost, price, and student success outcomes, and must willingly share this
information with students and families. Student achievement... must be measured... on a "value-added" basis that takes into account students’ academic baseline when assessing their results.

4. On Quality

The commission supports increased federal and state investment in education and research in critical areas such as the STEM fields (science, technology, and engineering), teaching, nursing, biomedicine, and other professions... the federal government must address immigration policies specifically aimed at international students... the commission recommends eliminating the requirement that in order to receive a student visa, all students must prove that they have no intent to remain in the United States after graduation...

FIVE QUESTIONS FOR THE BOARD TO PONDER...

1. Should we set a non-binding goal for Ohio University to restrict its tuition growth to the rate of growth in the income of the typical Ohio family in keeping with the Spelling Commission recommendation?

2. In order to get objective, unbiased, second interpretations on what goes on at the University, should we not have an independent auditor who reports strictly to the board, not the President, and provides information on how we are proceeding in meeting institutional objectives, including some of those suggested by the Spellings Commission?

3. In keeping with the Spellings Commission recommendation on costs and affordability, should we not have a board subcommittee that specifically addresses issues of costs, productivity, and technological improvements, a committee that uses the services of the new Trustee’s auditor a great deal?

4. Should not the Trustees direct the Administration to take meaningful, prompt steps to make our operations more transparent, publishing in easy to understand, non-technical form information on student progress, graduation rates after 4, 5, or 6 years, the budget of the university by categories, information on
the vocational or post-collegiate educational success of its students, and so on?

5. Should not the Trustees take steps beyond creating an independent board auditor that assures that it understands all sides of issues, and is not caught off guard when campus crises evolve? Aside from meeting occasionally with the Faculty Senate president, should the board arrange in some fashion for more extensive contacts with the university community that are not funneled through traditional university channels?
During the report from the Academic Quality Committee, Provost Krendl provided Trustees with an update on “General Education.” This included the mapping by the General Education Learning Outcomes Committee of learning outcomes, by defining the process to be followed, and establishing time lines leading toward a report on learning outcomes Winter Quarter.

Provost Krendl provided Trustees with an enrollment update comparing Fall 2006 with Fall 2005 data. She noted an overall student enrollment difference between the years of negative 121 with the only growth sector in the number of Athens Campus graduate students at plus 79 students. Provost Krendl listed enrollment goals for 2006-07 including an entering class size of 4,100 students with increasing ACT scores, and a more diverse class with more non-residents. She noted our recruitment priorities for 2007-08 are to increase retention, seek two-year transfer students, and improve our numbers of multicultural, non-resident and international students.

Provost Krendl concluded by commenting on the investments to be made through Vision Ohio and describing the makeup of the Budget Planning Council.
PROVOST'S REPORT

Ohio University Board of Trustees
October 20, 2006
National Awards

• Fulbright Scholars
  – Ohio University tied for 14th in the nation on number of awards
  – Tied with Boston College, Pennsylvania State University, Princeton University, UCLA, University of Texas
  – 45% award rate – the highest in the top 20 award-winning institutions in the country
Enrollment Update
## Enrollment Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Budgeted Enrollment</th>
<th>Expected Final Enrollment</th>
<th>Difference: Fall 2006 vs. Fall 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athens Undergraduates:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Freshmen</td>
<td>4,164</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>4,084</td>
<td>-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other New*</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing from prior spring</td>
<td>11,408</td>
<td>11,497</td>
<td>11,315</td>
<td>-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Athens Undergraduates</td>
<td>16,761</td>
<td>16,850</td>
<td>16,557</td>
<td>-204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students (Athens)</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>3,170</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteopathic Medical</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Athens</td>
<td>20,295</td>
<td>20,450</td>
<td>20,174</td>
<td>-121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other new includes non-degree (special) undergraduates; reenrolling undergraduates (not enrolled for at least one prior quarter; relocating undergraduates from regional campuses

**as of 10/16/2006
Enrollment Goals for 2006-2007

- Freshman Class 4100
- Academic Profile – ACT; High School Percentile, High School GPA
- Yield – 37.9%
- Multicultural – 7.9%
- Non-resident – up 15%
Recruitment Priorities for 2007-2008

