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Chairman C. Daniel DeLawder called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Chair DeLawder expressed his personal gratitude to the trustees for attending both meetings today and yesterday. He also thanked Secretary of the Board Thomas E. Davis for providing them with the trustees’ contact listing. Dr. Davis indicated that the entire trustee contact list is on the website for those who would be interested.

Chair DeLawder introduced and welcomed our two newest trustees appointed by the Governor, David Brightbill and David Wolfort.

ROLL CALL


Present: National Trustees Krasovec and Charles R. Stuckey, Jr., Student Trustees Chauncey Jackson and Tracy Kelly. Substituting for Alumni Association Representative Dennis Minichello was Arlene Greenfield. Chair DeLawder welcomed Arlene Greenfield.

Also attending were President Roderick J. McDavis and Board Secretary Thomas E. Davis.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF
THE BOARD MEETING of June 27, 2008
(Previously distributed)

Chair DeLawder asked for a motion to approve minutes of the Board of Trustee meeting of June 27, 2008. Trustee Dewire motioned to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Trustee Perry. All voted in favor.

COMMUNICATIONS, PETITIONS, AND MEMORIALS

There were no communications, petitions, or memorials. There were no announcements.
Report of the Chair

Chair DeLawder shared experiences from the Board’s meeting with dean of the university’s libraries, Scott Seaman, for trustees to see the effect of the new Faculty Commons area in Alden Library. Following Dean Seaman’s presentation, the Board participated in a one hour ethics training exercise conducted by legal counsel, John Biancamano. Chair DeLawder reported that all board members had completed the two hours of ethics training required through the Governor’s office. Chair DeLawder appreciated and recognized Mr. Biancamano’s professional attention to that matter and the lively discussion that came as a result.

Dr. David Descutner, Dean of the University College, was accompanied by a number of his staff to discuss the role and function of Ohio University’s University College. Chair DeLawder shared his observation of Dean Descutner’s passion and enthusiasm which he believes helps explain the success of the University College.

Chair DeLawder responded to a report in the student newspaper, The Post, regarding the President’s contract status. He indicated that he accepts responsibility for the delay in the finalization of the contract. Soon after he became officially appointed as our legal director, Mr. Biancamano gave Chair DeLawder the terms and conditions that the Board and the Executive Committee had agreed upon. These are now incorporated into the new employment agreement contract. Chair DeLawder’s goal is to finalize the contract within the next 30 days.

Chair DeLawder congratulated the University community on awards and grants recently received. He commented on the breath of the awards received which totaled approximately $5.4 million. He again congratulated President McDavis, faculty, administrators, and staff on work well done.

President McDavis thanked the faculty and staff for the great work they do to generate receipt of these external funds. President McDavis also commended Dr. Rathindra Bose, his staff, deans, and faculty for their leadership in helping to get grants submitted and funded and called on Dr. Bose for a comment.

Dr. Bose indicated the importance of collaborating with other institutions and research facilities to generate grant opportunities. He indicated that work is diligently underway in hopes of achieving a goal of $100 million in the next five years.

Chair DeLawder concluded his report with a request to adjust the agenda to so that the University Resources Committee report be given first to accommodate Mr.
Schey and his family’s schedule. With permission from the trustees, the Board proceeded with the University Resources Committee report.

University Resource Committee

Trustee Schey indicated his belief that the institution is as well positioned as can be expected in current financial times.

Trustee Schey shared a report presented by Vice President of University Advancement Howard Lipman which offered a brief overview of the two most recent University capital campaigns. Schey indicated that the upcoming campaign goals will be based on Vision Ohio and that two key initiatives will focus on facilities and scholarships. Schey reported the dollar goal and timeline of new campaign has yet to be established, however, all of the preparation should be completed by June 30, 2009.

Trustee Schey reviewed several of the campaign objectives, which include:

- Enlisting campaign volunteers who will widen the family of committed OHIO supporters
- Providing opportunities for OHIO faculty, staff and students to be involved in the campaign
- Increasing the number of mid-level gifts
- Providing all OHIO alumni and friends with opportunities to make campaign gifts
- Appropriately thanking and recognizing all donors who make gifts to the campaign
- Making certain that donors are aware of the impacts of their campaign gifts
- Informing and engaging more OHIO alumni with the university

Trustee Schey acknowledged Mr. Lipman for his work to date on preparations for the upcoming campaign.

Trustee Schey shared an overview of a presentation given at the University Resources Committee meeting by Laura Brege, Chairperson of The Ohio University Foundation Investment Committee. Trustee Schey thanked her for taking part in the Thursday afternoon Committee meeting. He discussed the evolution of the asset allocation over the past few years. At the end of the 2008 fiscal year, investments were down 3.8 percent. Mr. Schey commended the Investment Committee for their work on minimizing losses. He voiced confidence in our consultants, New England
Pension Consultants and recommended moving forward with our current investment model.

Trustee Schey discussed the FY2009-10 State Capital Bill (HB562) in relation to the resolution for approval of renovation projects. Trustee Schey stated that despite the differences between the requested amount and received funds, all projects will be completed. He recognized Governor Strickland for prioritizing higher education during recent budget cuts.

Trustee Schey moved to adopt the resolutions for FY 2009-10 Capital Improvements and basic renovations projects. Trustee Kidder seconded the motions. All voted approval.

APPROVAL OF PROJECTS, AUTHORIZATION TO HIRE CONSULTANTS, DEVELOP CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS, AND BID AND AWARD CONTRACTS FOR FY 2009-FY 2010 MAJOR CAPITAL PROJECTS ON THE ATHENS AND REGIONAL CAMPUSES

RESOLUTION 2008 - 3081

WHEREAS, the Ohio Board of Trustees approved the Six Year Capital Improvements Plan for fiscal years 2009-2014 at the September 28, 2007 board meeting, and

WHEREAS, Ohio University submitted the Six Year Capital Improvements Plan for fiscal years 2009-2014 to the Ohio Board of Regents in the Fall of 2007, and

WHEREAS, the projects included in the Six Year Capital Improvements Plan reflect the priorities of the 10 Year Capital Plan for the Athens campus and the master plans of each regional campus as developed by the Office of University Planning and Implementation in conjunction with the Facilities Planning Advisory Committee, the President, the Provost, the Executive Dean of Regional Higher Education and the Deans of the regional campuses, and

WHEREAS, the General Assembly has introduced and approved Amended Substitute House Bill Number 562, a capital improvements bill for the FY 2009-2010 funding period, and
WHEREAS, the approved Amended Substitute House Bill 562 has appropriations for major capital projects in the amount of $18,710,000 available for the Athens campus and $4,472,126 available for the regional campuses, and

WHEREAS, the listing of projects previously approved by the Ohio University Board of Trustees and subsequently approved by the General Assembly at the funding amounts noted as part of HB 562 for FY 2009-2010 are as follows:

ATHENS CAMPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>State Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lausche Heating Plant</td>
<td>$4,410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clippinger Lab Renovation – 2nd &amp; 3rd Floors</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Research Center (ILRF)</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHILlicoTHE CAMPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>State Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson Learning Commons</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and Roadway Improvements</td>
<td>$502,542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EASTERN CAMPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>State Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Hall Interior Renovations</td>
<td>$609,112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LANCASTER CAMPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>State Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brasce Hall Learning Commons</td>
<td>$801,485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOUTHERN CAMPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>State Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Entry &amp; Grounds Improvements</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$170,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Bldg Lab &amp; Classroom Renovation Planning</td>
<td>$58,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Southern Proctorville Campus Upgrades</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Southern Horse Park</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ZANESVILLE CAMPUS
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby authorize the President or his designee to hire consultants, develop construction documents, and bid and award contracts for each of the listed capital projects for Ohio University.