- Retention
- Transfer
  
  2 + 2 Programs
- Non-resident
- Multicultural
- International
Vision OHIO Investment Processes

- Undergraduate Education
  - First-year experience, retention, transfers

- Graduate Education and Research
  - GERB process

- Faculty Investments
  - Faculty Compensation Task Force
  - Faculty Development
  - Faculty Lines
Budget Planning Council

- 15 members
- Transition to New Budget Model
- Institutional Priorities
- Strategic Budget Planning Process
- Planning Unit Budget Proposals and Hearings
General Education

- General Education Learning Outcomes Committee
  - Requirements at Peer Institutions
  - Learning Objectives
Academic Honesty Update

• Academic Honesty Committee
  – Day of Discourse
  – Long-term and short-term action items
• Academic Honesty Hearing Committee
  – Procedures
Report of the President

President Roderick J. McDavis continued his reporting to the Board of Trustees and briefly identified his goals and activities since the June Trustees meeting. A copy of his report is included with the minutes, and only a brief outline is noted in the minutes.

Report Highlights

Presidential goals for 2006-07
Efforts to increase communication with faculty through departmental meetings
Information Technology recovery process
Campus and civic responsibility issues
Academic honesty initiatives
Vision Ohio implementation
Identification of three top priority areas: undergraduate education, graduate education and research, faculty support
Outstanding number of student Fulbright grants and other national recognitions received by students at the university
PRESIDENT'S REPORT
Ohio University
Board of Trustees
October 20, 2006
President's Goals for 2006-07

• Improve Faculty Communication and Collaboration
• Manage the Office of Information Technology Recovery Process
• Implement the Comprehensive Strategy to Reduce High-Risk Drinking
• Improve Academic Honesty
• Implement Vision OHIO
• Raise Funds to Support Strategic University Priorities
• Strengthen the Financial Control Environment
Faculty Communication and Collaboration

- Working on Faculty Senate and Administration Shared Priorities for the 2006-07 year:
  - Faculty Retention and Recruitment
  - General Education
  - Information Technology
  - Academic Integrity
- Meeting with Faculty in all Departments and Schools on the Athens and Regional Campuses During Fall and Winter Quarters
  - Attended 15 Meetings to Date, which Includes 208 Faculty
  - Significant Positive Exchange of Information and Ideas
- Holding Weekly Luncheon Discussions with Faculty
  - Provost Kathy Krendl and Faculty Senate Executive Committee Representative also Attend
Information Technology Recovery Process

- Facilitating Weekly Meeting of IT Oversight Committee with Board Members Input
- Implementing 20-point Plan
  - Top Priorities Include Installing a Perimeter Firewall and Minimizing Use of Social Security Numbers
- Top Two CIO Candidates brought to Campus for Interviews
  - Margaret P. Cline, Information Technology Consultant and Former CIO at Eastern Michigan University
  - Michael Hites, CIO at New Mexico State University
Personal and Civic Responsibility

• Implementing the New Comprehensive Strategy to Reduce High-Risk Drinking
  – Committee Appointed to Implement the New Strategy
  – Working with Student Senate to Ensure Strategy is Implemented Effectively and Fairly

• Athletics Director Kirby Hocutt Conducting Thorough Review of Student-Athlete Code of Conduct
  – Improved Disciplinary System will be in Place by Beginning of Winter Quarter
Academic Honesty

- "Day of Discourse" held September 28th to Address Academic Honesty
  - More Than 135 Attended the Gathering which was a Productive Exchange of Ideas
  - Education, Prevention, Detection, and Discipline were the Main Discussion Topics

- Academic Honesty Committee Reviewing Policies and Practices and Seeking Ways to Improve Academic Honesty
  - Committee Co-chaired by Associate Professor Scott Titsworth and Associate Professor Susan Sarnoff
Vision OHIO Implementation

- Faculty, Staff, and Students Involved in Strategic Planning Identified Three Top Priority Areas for Investment
  - Undergraduate Education
  - Graduate Education and Research
  - Faculty
Vision OHIO: Undergraduate Education