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

* projects either have multiple funding sources or funds are being accumulated over multiple biennia; these projects have been or will be brought to the Board individually prior to the inception of the project with all funding sources identified

cp - community project funding is project funding outside of the state capital allocation and results in proceeds flowing to project sponsors/participants

APPROVAL OF PROJECTS, AUTHORIZATION TO HIRE CONSULTANTS, DEVELOP CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS, BID AND AWARD CONTRACTS FOR BASIC RENOVATION PROJECTS ON THE ATHENS AND REGIONAL CAMPUSES

RESOLUTION 2008-3082

WHEREAS, the General Assembly has introduced and approved Amended Substitute House Bill Number 562, a capital improvements bill for the FY 2009-2010 funding period, and

WHEREAS, the approved Amended Substitute House Bill Basic Renovation appropriations total $5,043,296 available for the Athens campus and $1,322,121 available for the regional campuses, and
WHEREAS, discussions with University personnel and with the Ohio Board of Regents have identified the following specific Basic Renovation projects:

A. ATHENS CAMPUS – Basic Renovation Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>State Funding</th>
<th>Total Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Improvements</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Access – Main Green</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Facility Improvements</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Maintenance Hanger Roof</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alden Library HVAC</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backflow Preventers</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Infrastructure</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development Center Waterproofing</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Services Fire Alarms</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convo Center Concrete Restoration</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutler Hall High Voltage Upgrade</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutler Hall or Haning Hall Fire Alarms</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dysart Woods Facilities Improvements</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards Accelerator Lab Fire Alarms</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Masonry</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Roof Improvements</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine Hall Air Handler VFD Upgrade</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kantner Hall Fire Alarms</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konneker Center Steam Extension</td>
<td>$225,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCracken Hall District Chilled Water Connection</td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peden Stadium Concrete Renovation/Waterproofing</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peden Stadium Emergency Lighting</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridges Roof Replacements (select buildings)</td>
<td>$330,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Improvements</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryors Annexes HVAC Improvements</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West State Emergency Power</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>$193,296.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. REGIONAL CAMPUSES – Basic Renovation Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>State Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Improvements – Eastern</td>
<td>$218,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Infrastructure – Lancaster</td>
<td>$306,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Systems Improvement Project – Zanesville</td>
<td>$297,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Renovation – Chillicothe</td>
<td>$266,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Roof Replacement – Ironton</td>
<td>$232,932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby approve and authorize to hire consultants, develop construction documents, and bid and award contracts for each of the Basic Renovation projects.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby authorize the receipt of bids for these projects and authorizes 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 for expenditures for Basic Renovation projects including reappropriations.

Trustee Schey reviewed the resolution of approval of House Bill 251 which promotes energy efficiency and reduces energy consumption at Ohio University. He stated the goal included reducing energy consumption by 20% for 2014, as compared to 2004. Ohio University is focused on reducing our carbon footprint and coal consumption along with cost reduction, which aligns with the goals of Vision Ohio. On behalf of the Committee, Trustee Schey commended President McDavis for his leadership in this area.

Trustee Schey moved approval of House Bill 251. Trustee Perry seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

APPROVAL OF HOUSE BILL No. 251
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
FOR OHIO UNIVERSITY

RESOLUTION 2008 - 3083

WHEREAS, the General Assembly enacted House Bill No. 251 to promote energy efficiency and reduce energy consumption in state facilities and instructed the Inter-University Council of Ohio and the Ohio Association of Community Colleges to develop guidelines for the implementation of this legislation by state institutions of higher education; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with House Bill No. 251 the Inter-University Council and the Ohio Association of Community Colleges, in consultation with the Office of Energy Services of the Department of Administrative Services, developed and approved guidelines in June of 2007 for use by the board of trustees of each
state institution of higher education to introduce energy efficiency measures and reduce energy consumption in both on- and off-campus facilities; and

WHEREAS, those guidelines indicate that each state institution of higher education shall develop a fifteen year plan, hereafter referred to as the H.B. No. 251 Implementation Plan, for phasing in energy efficiency and conservation project; and

WHEREAS, Ohio University is in the process of developing a comprehensive Campus Sustainability Plan Proposal, consisting of eleven functional areas, that aligns with goals contained within Vision OHIO; and

WHEREAS, the H.B. No. 251 Implementation Plan presented for board approval meets the requirements of the legislated mandates of House Bill No. 251 and focuses on three of the eleven functional areas of the more comprehensive Campus Sustainability Plan,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby approve the attached House Bill No. 251 Implementation Plan for Ohio University.

Trustee Schey introduced Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer to Board William R. Decatur. Mr. Decatur explored three aspects of the budget: our current budget versus actual budget, current contingency planning, and planning for the fiscal year 2010 budget. Mr. Decatur reported that Ohio University increased enrollment and retention rates and added approximately $1.2 million in revenue. Mr. Decatur explored recent budget cuts from the state and the impact on Ohio University. He acknowledged investment concerns within the budget and identified the objective of the recent hiring freeze as a means for one-time savings.

Trustee Kidder asked a question regarding the current budget and refinancing of our debt. Mr. Decatur responded that there are no major concerns with JP Morgan, the institute holding a majority of our cash. He reported that despite the investment performance, the university's balance sheet is not majorly affected. Mr. Decatur indicated that the staff is exploring alternative strategies to address our debt, including attempts to re-market variable bonds for Courtyard Apartments. He indicated that an unsuccessful attempt to re-market the bonds with the new increased rates will result in negative operating balances for this project.

Trustee Schey referenced a report delivered at the Committee meeting by CIO Brice Bible regarding new updates within Information Technology. Trustee Schey
reported that IT is exploring the possibilities of shared services and other forms of cost savings.

Trustee Schey reported Hudson Heath Center and Parks Hall are currently being re-evaluated after the decision was made not to move forward with a new university health care facility.

Trustee Schey moved to approve the resolution to purchase three parcels of land in regard to the airport. Trustee Anderson seconded the motion. All voted approval.

AUTHORIZING THE ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PARCELS OF LAND AND PROPERTY EASEMENTS LOCATED IN THE RUNWAY PROTECTION ZONES OF THE OHIO UNIVERSITY AIRPORT

RESOLUTION 2008 - 3084

WHEREAS, Ohio University does not currently control all of the property within the Runway Protection Zones of the Ohio University Airport, and

WHEREAS, in order to enhance the protection of people and property on the ground, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) strongly encourages airport owners to control all land within their Runway Protection Zones, and

WHEREAS, the acquisition of land and property easements within the Runway Protection Zones is identified in the FAA approved Ohio University Airport Master Plan and Airport Layout Plan, and

WHEREAS, funding sources for this project have been identified as follows,

$ 231,704 Federal Aviation Administration grant
$ 23,991 Auxiliary Services (local match)
$ 255,695 Total Project Cost

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby approve the purchase of certain parcels of land and property easements, in accordance with all applicable state and federal standards, advisories and orders.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby authorize the purchases within acceptable appraised property values, and does authorize the President or his designee to move forward on the approval process for
such land purchases, providing the amount of the total offers do not exceed the available funds.

Schey moved approval of the resolution to acquire 15 Park Place which will be the new international student center. Trustee Anderson seconded the motion. All voted approval.

**APPROVAL TO ACQUIRE 15 PARK PLACE, ATHENS, OHIO**

**RESOLUTION 2008 - 3085**

**WHEREAS**, the property at 15 Park Place, Athens, Ohio has long been on a list of key properties for acquisition by the University due to its proximity to the center of campus, and

**WHEREAS**, Ohio University has received a gift pledge for the purchase of 15 Park Place, and the improvements located upon the land along with $1.3 million to be used toward the renovation of the facility, and

**WHEREAS**, the funds for renovation will be utilized for the creation of the International Center which will consolidate services for the University’s international students and faculty including International Services, Education Abroad, the Office for the Associate Provost for International Affairs, Visa Processing, and International Recruitment, and

**WHEREAS**, Ohio University has had two appraisals prepared for the approximately 0.311 acres of land and the facility which reasonably support the seller’s asking price, and

**WHEREAS**, the Sig House Company has agreed to sell the property to Ohio University for seven hundred thousand dollars ($700,000) with purchase to take place after November 17, 2008,

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby authorize Ohio University, the President or his designee, to enter into a purchase agreement with the Sig House Company, and to execute and deliver any documents as may be necessary to meet the requirements of the Ohio Board of Regents and the Ohio Controlling Board.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby authorize the President or his designee to pursue and engage appropriate outside counsel for this purchase and transfer of ownership of all interests.

Student Trustee Kelly asked if Hudson Health Center could qualify as an Advancement campaign funding initiative. Mr. Lipman responded that donors have not traditionally given their philanthropy dollars to lessen the burden of student fees, however, this possibility could continue to be explored.

Full minutes of the Committee meeting held on Thursday afternoon follow. Background materials for the University Resources Committee actions and reports may be found in Appendix A.