- Improve General Education
- Expand Service Learning and Other Learning Growth Opportunities
- Improve First-Year Student Engagement and Retention
Vision OHIO: Graduate Education and Research

- Increase Support for Graduate Research and Creative Activity
- Increase Efforts to Recruit and Retain Excellent Graduate Students
- Establish Realistic Workload Guidelines
Vision OHIO: Faculty Support

- Increase Efforts to Recruit and Retain Excellent Faculty
- Set Realistic Faculty Workloads
- Establish a Faculty Professional Development Office
National Recognition

- Tied for 14th Place in *Chronicle of Higher Education* Ranking of U.S. Student Fulbright Grants
- Ranked 40th on *Washington Monthly*’s list of 245 National Universities
  - Ranking Measures Community Service, Research, and Commitment to Providing Access to Higher Education
- Ranked 110th on *U.S. News & World Report*’s List of Best 249 Universities
- New Record Set with 45 Nationally Competitive Student Awards in 2005-06
Alumni Events/Development Trips

- Chatham, MA
- Cleveland, OH
- Bangkok, Thailand
- Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Public Relations/Community Relations

- 33 Speaking Engagements
- 17 Press Briefings/Conferences/Media Interviews
- 14 Higher Education Council/MAC Meetings/Conference Calls
- 10 Receptions/Luncheons for Community and Faculty Members, Students, and Alumni
- 7 Meetings with Government Officials
- 6 Community Meetings/Events
Report of the Treasurer

The Treasurer's report was presented to the Audit, Finance, Facilities, and Investment Committee at their Thursday, October 19, 2006 meeting. A copy is included with the official minutes.
Interoffice Communication

Date: October 2, 2006

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: William R. Decatur, Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer

Re: Treasurer’s Report

Schedules containing information required by our investment policies to be presented to the Board on a quarterly basis are attached as follows:

- Investment Performance Report

The fiscal 2007 year-to-date composite return as of August 31, 2006 was 1.97% compared to a benchmark return of 1.84%. The fiscal 2006 year-to-date composite return as of June 30, 2006 was 9.90% compared to a benchmark return of 12.60%. Fiscal 2006 was a transition year; the staff participated in searches to select new small cap, international equity, fixed income, absolute return and private equity managers. The target return goal for the portfolio is 8.7% with a standard deviation of 11.8%. The materials include pie charts that depict asset allocation detail, by segment and by manager, for the University’s and Foundation’s endowment and non-endowment investments.

- Investment Loan Fund Detail

Outstanding investment loans total $5.4 million. The investment loan program provides units within the University an opportunity to borrow money from the University’s Diversified Pool of funds for purposes that advance the educational mission.

- Bond Principal Outstanding as of August 31, 2006

In addition to the required reports, the materials include a supplemental schedule depicting bond principal outstanding as of August 31, 2006. The University has issued tax-exempt bonds and bond anticipation notes, and principal outstanding totals $223.4 million. This includes $31 million in non-recourse debt issued by a subsidiary of the Foundation for a student housing project known as University Courtyard apartments. At one time, the rating agencies considered this type of debt “off balance sheet”; this is no longer the case. Though we include the non-recourse debt in the summary, it is not included in the total bonds and notes payable in the University’s general ledger.