University Resources Committee Meeting
Thursday, October 3, 2008, 1:30 p.m.
Walter Hall Governance Room

Present: Chair Larry Schey, President Roderick McDavis, Tracy Kelly, Charles Stuckey, Sandra Anderson, David Wolfert, Gene Harris and C. Daniel DeLawder,

Capital Campaign Plan

Howard Lipman reviewed preliminary plans for the next capital campaign with the Trustees and shared an overview of a draft campaign plan.

The University's most recent capital campaigns were the Third Century Campaign (1987-1993) and the Bicentennial Campaign (1997-2004). The Third Century Campaign achieved $132.7 million against a goal of $100 million and the Bicentennial Campaign achieved $221.4 million against a goal of $200 million.

The dollar goal and timeline for the new campaign have not yet been established. Of the total goal, it is anticipated that cash gifts will comprise approximately 86 percent and the remaining 14 percent will come from planned and in-kind gifts.

Other campaign objectives and principles include:
• Enlisting campaign volunteers who will widen the family of committed Ohio supporters.
• Providing opportunities for Ohio faculty, staff, and students to be involved in the campaign.
• Coordinating centrally the cultivation/solicitation of campaign prospects.
• Accepting all reasonable gifts offered during the campaign period but placing the greatest emphasis on gifts for stated campaign purposes.
• Increasing the numbers of mid-level gifts.
• Providing all Ohio alumni and friends opportunities to make campaign gifts.
• Appropriately thanking and recognizing all donors who make gifts to the campaign.
• Making sure donors are aware of the impacts of their campaign gifts.
• Informing and engaging more Ohio alumni about their university.

The goals for the campaign will be based on Vision Ohio, Ohio University's strategic plan. Vision Ohio will be used to determine University-wide campaign initiatives and projects as well as featured initiatives and projects for individual colleges and units.

Campaign gifts strategies will include seeking gifts at the following levels:

• Nucleus gifts - $1 million or greater
• Leadership gifts - $100,000 - $999,999
• Major gifts - $50,000 - $99,999
• Middle gifts - $10,000 - $49,999
• Ohio Fund gifts - up to $10,000

The volunteer structure for the campaign will include:

• National Campaign Chairs
• National Campaign Committee
• College/Unit Committees
• Geographic based Committees
• Special Project Committees

Mr. Lipman reviewed with the Trustees a series of action steps and key tasks which are needed in preparation for the campaign.
Investment Strategy Review

Laura Brege, OU Foundation Investment Committee Chair, provided the Board with an overview of the current state of the University's endowment. Ms. Brege discussed the evolution of the asset allocation over the past few years and explained how the repositioning away from an allocation heavily weighted toward equities and, to a lesser extent, fixed income has resulted in a portfolio that exhibits an improved risk-return profile and less volatility. With guidance from the Foundation’s investment consultant, New England Pension Consultant (NEPC), the repositioning of the portfolio’s allocation has resulted in allocations to private equity investments and real assets like commodities and real estate. Ms. Brege also acknowledged the two student groups who are actively managing small positions in public equities and fixed income securities.

According to Ms. Brege, the Committee has engaged an independent third party to perform an assessment of the endowment’s recent performance, asset allocation, and manager selection. It is anticipated that a report of the assessment will be available for the Foundation’s Board of Trustees meeting in November and the University’s Board of Trustees meeting in January.

Resolution State Major Capital Projects Approval

- FY2009-2010 State Capital Bill (HB562) passed in June with a reduction from the previous board approved amount of $30.4M vs. $29.5M – reduction of $835,000

- Slides show the comparison of the requested and approved major capital and basic renovation totals by Athens and Regional Campuses
  - Athens Campus projects include: Lausche Heating Plant, Clippinger Lab, Academic Research Center, and West Green Chilled Water Plant
  - Regional Campuses projects include roadway improvements, building expansion, renovation project, land acquisition, and campus upgrades – detail can be found in your package

- Resolution for approval to hire consultants, develop construction documents, bid and award contracts for projects approved by the State
Resolution Basic Renovation Projects Approval

- Projects were reviewed and approved at a previous meeting; a complete listing of specific renovation projects is included with the resolution.
- All projects listed are considered equally urgent, are funded by state appropriations and do not cost the University—the figures provided reflect the reduced funding amount.
- Approval is recommended for resolution to hire consultants, develop construction documents, bid and award contracts for projects approved by the State.

Resolution HB 251 Energy Efficiency and Conservation Guidelines Plan Approval

- General Assembly enacted HB 251 in 2004 to promote energy efficiency and reduce energy consumption.
- Inter-University Council developed guidelines in June 2007 for use in Higher Education to develop a fifteen year plan—Ohio University expanded the initiative to all areas of operation campus wide—beyond IUC guidelines—aligning the plan with Vision OHIO and transformational goals.
- Plan requires Board approval before the end of 2008.
- Goals include: reduce energy intensity 20% by 2014 compared to 2004 (which was Ohio University’s best year), reduce GHG (greenhouse gas emissions) as part of the President’s Climate Commitment, and reduce utility costs with metrics in place to measure successes.
- Cost estimate to reach HB 251 goal is $35M.
- Avoidance Opportunities, Key Successes, and strategies to achieve the goals are shared in the materials.

Budget Update

FY 2009 Budget

- Enrollment figures are excellent with over attainment in the freshman class, non-resident/international, regional campuses, transfers, and retention categories.
- Fall Quarter favorable variance = $680,000 with more to be realized if trends continue.
- Enrollment gains above may need to offset investment income shortfall.
- Ohio University has taken a proactive approach to state cuts by:
developing contingency plans which include a position review process and a hiring freeze to identify savings; however the potential is limited by two previous ERIP opportunities ('key' positions such as group 1 faculty are exempt)

establishing a Business Service Center utilized by VP Finance & Administration and ICA currently with potential growth to other areas

redesigning the procure-to-pay process

negotiating a premier contract through IUC for prescription drugs

**FY 2010 Budget**

- Budget Planning Council meetings are underway; setting targets and discussing contingency plans

**Update on Statewide Shared Services Related to IT Improvement Plan/Funding Strategies for Information Technology Improvement Plan**

- Respond to the request from JUNE BOT meeting to look @ shared opportunities in the state.
- Identify funding alternatives
- Information Technology improvement plan
  - SIS, Financial and Administrative Services (e-business), Academic Technology
  - FOUNDATION: IT Infrastructure Network
- SIS – Student Information System
  - SIS is necessary for Q2S conversion
  - $8.6 Million = Software
    - Core PeopleSoft system purchased for $2 Million, 22% Maintenance yearly
    - OPPORTUNITY TO RENEGOTIATE STATE SOFTWARE AGREEMENTS
  - $2.25 Million = Hardware
    - Hosting @ OSU for Dem and Development ($300,000 est. cost, we spent $30,000 with OSU)
    - Preliminary numbers do not look like it will make sense to go outside, not many companies who host student systems (VERY FEW EXTERNALLY HOSTED ENVIRONMENTS EXIST) – We will pursue it as an option
- $5.7 Million = OHIO Staffing
- $9.4 Million = Consulting
  - Knowledge base exists with consultants, they can come and implement
  - We could adopt another solution or we could market our solution to another school
    - Provost & CIO support 2\textsuperscript{nd} option, maybe we can market our student business practices in order to save $$
    - QUESTION: IS THIS A HARD NUMBER? No, it is an estimate; hard number should be ready in January
- $875K Operating Expenses – Rental space for project office:
  - POTENTIAL FOR INTERNAL FUNDING
- ISSUE: LEGACY INFORMS SYSTEM
  - Current Vendor (INFORMS) is going out of business, our system will NOT be supported after June of 2010
  - If the company stayed in business, they would run on a platform that is not optimal
  - COMMENT: We really don’t have a choice. Brice: We still need to get the cost as low as it can be.
  - COMMENT: Staffing portion of SIS Budget: This is a 3 year cost to gain backfill on positions that will implement the new system (keeping the lights on during implementation) NOT A DUPLICATION OF OUR CURRENT STAFF
    - Staffing services to seek - Retired staff members to keep system running so existing staff can assist in implementing the new SIS. We have to continue business. This is a very common model.
  - COMMENT: Is there any way to join with a peer institution to collaborate on implementation? It is timing related and the others are currently running or in various stages of implementation.
  - PeopleSoft schools in Ohio consist of: BGSU, OSU (Just came up)
  - COMMENT: We absolutely need this for Q2S, Correct? We will have a conversation with OSU about attaching ourselves to them to achieve cost savings.
Bill Decatur – Financial discussion for SIS funding
- A project of this magnitude cannot be carved out of our current budget
- We will have to go into a debt scenario to fund this implementation
  - 3 Tier
    1. $25 Million
    2. $50 Million
    3. $75 – 100 Million

**Hudson Health Center Renovation Update**

- Current Health Center is being evaluated for renovation
- Architect will provide an estimated cost for the project
- FPAC (Facilities Planning Advisory Committee) will review and prioritize this project within the 10-year Capital Planning process
- A recommendation will be available by spring

**Parks Hall Renovation Update/COM/UMA**

- Facilities Management is researching renovations at Parks Hall
- COM & UMA are exploring partnerships with non-university entities and also funding that will not create university debt
Report of the President

President McDavis began his report with an update of the Five Year Vision Ohio Implementation Plan (FYVOIP). His discussion focused on outcomes in the following areas: Recruit and Retain Talented and Diverse People, Strengthen Undergraduate Education, Enhance Graduate Education and Research, Fortify and Align Infrastructure with Academic Mission, and Enhance Prominence within Ohio, the nation, and the world. Dr. McDavis stressed the importance of following through with our stated strategic goals. The university has started implementing the first year of Vision Ohio as evidenced by reported outcomes.

President McDavis expressed his gratitude to members of the senior leadership team, faculty, staff, and all those on the campus who have stepped forward to help aid in implementing all components of Vision Ohio. Dr. McDavis reported Vision Ohio is something that cannot happen by any single individual but happens because a lot of people want Ohio University to be the best place that it can be for the education of students and as a great workplace for staff and faculty. He expressed his appreciation with the progress being made through the implementation of the strategic plan to elevate the university to a new level of excellence. He will continue to offer updates as the university moves forward.

President McDavis' report may be found in its entirety in Appendix B.

Report of the Executive Vice President and Provost

Executive Vice President and Provost Kathy Krendl reviewed the Retention and Enrollment Report for AY 2007-08. Her report was directly linked to Vision Ohio goals. She reported the stated goal of stabilizing the retention rate, however, the AY 2006-2007 retention is approximately 80%, an increase of 2%. Trustee Kidder asked about the retention rates of other Ohio institutions and it was reported that OSU and Miami have the two highest rates, both at about 90 percent.

Trustee Harris commended Dr. Krendl for the retention and enrollment strategies and for the outreach efforts in support of student admission. Dr. Krendl indicated that current goals are balancing both access and excellence. Trustee Dewire clarified that the statistics presented are for the Athens campus only.
Dr. Krendl reviewed the strategic investments in retention from 2006 to 2008, and in doing so, recognized Wendy Merb-Brown from the University College for her leadership with learning communities. Dr. Krendl pointed to learning communities as one of the major reasons for our improved retention rates.

Dr. Krendl addressed Objective 2 of the FYVOIP: Solution to Future Retention Challenges. She identified strong enrollment figures for Ohio University given the current economic climate. She commended David Garcia, Director of Admissions, and his staff for their work related to enrollment and retention. Dr. Krendl shared data reflecting an increase in multicultural student applications. In addition she pointed to an increase in the transfer enrollment rate.

Dr. Krendl reviewed regional campus enrollment goals indicating that 578 additional students were enrolled in regional campuses this year. She recognized successes by Executive Dean for Regional Campuses Dan Evans, and Chillicothe Dean Rich Bebee. Trustee Kidder asked how Chillicothe was able to enroll an additional 254 students this academic year. Dean Bebee reported that recruitment on the Chillicothe campus plan is tied to Vision Ohio while their marketing is focused upon partnerships, collaborations, and relationship development within the community. He identified three strategies: experience education, the Seniors to Sophomores program, and meeting the demand for increased online classes that contributed to the increase in his campuses enrollment. Dr. Krendl thanked him and commended both he and his staff’s exemplary work. She explained that each of the regional campuses experimented with different targeted interventions for increasing enrollment. Dr. Krendl reported there will be a follow up study on the effectiveness of these various intervention strategies. She recognized the creativity of the regional campus deans.

Dr. Krendl reviewed Graduate enrollment applications and selectivity. She identified the strategic investments in recruitment in AY 2007-08. Trustee Kidder inquired about the countries focused for recruitment for prospective students. Dr. Krendl reported that the university has recently strategically focused on Turkey, India, and China as countries with significant potential for recruitment opportunities.

Dr. Krendl noted that the institution’s University Systems of Ohio Accountability Measures Report is currently in process and will be completed by November 30, 2008. The Report will be presented to the Board of Trustees for action at the January 2009 Board meeting. Future enrollment considerations were discussed by Dr. Krendl. The context for future strategies will be framed with a statewide shrinking pool of high school graduates in mind. Chair DeLawder noted that there is a predicted 10% decline over the next five years in high school graduating seniors.
Trustee Kidder asked if this was true nationally, and Dr. Krendl replied that it is not a national statistic as it varies in each region.

Dr. Krendl reported that the solution to future enrollment challenges is being addressed in FYVOP Objective 10. She introduced Gina Calcamuggio who is heading up the current university marketing campaign. Ms. Calcamuggio was the architect of The Promise campaign launched during the past academic year. Ms. Calcamuggio shared this year’s marketing materials with the Board at their August Board retreat.

Dr. Krendl indicated that reports for the Graduate Centers of Excellence are due by October 15, 2008. Selections for Centers of Excellence will then come to the Board for approval before the deadline of June 30, 2009. Trustee Perry inquired concerning an earlier statement by Dr. Krendl that Ohio University was ahead of peers and competitors in the state for Centers of Excellence. Dr. Krendl reported that Cleveland State is now aware of their identified Centers of Excellence.

Trustee Kidder stressed the importance of the Board being well informed of progress being made with the identification of our institution’s Centers of Excellence.

Chair DeLawder congratulated Dr. Krendl on this work. He again stressed the importance of targeting the shrinking pool of future students.

President McDavis stated that the university is currently ranked fourth in technology transfer income. He commended Dr. Bose’s work as well as the widespread faculty involvement across the campus.

Chair DeLawder thanked both the President and the Provost for their reports. He moved to the next item on the agenda, a report from the Chair of the Faculty Senate by Dr. Sergio Lopez-Permouth. By agreement, this item was deferred to the January meeting.

Dr. Krendl’s report may be found in its entirety in Appendix C.
University Academics Committee

Trustee Perry explained the process for reviewing Centers and Institutes within the University. She commended the process that requires a five year, peer reviewed procedure of quality assurance and relevance of purpose of the University's various Centers and Institutes.

Trustee Perry moved to accept the resolution for Review of Centers and Institutes. Trustee Kidder seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

REVIEW OF CENTERS AND INSTITUTES

RESOLUTION 2008 - 3086

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 2008 Reviews of Centers and Institutes, which recommend that the following centers and institutes be continued or discontinued.

- Intelligent, Chemical Instrumentation - Continued
- Scripps Survey Research Center - Continued
- Intelligent, Distributed, and Dependable Systems - Continued
- Democracy in Education - Two-year Extension

Trustee Perry gave a brief review of necessary criteria for emeritus/emeriti awards for outstanding service to Ohio University. She indicated that the emeritus/emeriti awards under consideration have a combined total of 156 years of service to Ohio University. Trustee Perry moved to approve the resolution for emeritus/emerita awards. Trustee Dewire second the motion. All voted in favor.
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>First Name</th>
<th>Middle Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leona</td>
<td>&quot;Lee&quot;</td>
<td>Cibrowski</td>
<td>Associate Dean Emerita</td>
<td>College of Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>Diggle</td>
<td>Associate Director Emeritus, Avionics Engineering Center</td>
<td>Russ College of Engineering and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Administrator Emerita, Student Services Office</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>Gilmore</td>
<td>Executive Director Emeritus, Division Campus Recreation</td>
<td>College of Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>&quot;Margy&quot;</td>
<td>Goodwin</td>
<td>Assistant Dean Emerita, Student Services</td>
<td>College of Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Kohn</td>
<td>Distinguished Senior Research Scientist Emeritus, Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>College of Osteopathic Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td></td>
<td>Witkowski</td>
<td>Assistant Dean Emerita, Budget and Administration</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trustee Perry discussed the University System of Ohio’s plan for a single academic calendar. A committee has been created to facilitate the quarter to semester transition process. Trustee Perry stressed the importance of ensuring the best outcomes for Ohio University students and faculty in this process. In addition she highlighted three main goals in the transition:

- Be transformational in our review of our academic curriculum
• Provide a transition plan that results in minimal disruption to campus
• Engage and include people across the campus in this process

Trustee Perry moved that the Board adopt and endorse the conversion to an academic semester beginning in the 2012-13 academic year. Trustee Dewire seconded the motion. In discussion, Student Trustee Kelly raised the question of cost for this conversion. Trustee Perry reported fluctuating numbers at this time but indicated that a more accurate number will be addressed in upcoming Board meetings. Dr. Krendl reported that the two primary areas of expenditure for the transition would be in the areas of student academic advising and faculty support for curricular transition.