I will be happy to answer any questions you may have about the reports prior to or during the October Board meeting.
Ohio University and Foundation Endowment Assets - Preliminary Investment Performance Report
As of August 31, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type/Manager</th>
<th>Market Value (mill)</th>
<th>Actual Weight</th>
<th>Target Weight</th>
<th>Rates of Return (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio COMPOSITE ACCOUNT</td>
<td>$303.3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOCATION INDEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY INDEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC EQUITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-Cap Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon CF Stock Index Fund</td>
<td>$64.9</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;P 500 Total Return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio SFMG</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Cap Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$12.7</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell 2000 Total Return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadence</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell 2000 Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernstein</td>
<td>$5.8</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell 2000 Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL EQUITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed International Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AllianceBernstein</td>
<td>$13.9</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Star</td>
<td>$13.4</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCI All Country ex-US</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Markets Equity</td>
<td>$6.4</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCI Emerging Markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIXED INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Plus Fixed Income</td>
<td>$33.8</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMCO Total Return Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fixed Income</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman Brothers Aggregate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inception Date</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/30/02</td>
<td>8 bp</td>
<td>8 bp</td>
<td>8 bp</td>
<td>8 bp</td>
<td>8 bp</td>
<td>8 bp</td>
<td>8 bp</td>
<td>8 bp</td>
<td>8 bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/30/02</td>
<td>575/700</td>
<td>575/700</td>
<td>575/700</td>
<td>575/700</td>
<td>575/700</td>
<td>575/700</td>
<td>575/700</td>
<td>575/700</td>
<td>575/700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/27/04</td>
<td>93 bps</td>
<td>93 bps</td>
<td>93 bps</td>
<td>93 bps</td>
<td>93 bps</td>
<td>93 bps</td>
<td>93 bps</td>
<td>93 bps</td>
<td>93 bps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/06</td>
<td>100 bps</td>
<td>100 bps</td>
<td>100 bps</td>
<td>100 bps</td>
<td>100 bps</td>
<td>100 bps</td>
<td>100 bps</td>
<td>100 bps</td>
<td>100 bps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/06</td>
<td>95 bps</td>
<td>95 bps</td>
<td>95 bps</td>
<td>95 bps</td>
<td>95 bps</td>
<td>95 bps</td>
<td>95 bps</td>
<td>95 bps</td>
<td>95 bps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/30/06</td>
<td>43 bps</td>
<td>43 bps</td>
<td>43 bps</td>
<td>43 bps</td>
<td>43 bps</td>
<td>43 bps</td>
<td>43 bps</td>
<td>43 bps</td>
<td>43 bps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/06</td>
<td>5675/700</td>
<td>5675/700</td>
<td>5675/700</td>
<td>5675/700</td>
<td>5675/700</td>
<td>5675/700</td>
<td>5675/700</td>
<td>5675/700</td>
<td>5675/700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohio University and Foundation Endowment Assets - Preliminary Investment Performance Report
As of August 31, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type/Manager</th>
<th>Market Value (mill)</th>
<th>Actual Weight</th>
<th>Target Weight</th>
<th>Inception Date</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABSOLUTE RETURN STRATEGIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden Endowment Advisers</td>
<td>$10.3</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>09/03/04</td>
<td>150 bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty-View Plus Fund</td>
<td>$9.5</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>09/03/04</td>
<td>150 bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariner</td>
<td>$4.7</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>09/03/04</td>
<td>150 bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Street</td>
<td>$4.8</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>09/03/04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVE INVESTMENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adena</td>
<td>$12.6</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIG</td>
<td>$8.5</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>$3.3</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP II</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP III</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHX</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ener</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walz &amp; Gaff</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaktree</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
<td>06/30/06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-pooled Assets</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DHX</td>
<td>$3.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Inn</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFD</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
<td>05/03/04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monthly Ohio Composite vs. Allocation Index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Jul-06</th>
<th>Aug-06</th>
<th>Sep-06</th>
<th>Oct-06</th>
<th>Nov-06</th>
<th>Dec-06</th>
<th>Jan-06</th>
<th>Feb-06</th>
<th>Mar-06</th>
<th>Apr-06</th>
<th>May-06</th>
<th>Jun-06</th>
<th>Fiscal YTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>07/07/06</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average annualized returns - actual fund inception date is within previous fiscal year
Fiscal Year ends June 30 - All currency is net

**Alternative Investments** reported on a quarterly basis, updated on a current month basis for purchases and distributions.
The above performance is based on month-end account balances and individual investment returns. Actual returns may vary.
# Ohio University Endowment Investments
## as of August 31, 2006