Chair DeLawder shared his impression on the amount of detail being addressed by a broad spectrum of individuals across campus whom have been involved with transition planning. He stressed how this process can be an opportunity to advance the university’s curriculum.

President McDavis commended Dr. Krendl and the Quarters to Semesters Transition Team members’ work on the process to date. He indicated that of the four public institutions that operate on the quarter system, Ohio University would be the first to take action on the change from quarters to semesters. He indicated that such a move would again demonstrate that Ohio University is a leadership institution. President McDavis acknowledged that not everyone may be happy with this decision to transition, but that it would move Ohio University in a positive direction. Trustee Dewire noted that all other four universities in Ohio are on the same transition timeline for fall of 2012. Secretary Davis clarified that the motion was previously seconded by Trustee Dewire. All voted in favor.

ACADEMIC CALENDAR CONVERSION

RESOLUTION 2008 - 3088

WHEREAS, the University System of Ohio Strategic Plan for Higher Education 2008-2017 was submitted by the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents to Governor Ted Strickland and the Members of the OHIO General Assembly; and

WHEREAS, the University System of Ohio Plan encourages a single academic calendar which would enhance ease of student transferability and allow for the building of multi-institutional academic programs; and
WHEREAS, the University System of Ohio Plan points to the fact that a common academic calendar would bring significant gains in academic quality that will better serve the educational needs of the citizens of the state; and

WHEREAS, a common academic calendar would promote system wide efficiencies; and

WHEREAS, of the 14 University main campuses, only four, including Ohio University, remain on the quarter system; and,

WHEREAS, the conversion to semesters provides Ohio University a singular opportunity to transform its curriculum to meet the needs of future generations of students; and

WHEREAS, a Quarters to Semester Transition Team has been constituted and is working toward a conversion with a recommended implementation target of the 2012-13 academic year,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Board of Trustees endorses the conversion to a semester academic calendar beginning in the 2012-13 academic year.

Trustee Perry voiced a need for future reports on the enrollment goals of regional campuses. She discussed Vision Ohio Five Year Vision OHIO Implementation Task Tracking Tool demonstration. Trustee Perry shared Dr. David Thomas’ reports from University Curriculum Council on the digitization process along with his update on General Education. Trustee Perry explained how a report on general education assessment by Dr. Michael Williford reviewed the standard survey results of our alumni five years after graduation.

Trustee Perry asked for a comment from Dr. Krendl on the previously mentioned Affordability Report. Dr. Krendl indicated that reports to be submitted to the Chancellor on the topics of accessibility and affordability are in the process of being developed and would be presented at the next Board of Trustees meeting.

Full minutes of the Committee meeting held on Thursday afternoon follow. Background materials for the University Academics Committee actions and reports may be found in Appendix D.
University Academics Committee
Ohio University Board of Trustees

SUMMARY

1:30 p.m., October 2, 2008
Margaret M. Walter Hall Governance Room

Present: Chauncey Jackson, David Brightbill, Norman Dewire, C. Robert Kidder, Frank Krasovec, Arlene Greenfield for Dennis Minichello, Marnette Perry, Chair
Kathy A. Krendl, Executive Vice President and Provost, Tom Davis, Executive Secretary to the Board of Trustees, Rathindra Bose, Craig Cornell, David Descutner, Ann Fidler, Dennis Irwin, Greg Shepherd, David Thomas, Martin Tuck

Reviews of Centers and Institutes

Summary and discussion led by Kathy Krendl

Krendl introduced the standard process for Center/Institute review: compare central mission and productivity.

- Currently reviewing policy to clarify the difference between a Center and an Institute.
- Centers/Institutes are created through a proposal process.
- Funding varies according to mission but Center/Institute status helps attract external funding.
- Relationship to Vision OHIO
  - Many formed prior to Vision OHIO, current proposal process requires alignment with Vision OHIO.
- Scripps Survey Center:
  - The Scripps Survey Center aligns well with the Scripps Foundation objectives and this Center is mutually beneficial.
  - Working together to expand survey operations in Florida.
  - Partnering with the Voinovich School to utilize expertise and create jobs to serve non-profits in this region on projects of mutual interest.
- Centers/Institutes bring a number of faculty together to tackle projects that individual faculty can not do.
  - They are now working collaboratively through OBOR. The Choose Ohio First project, of which we are the lead, partners with 11 Ohio institutions.
- Assessments are usually internal, however some have external reviewers.
- Recommendations resulting from reviews are referred to deans, directors and chairs for follow-up to assure continual improvement.
The report on Center and Institute review was accepted by the University Academics Committee by consensus.

**Awards of Emeritus/Emerita Status**

Krendl reviewed the criteria for award of emeritus/emerita status which include service for 10 years and demonstrated extraordinary service to the institution. Units recommend nominees, deans approve and forward to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

**EMERITUS/EMERITA AWARDS RESOLUTION 2008**

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.

Trustee Dewire so moved, Trustee DeLawder seconded, resolution passed.

Faculty:
- Leonard D. Kohn, Distinguished Senior Research Scientist Emeritus, College of Osteopathic Medicine

Administrators:
- Leona Cibrowski, Associate Dean Emerita, College of Health and Human Services
- David Diggle, Associate Director Emeritus, Avionics Engineering Center, Russ College of Engineering and Technology
- Jesse Essex, Administrator Emerita, Student Services, College of Education
- James Gilmore, Executive Director Emeritus, Division of Campus Recreation, College of Health and Human Services
- Margaret Goodwin, Assistant Dean Emerita, Student Services, College of Health and Human Services
- Jean Witkowski, Assistant Dean Emerita, Budget and Administration, College of Arts and Sciences
Academic Calendar Conversion: Quarters to Semesters

The Ohio University Board of Trustees must approve the change to semesters. Three other state institutions (Wright State, Ohio State, and Cincinnati) are still on quarters and are in the process of making the same recommendation to their Boards of Trustees. Planning for a change to semesters is underway to ensure the best outcome for Ohio University students and faculty.

Kathy Krendl presented the following report:

- At the June Board meeting we presented what we knew and where we were at the time. Since then the USO has been established and their recommendation is that all state institutions in Ohio move to a common academic calendar.
- We are the first to go to our Board for action on this point.
- Our intention is not to simply translate existing curricula from quarters to semesters but to undergo an ambitious, truly transformative curriculum review.
  - Best practices for conversion were reviewed during summer
- We have a transition team in place with a charge, a guide document, and student web site.
- We hope to implement in 2012; SIS should be in place by Fall 2011
  - Consultants recommend installing SIS first and running it in quarters for one year prior to changing the calendar.
- We have two new products to assist with transition.
  - A graduation prediction/DARS report for use with next year's incoming class to show how they may be impacted by the change.
  - A product to track records of achievement and personal interests among prospective students to strengthen student recruitment and retention.
- The Transition Team, with very broad representation, is examining the timeline, principles, constraints, and assumptions of the guide document weekly.
  - Chairs and directors are reviewing other institution calendar systems and transitions to inform their curricular redesign.
- We have a draft of a 4-year budget to fund the transition.
  - This budget is a one-time only (out-of-pocket) fund for the transition. We expect to spend around $2M over four years to transform and transition the curriculum.
- We have retained a consultant from the University of Toledo where they had a very smooth transition. His recommendation is that we use the time up front to revise the curriculum. This is being done carefully and thoughtfully.
• Primary principles include: no student will be put at risk; faculty load will remain neutral, size and structure of the curriculum will remain neutral.

Question: Could we lose students when we move to this calendar?
At the timeline we project; there will be no quarter institutions left in the state. Affiliated regional and community colleges are also moving to a semester calendar.

Question: Are we using this opportunity to its fullest to come out of it a better institution?
The curricular development process usually involves single additions/removals of courses. This opportunity allows us to review the curriculum as a whole ensuring each piece works together. To do this our faculty, chairs and directors must work consultatively to make sure that their decisions do not adversely affect other programs. We view this as a huge opportunity to make this truly transformational for the institution.

Question: Will this transformation enhance retention?
Yes, it certainly should. Student preparation needs to provide skills for a lifetime in a global, highly competitive world.

Question: How will student advising be done?
Faculty will review each program with individual students. This will be a more intensive, complicated process.

Question: Will the transformation of the curriculum affect reallocation of resources?
We are preparing a new budget preparation process for academic units which will change how budgets are built. Each college has an enrollment target to meet. They have agreed that if targets are not met, resources can be shifted.

Through Vision OHIO one-time money allocated for new initiatives has resulted in projects meeting and in some cases exceeding goals. Setting priorities with annual review has worked well to strengthen programs.

This transformation will improve efficiency in class scheduling and space utilization to reduce energy costs.

Question: Are the hours to graduation going from 192 to 128?
Choices for hours to graduate may range from a 120 minimum to 128.
Chair Perry closed the discussion with the charge to use this opportunity to be transformational, reshaping the curriculum to meet the future.

Reports:

Regional Campus Pilot Projects:

In response to the Chancellor's request to be responsive to part-time, non traditional students and to reduce costs as much as possible, we created pilot programs at our regional campuses.

- Chillicothe Campus: *The Experience College* program provides college credit for one tuition free course. Students must meet criteria for eligibility. Application fees are waived.
- Zanesville, Campus: *Back to School* program recruited in surrounding communities to provide one free course to students meeting their criteria. Application fees are waived.
- Southern Campus: *Make your Mark* program offered a course for $10 per credit hour, and one class at a reduced rate for those meeting eligibility requirements.
- Lancaster Campus: *First Year Experience* provides conference participation, common readings, and social opportunities to create a special first year.
- Eastern Campus: *High School Invasions* program moved faculty into two local high schools to teach all the subject matter for one day. They met with students after hours to provide services and information. This was very well received and drew a lot of media attention.

Question on enrollment on regional campuses revealed overall increase of 578 new students.

Trustee Perry noted that the Trustees want Ohio University to own this channel of education.

- Last year we convened a task force on regional campuses that resulted in a thorough report. Krendl is visiting each campus with some faculty and staff members to discuss recommendations from the reports. We will review recommendations next year to see what has transpired.

- The Athens campus will not grow significantly but the regional campuses have growth opportunities in various areas. Cornell described a program that Ohio State uses in which students who do not meet admission criteria for their main campus receive a letter welcoming them to their nearest regional campus. We will begin doing that here. This allows first year profiles to remain high on the main campuses.
• Flaherty added that Ohio consciously developed regional campuses as opposed to community campuses in other states. Ohio University’s regional campuses have higher tuition than community colleges and have different missions and programs. We offer 11-12 baccalaureate degrees and 12 masters programs and our enrollment of over 8000 compares well with other state universities.

• Krendl said we have by far the best relationship and best ongoing conversation with regional campuses. Our visits have been warmly received; discussions center on “one” university; willingness evident to have this conversation.

Trustee Dewire asked for a report on articulation agreements with regional campuses at a future meeting.

Five Year Vision OHIO Implementation Task Tracking Tool Demo

• Bret Swart and Mary Patacca created a tool to provide to measure accountability for our strategic plan for all campuses.
• Device includes projects, managers, goals, outcomes, strategies, alignment with AQIP processes and much more.
• Reports can be framed on objectives; each shows percent complete.
• The tool allows the campus community to understand where we are on each outcome for each project.
• There are 7 units of responsibility in the university and reports will be pulled quarterly for review. Attachments can be submitted for qualitative as well as quantitative information.

Question: How will data be used to inform next steps?
• It will help us understand where resources are spent and if they are effective.
• The plan will be opened for community for review next year to propose changes and additions. This tool will provide a guide to choose new priorities.

University Curriculum Council Digitization Project: David Thomas

Project created and funded to digitize all processes for course creation, modification, and review will replace the current cumbersome paper process. We hope to test the product in June of 2009. This project will work in tandem with the SIS and Transition to Semesters to streamline the massive curricular revision process.
required. As part of the curricular review, outdated courses will be identified and removed from various systems. Cost is $23,000.

**General Education, Content, David Thomas**

Thomas stated that while Ohio University's general education program is in his view the best in the state, it is undervalued when it should be a point of pride. He proposes changing its name to the Ohio University Liberal Arts Core and marketing it accordingly.

**General Education, Assessment, Michael Williford**

Williford reviewed the standard survey results of our alumni five years after graduation. The survey is intended to tell us if our students feel that they have acquired the skills and knowledge they need to be successful in their employment. The survey compares general education coursework alone and in comparison with major coursework. A more informative data piece rates competency acquisition which yields better results.

Trustees were concerned about some statistics which, depending on how they are viewed, can be concerning. Williford believes the current survey does not get at the type of information we really need. He described a new, time intensive, survey program he will soon implement to provide information related directly to learning objectives through a structured interview process.

**Affordability Report, Kathy Krendl**

Krendl reviewed current data on cost comparisons including:

- Average Freshman Tuition, OU $8,907/$7,596 average across the state
- External and Internal Aid Support, OU discount rate is $2,029 per student
- Student need comparison: currently our families need is below average. This is not expected to continue next year under the current economic climate.
- Student out of pocket cost after discount, OU $6,878/$6,084 average

Krendl noted that clearly we have challenges in meeting these financial goals. This year will see declines in population increasing competition for new students. Our current freshman yield rate was 38% last year and is 37.5% this year. The Gateway Scholarship offering yielded 50% acceptance which shows this is working to get need based higher achieving students at Ohio University.
Trustee Perry requested receiving brief reports ahead of the meetings so that they can be better prepared.

Meeting adjourned by Chair Perry at 4:01.

**Governance Committee**

Trustee Dewire presented proposed changes related to the terms of appointment for the Kennedy Museum of Art's advisory board members. Trustee Dewire moved approval of the resolution for the Kennedy Museum of Art. Trustee Anderson seconded the motion. All voted in favor.

**Kennedy Museum of Art's Advisory Board Members**

**Resolution 2008 – 3089**

**WHEREAS**, the Ohio University Board of Trustees adopted the amended Constitution of the Edwin L. and Ruth E. Kennedy Museum of Art at its June 18, 2008 meeting, and

**WHEREAS**, Article III of the Constitution outlines the process for appointment to the Museum’s Advisory Board, and

**WHEREAS**, the Dean of the College of Fine Arts in consultation with the President has recommended a minimum of five and no more than nine qualified members to serve on the Museum’s Board

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that Ohio University Board of Trustees approves the following appointments to the Advisory Board:

**One-Year Term**
Joyce Richardson  
Board President, Friends of the Kennedy*

**Two-Year Term**
Sally Linder  
Senior Director of Media Relations, Ohio University
Dr. Tadeusz Malinski  
Chair, Biochemistry, Ohio University
Three-Year Term

Ann Lee Konneker	 Ohio University benefactor
John Sole	 Sole and Bloom Realty
Vanessa Kaukonen	 Co-Founder, Fur Peace Ranch

*The Friends of the Kennedy board seat is occupied by whoever is president or designated by the Friends of the Kennedy.

Trustee Dewire shared results of the meeting with General Counsel regarding legal matters and concerns. Trustee Dewire reported on his recent attendance at the Chancellor’s Conference for Trustees of Public Institutions. Trustee Dewire shared that the Chancellor is expecting three upcoming reports from Ohio University: Centers of Excellence, how we are making the university affordable, and how we are aligned with the University System of Ohio.

Trustee Dewire introduced the idea of developing a standardized board evaluation based on other public universities in Ohio and peer institutions as well as best practices outside of Ohio. Trustee Dewire indicated that the Board’s by-laws will be reviewed with potential changes coming forward at the January 2009 meeting.

Trustee Dewire discussed a report on public universities with faculty trustee representatives that was developed by Drs. Krendl, Davis, Thomas, and Ms. Watts. Trustee Dewire requested additional information on methods by which faculty input is received from universities without faculty trustees as part of the Board.

Full minutes of the Committee meeting held on Thursday afternoon follow. Background materials for the Governance Committee actions and reports may be found in Appendix E.

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEETING
October 2, 2008

In attendance were members of the Committee Norman “Ned” E. Dewire, Sandra J. Anderson and Gene T. Harris. Also attending were Trustee C. Daniel DeLawder, Arlene Greenfield, (representing Alumni Representative Dennis Minichello), Student Trustee Chauncey Jackson, Secretary to the Board Tom Davis, and General Counsel John J. Biancamano.
Trustee Dewire began the meeting at 4:30 p.m. by reviewing the topics to be discussed.