### Endowment Assets by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Endowment</th>
<th>Endowment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon CF Stock Index</td>
<td>8,930,811</td>
<td>4,864,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio SEMG</td>
<td>133,462</td>
<td>64,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce Small Cap</td>
<td>2,245,908</td>
<td>1,088,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernzott Small Cap</td>
<td>860,940</td>
<td>417,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadence Small Cap</td>
<td>785,250</td>
<td>402,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Star</td>
<td>1,849,930</td>
<td>943,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AllianceBernstein</td>
<td>2,162,215</td>
<td>991,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>882,257</td>
<td>449,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Equity</strong></td>
<td>17,850,784</td>
<td>9,221,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>3,139</td>
<td>(3,139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio SFIMC</td>
<td>122,125</td>
<td>59,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMCO Total Return</td>
<td>3,771,976</td>
<td>2,264,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fixed Income</strong></td>
<td>3,997,241</td>
<td>2,320,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absolute Return</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden Endowment Advisers</td>
<td>1,536,655</td>
<td>744,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Street</td>
<td>719,187</td>
<td>348,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LibertyView Plus Fund</td>
<td>1,423,644</td>
<td>669,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariner</td>
<td>695,931</td>
<td>337,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Absolute Return</strong></td>
<td>4,375,177</td>
<td>2,120,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adena Ventures</td>
<td>301,172</td>
<td>236,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIG</td>
<td>509,366</td>
<td>156,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altus</td>
<td>44,601</td>
<td>20,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer Rosenthal McGlynn</td>
<td>226,754</td>
<td>61,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>199,339</td>
<td>78,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>67,869</td>
<td>31,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaktree</td>
<td>492,650</td>
<td>192,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siguler Guff</td>
<td>151,684</td>
<td>74,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Alternatives</strong></td>
<td>1,992,694</td>
<td>854,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Endowment Assets</strong></td>
<td>28,115,687</td>
<td>14,516,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>42,632,361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Endowment Assets by Manager Diagram](image-url)

**Endowment Assets by Manager**

- **Equity**
- **Fixed Income**
- **Absolute Return**
- **Alternative**

**Investment** | **Endowment** | **Quasi Investment**
---|---|---
Mellon CF Stock Index | 8,930,811 | 4,864,852
Ohio SEMG | 133,462 | 64,679
Royce Small Cap | 2,245,908 | 1,088,404
Bernzott Small Cap | 860,940 | 417,230
Cadence Small Cap | 785,250 | 402,008
New Star | 1,849,930 | 943,026
AllianceBernstein | 2,162,215 | 991,080
Aberdeen | 882,257 | 449,025
Total Equity | 17,850,784 | 9,221,028

Richmond | 3,139 | (3,139)
Ohio SFIMC | 122,125 | 59,184
PIMCO Total Return | 3,771,976 | 2,264,397
Total Fixed Income | 3,997,241 | 2,320,443

Arden Endowment Advisers | 1,536,655 | 744,841
Federal Street | 719,187 | 348,534
LibertyView Plus Fund | 1,423,644 | 669,929
Mariner | 695,931 | 337,002
Total Absolute Return | 4,375,177 | 2,120,305

Adena Ventures | 301,172 | 236,091
AIG | 509,366 | 156,005
Altus | 44,601 | 20,924
Cramer Rosenthal McGlynn | 226,754 | 61,480
Kirkland | 199,339 | 78,897
Lexington | 67,869 | 31,928
Oaktree | 492,650 | 192,867
Siguler Guff | 151,684 | 74,496
Total Alternatives | 1,992,694 | 854,689

Total Endowment Assets | 28,115,687 | 14,516,464
Grand Total | 42,632,361 |
Ohio University
Non-Endowment Investments
as of August 31, 2006

### Non-Endowment Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Actual %</th>
<th>Target %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Pool</td>
<td>49,920,278</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity Pool</td>
<td>45,764,120</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversified Pool</td>
<td>32,001,483</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Working Capital Investments</td>
<td>127,705,881</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cash Pool
- JP Morgan Money Market: 45,012,674
- Sweep Accounts: 26,910
- Cash: 4,850,694
- Total Cash Pool: 49,920,278

#### Liquidity Pool
- JP Morgan
- Peoples Bank
- Fifth Third Bank
- Ohio SFIMG
- PIN1C0 Total Return: 7,555,255
- Total Liquidity Pool: 45,764,120