Ed Pauley, Director of the Kennedy Museum, presented a resolution to appoint six members to the Kennedy Museum of Art Advisory Board. Trustee Anderson moved to send the resolution to the full Board for its consideration. Trustee Harris seconded the motion and it passed with a unanimous vote.

The Committee discussed the legal report it would like to receive from the General Counsel in future meetings. Mr. Biancamano said that he will provide a concise listing of significant legal matters for the Governance Committee at the January, 2009 meeting. The Committee will then decide if any of the matters listed require more detailed discussion in executive session consistent with the Open Meetings Law.

Trustee Dewire reported on the Chancellor’s Conference for Trustees of Public Institutions held September 16, 2008. At this meeting, the Chancellor discussed the status of the University System of Ohio. He also requested reports from the universities on Centers of Excellence and their progress with respect to University System goals.

Dr. Davis gave a report on what the other public universities in Ohio do regarding board evaluations. Only one institution, Ohio State, is in the process of developing a process for evaluating its board. It was agreed that Trustee Dewire will contact an OSU trustee to get current information about their evaluation process and will report on this at the January meeting. Dr. Davis was asked to get more information about board evaluation procedures from peer institutions outside Ohio.

Trustee DeLawder suggested that the Committee develop an evaluation questionnaire for the August, 2008 board retreat and orientation. Dr. Davis will work with the Committee on this questionnaire for discussion at the January meeting.

The Committee discussed the OSU Statement on Trusteeship that was reviewed at the Board retreat in August. It was agreed that a similar document should be developed for this Board. Such a document can help define the mission of the Board and describe trustee roles and responsibilities for new Board members.

It was agreed that the Committee will meet in early December to prepare a draft for presentation at the January meeting. Prior to the meeting, Mr. Biancamano will
prepare a preliminary draft based on the OSU statement as well as materials provided by Trustee DeLawder and comments from the members of the Committee. The Committee discussed Trustee DeLawder's proposed committee configurations for 08-09 and future years. The document provided by Mr. DeLawder included recommendations for Board committee assignments several years in the future. He explained that he prepared this document to provide an opportunity for all trustees to get experience in every area of Board service. It was agreed that this document will be reviewed by the Governance Committee every year when committee assignments are made and will be revised by the Committee as needed.

Several staff and faculty members presented information concerning a proposal to add a faculty member to the Board of Trustees. Dr. Davis and Ms. Watts reviewed a chart showing information from other Ohio public universities that had faculty trustees. Provost Krendl, Drs. David Descutner, Thomas and Sergio Lopez- Permouth also commented on the proposal. Trustee Dewire requested that additional data be gathered from schools that do not have faculty trustees. This information will be presented at the January meeting.

Kathy Gilmore presented the proposed Audit Committee Charter. It was agreed that the Charter would be recommended to the full Board by the Audit Committee. Adoption of the Charter will require one change to the Board Bylaws. Mr. Biancamano will prepare this amendment for review by the Governance Committee at the January meeting.

Mr. Biancamano was asked to check if the University is required to file IRS Form 990 and also to look into whether Board members are required to file any additional conflict of interest reports.

Meeting Adjourned: 6:12 p.m.
Audit Committee

Trustee Kidder discussed the mission of the Audit Committee and how high quality financial control is part of the academic excellence at Ohio University. Trustee Kidder reported how an Internal Control Environment (ICE) was created this year. ICE will provide a detailed control improvement plan for the January Board meeting. Trustee Kidder addressed the benefits of centralized over decentralized control activity and how it leads to a healthy control environment.

Trustee Kidder shared information from Kathy Gilmore’s FY 2008 Activity Report. Several audits from FY 2008 are currently in process. Trustee Kidder reported on the recent evaluation of the ethics hotline. He indicated that continued monitoring would be required.

Trustee Kidder reported on a recent meeting that he had with the new auditors for the university. He indicated that he explained the institution’s expectations to the auditors. He commented on the advantages of receiving regular updates which allows the institution to align with best practices.

Full minutes of the Committee meeting held on Thursday afternoon follow. Background materials for the Audit Committee reports may be found in Appendix F.

Ohio University
Audit Committee
October 2, 2008

Meeting called to order by Committee Chair Robert Kidder at: 4:27pm.

Present
Committee Chair Robert Kidder
Trustee David Brightbill
Trustee David Wolfort
President Roderick J. McDavis
Student Trustee Tracy Kelly
Trustee Larry Schey

Internal Control Environment
(Presentation by Kathy Gilmore and Chris Clifford)

- In FY08, Finance performed a Control Environment Assessment (CSA) survey
Identified and discussed some of the strengths and weaknesses of the control environment
A multidisciplinary committee was formed in FY06
Committee's work completed in May 2008
A internal control environment committee (ICE) was formed in August 2008 to continue improving environment
Discussed the next steps in the process

Audit Committee Discussion:
- Trustee Kidder discussed the new audit committee and the control environment. Cash collections mentioned as an example of a weak control environment. A need for strong financial controls is the reason the committee exists.
- Trustee Wolford asked about need to centralize operations.
- Trustee Kidder spoke about typical audit comments and operations that are loosely controlled. Reconciliations etc. Mentioned the need for management to meet their own management plan included in the audit reports.
- Trustee Wolford spoke about the changes in the role of auditing and historical biases in auditing.
- Trustee Brightbill asked about the current external auditor.
- Trustee Kidder asked for examples of decentralization.
- VP Decatur spoke about contracting authority as an area of weakness.
- President McDavis spoke about the deliberate process the University has gone through to get to where we are today with the need to centralize some processes. The committee will be helpful in pointing the University in the right direction.
- Trustee Kidder asked how Ohio State has dealt with decentralization. Kathy Gilmore mentioned Ohio State's management sub-certification process.
- Discussion concerning budgetary controls and whether there is a need to control line item budgetary increase or decreases. Trustees concerned that process would be overly bureaucratic. VP Decatur commented that this was not the intent.
- VP Decatur spoke about the limitations of Oracle the way it is currently set up. Results in increased shadow systems.
- Trustee Wolford asked about the re-install of Oracle. VP Decatur discussed process.
- Discussed purchasing from preferred vendors. Strong policies needed to require employees to make purchases in the most effective manner.
FY08 Activity Report (Presented by Kathy Gilmore)

Control Environment:
- Chief Audit Executive co-chaired the CSA Committee
- Articles featured in the Ohio University Outlook
- Added deans and vice-presidents to distribution list for all Internal Audit reports
- At the request of Chief Information Officer Internal Audit assisted the Office of Information Technology (OIT) in conducting a risk assessment

Special Projects
- Conducted external audit Chapter 7 compliance testing for Deloitte, resulting in annual cost savings for the University
- Coordinated the external auditor selection process and prepared the required RFP (request for proposal)
- Offered professional consultations on internal control, compliance, ethics, and conflict of interest matters

Administered the Ethics Hotline
- Five reports received during FY 08

FY08 Work Plan Performance:
- Planned Audits
  - Completed 11 of 16 regularly scheduled audits
  - 5 remaining in process at year-end
  - Facilities Management moved to FY 09 and replaced with the Cash Collection Points Inventory
- Investigations
  - Completed 4 investigations

Staffing:
- Filled vacant Senior Auditor position
- Addressed IT Audit Requirements through coordination with Information Security (IS)
- IA staff continues to develop IT audit skills

Budget
Chief Audit Executive gave update on Internal Audit budget
Audit Committee Discussion:
- Trustee asked for a description of closed investigations for the benefit of the new audit committee members.
- Trustee Wolfort asked about the ethics hotline.

Adjournment at 5:45 to executive session. Executive session ended at 6:19pm.

Executive Committee

Chair DeLawder was pleased to report the progress in regard to the president’s comprehensive evaluation. On behalf of the trustees, he signed an engagement letter with the Association of Governing Boards (AGB). He indicated that Dr. Terry MacTaggart has been assigned to serve as the external consultant to help carry out the comprehensive presidential evaluation. Chair DeLawder reported that a timeline was being established for on-campus interviews and that Dr. MacTaggart would be visiting the campus and interviewing a number of individuals and representatives of constituent groups of Ohio University.