#### Diversified Pool
- Equity: 20,726,250
  - Mellon CF Stock Index: 12,361,560
  - Ohio SEMG: 136,342
  - Royce Small Cap: 1,157,297
  - Bruntum Small Cap: 476,421
  - New Star: 2,267,339
  - AllianceBernstein: 1,951,755
  - Attainian: 1,075,621
- Total Equity: 20,726,250

#### Absolute Return
- Arden Endowment Advisers: 1,570,113
- Liberty View Plus Fund: 1,454,358
- Mariner: 710,394
- Total Absolute Return: 4,469,568

#### Alternatives
- Adena Ventures: 391,977
- AIG: 259,382
- Allus: 39,506
- Cramer Rosenthal McClure: 1,163,582
- Kirtland: 150,092
- Lexington: 57,697
- Oaktree: 336,882
- Siguler Guff: 129,105
- Total Alternatives: 1,455,303

#### Investment Loan Fund
- 5,350,363

#### Total Diversified Pool
- 32,001,483

#### Grand Total
- 127,705,881

### Non-Endowment by Type

#### Cash & Equivalents
- 36%

#### Fixed Income
- 35%

#### Equity
- 25%

#### Other
- 3%
Ohio University Foundation
Endowment Investments
as of August 31, 2006

Endowment Assets by Type

- **Equity**
  - Mellon CF Stock Index: $51,117,113
  - Ohio SEMG: $702,303
  - Royce Small Cap: $9,392,235
  - Bernzott Small Cap: $4,545,740
  - Cadence Small Cap: $4,547,322
  - Allegiant Small Cap: $1,326
  - New Star: $10,648,159
  - AllianceBernstein: $10,774,924
  - Aberdeen: $5,085,188
  - **Total Equity**: $98,814,309

- **Fixed Income**
  - Ohio SFIMG: $640,592
  - PIMCO Total Return: $27,765,992
  - **Total Fixed Income**: $28,406,585

- **Absolute Return**
  - Arden Endowment Advisers: $8,005,713
  - Federal Street: $3,759,933
  - LibertyView Plus Fund: $7,412,439
  - Mariner: $3,634,677
  - **Total Absolute Return**: $22,812,763

- **Alternatives**
  - AIG: $2,819,944
  - Ailes: $237,246
  - Athenian Venture Partners: $1,717,592
  - Cramer Rosenthal McGlynn: $825,992
  - DHI: $2,707,814
  - Kirtland: $967,670
  - Lexington: $356,651
  - Oaktree: $2,325,784
  - Siguler Guff: $795,923
  - **Total Alternatives**: $12,754,617

- **Total Endowment Assets**: $160,788,274
Ohio University Foundation
Non-Endowment Investments
as of August 31, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Actual %</th>
<th>Target %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Pool</td>
<td>4,184,461</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversified Pool</td>
<td>15,499,553</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Working Capital Investments</td>
<td>19,684,014</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cash Pool
- JP Morgan | 4,184,461

Diversified Pool
- Equity:
  - Mellon CF Stock Index | 4,957,865
  - Ohio SEMG | 68,140
  - Royce Small Cap | 417,568
  - Bernzott Small Cap | 979,261
  - Cadence Small Cap | 441,173
  - Allegiant Small Cap | 32
  - New Star | 1,028,962
  - AllianceBernstein | 1,039,704
  - Aberdeen | 490,581
- Total Equity | 9,423,286

Fixed Income
- Ohio SJIMG | 58,000
- PIMCO Total Return | 2,556,019
- Total Fixed Income | 2,654,020

Absolute Return
- Arden Endowment Advisers | 768,430
- Federal Street | 347,139
- LibertyView Plus Fund | 712,019
- Mariner | 335,950
- Total Absolute Return | 2,163,538

Alternatives
- AIG | 296,890
- Altus | 23,055
- Athenian Venture Partners | 174,634
- Cramer Rosenthal McGlynn | 81,656
- DHI | 260,046
- Kirtland | 91,241
- Lexington | 32,708
- Oaktree | 224,393
- Siguler Guff | 74,087
- Total Alternatives | 1,258,710

Grand Total | 19,684,014

Non-Endowment by Type
- Cash & Equivalents: 6%
- Equity: 40%
- Fixed Income: 11%
- Absolute Return: 21%
- Alternatives: 20%

Non-Endowment by Manager
- JP Morgan
- Altus
- Bernzott
- New Star
- AllianceBernstein
- Various Absolute Return
- Other
Ohio University  
Investment Loan Fund  
August 31, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Loan</th>
<th>Loan Approval Date</th>
<th>Authorized Amount</th>
<th>Draw Amount</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Payments</th>
<th>Net Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Contract - Phase II B</td>
<td>July 2002</td>
<td>1,276,818</td>
<td>1,276,818</td>
<td>214,847</td>
<td>748,226</td>
<td>743,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Auto ID</td>
<td>June 2002</td>
<td>177,100</td>
<td>177,100</td>
<td>26,137</td>
<td>66,706</td>
<td>136,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport - T-Hangars</td>
<td>Nov. 2001</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>56,249</td>
<td>105,971</td>
<td>250,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadband Antenna Tower - Cambridge</td>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>592,574</td>
<td>592,574</td>
<td>55,484</td>
<td>58,211</td>
<td>589,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alden Library 2nd Floor Renovation</td>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>240,717</td>
<td>9,297</td>
<td>194,350</td>
<td>55,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport 2 Aviation Training Upgrade</td>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>432,267</td>
<td>432,267</td>
<td>55,584</td>
<td>319,897</td>
<td>167,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball Stadium Lights</td>
<td>June 2003</td>
<td>281,121</td>
<td>281,121</td>
<td>9,489</td>
<td>9,489</td>
<td>160,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Learning &amp; Research Facility</td>
<td>Jan. 2005</td>
<td>1,093,100</td>
<td>160,500</td>
<td>9,489</td>
<td>9,489</td>
<td>160,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Training - 7 New Piper Warriors</td>
<td>Jan. 2005</td>
<td>1,134,000</td>
<td>1,134,000</td>
<td>85,764</td>
<td>157,296</td>
<td>1,062,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peden Towers - 1st Floor</td>
<td>Apr. 2005</td>
<td>293,295</td>
<td>289,545</td>
<td>12,789</td>
<td>200,363</td>
<td>101,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Contract - Phase IV</td>
<td>Apr. 2005</td>
<td>1,381,667</td>
<td>1,243,103</td>
<td>54,647</td>
<td>54,647</td>
<td>1,243,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA ACTS Satellite Phase II</td>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td>384,375</td>
<td>384,375</td>
<td>26,181</td>
<td>118,156</td>
<td>292,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peden Towers - 2nd Floor</td>
<td>June 2005</td>
<td>266,250</td>
<td>237,023</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>237,885</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Communication Computers</td>
<td>Sep. 2005</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>29,123</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>8,063</td>
<td>22,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Research Building</td>
<td>Oct. 2005</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peden Towers - 5th Floor</td>
<td>Apr. 2006</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>250,594</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>250,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,676,668</td>
<td>7,122,961</td>
<td>617,222</td>
<td>2,389,820</td>
<td>5,350,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$30,605,000</td>
<td>$28,735,000</td>
<td>$41,885,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2000 Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing for Ohio, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Courtyard Apartments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2001 Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Terminal 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Terminal 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts Studio**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athena Theater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentley Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peden Stadium Field Lowering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Training Center**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Walter Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Air</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Contracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carin Strength &amp; Conditioning Center**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$49,760,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2006A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$28,145,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2006B &amp; C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$37,195,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$223,375,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2004 Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Air 350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lausche 2 Year Project**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lausche 15 Year Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Contracting A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Contracting B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2006A Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilled Water Loop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grover Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Campuses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. State Street Lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores/Receiving Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track &amp; Turf Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Training Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2006B Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Information System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2006C Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILRF Design Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = Outstanding debt has been retired
ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT STATED MEETING

The next meeting of the Board of Trustees will be on the morning of December 1, 2006.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

CERTIFICATION OF SECRETARY

Notice of this meeting and its conduct was in accordance with Resolution 1975–240 of the Board, which resolution was adopted on November 5, 1975, in accordance with Section 121.22(F) of the Ohio Revised Code and of the State Administration Procedures Act.

R. Gregory Browning
Chairman

 Alan H. Geiger
Secretary