Chair DeLawder expressed excitement about what Dr. MacTaggart will bring in terms of assistance to the President in the evaluation process and what will result from these efforts in the future. Chair DeLawder was pleased with the prospect of becoming more actively aligned with other high performing institutions. President Mc Davis also will complete his own individual personal self-assessment. On-campus interviews for this evaluation will begin in November. The Executive Committee of the Trustees will serve as the evaluation committee for this exercise, and will receive feedback throughout the process. Chair DeLawder is hopeful to report back with further information at the January Board meeting.

There was no unfinished or new business as reported by Secretary of Board. Minutes from the Committee meeting held earlier in the morning follow.
Ohio University Board of Trustees
Executive Committee Meeting
October 3, 2008
Ohio University Inn

In attendance: Trustees DeLawder, Perry, Brightbill, Dewire, Harris, Kidder, Wolfort, National Trustees Krasovec and Stuckey, Student Trustees Jackson and Kelly, and Alumni Board representative Arlene Greenfield (substituting for Dennis Minichello).

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 a.m. by Trustee DeLawder.

Chair DeLawder announced a contractual agreement with the Association of Governing Boards to identify a consultant to work with the Board in an effort to carry out the Comprehensive Presidential Evaluation of President McDavis. He briefly reviewed the vita of Dr. Terry MacTaggart, a consultant with AGB who will be working with the Evaluation Committee made up of Trustees DeLawder, Perry, and Schey.

Dr. Davis offered an update on the protocol for scheduling interviews with Board members and the various constituent groups both on and off of campus. They will begin sometime in mid-October and will be conducted by Dr. MacTaggart. More information on Board involvement will be forthcoming.

Chair DeLawder discussed the involvement of John Biancamano in upcoming Board meetings. He will be invited to attend all Governance Committee and Executive Committee meetings. In addition, he will be invited to present legal cases that rise to the level of importance of Board awareness. Such cases will be addressed within the context of Executive Session as allowed by law.

Trustee Stuckey raised the question of the need for an additional Trustee to serve on the IT Committee. This could be a voting or National Trustee. The value and means of involving non-Board members also was explored.

President McDavis offered an update on the state of the search currently underway for the Executive Director for Communications and Marketing. Candidates have been identified and are currently being invited for campus visits. It is his hope to have a position filled prior to the next Board of Trustees meeting.

Trustee Wolfort inquired about the existence of a University relocation policy. President McDavis indicated that a policy existed but that it may be too vague for
current times. Both Trustee WolforT and Trustee Perry offered to forward their organization's relocation policies to President McDavis for consideration. A question was raised by Trustee Wolfort concerning the number of "interim positions" currently being filled on a somewhat time-unlimited basis within the administration. President McDavis indicated that he would explore the nature and extent of such positions and report back to the board at the next meeting.

Finally, President McDavis discussed his personal performance objectives which are tied to the Vision Ohio strategic priorities. President McDavis was commended on tying his objectives to measurable outcomes for the Board’s consideration.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 am.

There was no unfinished or new business as reported by Secretary of Board.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT STATED MEETING

The next meetings of the Board of Trustees will be on January 22 and 23, 2009 on the Eastern Campus

ADJOURNMENT

Chair DeLawder adjourned the meeting adjourned at 12:23 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.

C. Daniel DeLawder
Chairman

Thomas E. Davis
Secretary
Interoffice Communication

Date: September 8, 2008

To: The President and Board of Trustees

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

Re: Resolution for Approval of Major Capital Projects for Biennium FY 2009- FY 2010 in Amended Substitute House Bill 562

Attached please find:

1) A resolution for consideration by the Board of Trustees at their October 2008 meeting. The resolution is required pursuant to the hiring of consultants, developing construction documents, bidding and awarding contracts and is being requested for all major capital projects defined within the resolution and funded through House Bill 562.

2) A listing comparing the FY 2009 – FY 2010 Biennial Capital Request as defined and approved by the Board of Trustees in September 2007 as part of the Six Year Board of Regents Capital Plan with the actual appropriation in House Bill 562. The capital request was developed based on an estimated control total provided by the Ohio Board of Regents; the actual House Bill 562 appropriation is a bit less. The Ohio University capital request in total, including regional campuses, was $30,382,625; the Ohio University actual appropriation within House Bill 562 is $29,547,543. This total number includes not only the capital funding for the individual major capital projects, but also the Basic Renovations minor capital funding which will be described in greater detail in a separate resolution.

3) A short description of each of the major capital projects as funded within the Ohio University appropriation within House Bill 562.

The individual projects were identified with input from the Facilities Planning Advisory Committee, the President, the Provost, the Executive Dean of Regional Higher Education, and the Deans for each of the regional campuses. The Athens campus projects are based on the 10 Year Master Plan, and Board approved Six Year Board of Regents Biennial Capital Plan. The projects for each of the regional campuses were developed in harmony with each campus’s Master Plan.
Please note:

1.) Funding for the Southeastern Book Depository Addition project listed was requested to be considered by the Board of Regents as a Special Purpose Capital Appropriation funded by Ohio Link. This project was not funded, and is not noted in the totals above.

2.) The priority project list for Southern Campus contains a line item for proposed property purchases. Approval is sought to pursue property purchases and to negotiate a purchase agreement. Subsequent approval will be sought from the Board of Trustees to purchase a property once a purchase agreement (contingent on Board approval) has been executed.

3.) This information on capital funding is for state capital funds only and does not include funds to be received from grants or contributions.

Please contact me if you have questions about these items. Facilities department staff will be available at the time of presentation to answer questions as well.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Board Approved</th>
<th>H.B. 562</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic Renovations – Formula Funding*</td>
<td>4,492,315</td>
<td>5,043,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supplemental Basic Renovations</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>Included Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lausche Heating Plant Completion</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>4,410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clippinger Lab Renovation – 2nd &amp; 3rd Floors</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
<td>3,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Academic Research Center (ILRF)</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 24,792,315</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 23,753,296</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Southeastern Regional Book Depository      | $ 3,100,000    | $ 0              |

*(Special purpose capital appropriation not funded by OHIO LINK as expected and not in total above.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Board Approved</th>
<th>H.B. 562</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic Renovations – Formula Funding*</td>
<td>306,360</td>
<td>266,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stevenson Learning Commons</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parking and Roadway Improvements</td>
<td>463,816</td>
<td>502,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,270,176</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,269,171</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Board Approved</th>
<th>H.B. 562</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic Renovations – Formula Funding*</td>
<td>258,640</td>
<td>218,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shannon Hall Interior Renovations</td>
<td>584,247</td>
<td>609,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 842,887</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 827,786</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Board Approved</th>
<th>H.B. 562</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic Renovations – Formula Funding*</td>
<td>296,502</td>
<td>306,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brasee Hall Learning Commons</td>
<td>954,650</td>
<td>801,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,251,152</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,108,062</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FY 2009 – FY 2010 STATE CAPITAL FUNDING**
**FINAL HOUSE BILL 562 COMPARED TO BOARD APPROVED REQUEST**
Ohio University
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**SOUTHERN CAMPUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Board Approved</th>
<th>H.B. 562</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic Renovations – Formula Funding*</td>
<td>259,174</td>
<td>232,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Campus Entry &amp; Grounds Improvements</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Land Acquisition</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>170,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Academic Bldg Lab &amp; Classroom Renovation Planning</td>
<td>68,491</td>
<td>58,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. OU Southern Proctorville Campus Upgrades</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. OU Southern Horse Park</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 852,665</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,162,253</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Projects**

**ZANESVILLE CAMPUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Board Approved</th>
<th>H.B. 562</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basic Renovations – Formula Funding*</td>
<td>328,949</td>
<td>297,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Elson Hall Partial 2nd Floor Renovation</td>
<td>1,044,481</td>
<td>1,129,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,373,430</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,426,975</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL OHIO UNIVERSITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>$30,382,625</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,547,543</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Regional Book Depository Addition</td>
<td>$ 3,100,000</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See separate resolution for Basic Renovations funding and listing of specific projects within it.*
A. ATHENS CAMPUS

1. LAUSCHE HEATING PLANT ($4,410,000)
   The completion of this multi-phased project will include refurbishment of the plant-wide electrical distribution system, installation of an emergency generator, improved de-aerated water system and replacement of the economizers for three boilers. The goal is an upgraded heating plant contributing to conservation and efficient use of energy.

2. CLIPPINGER LAB RENOVATION – 2ND & 3RD FLOORS ($3,400,000)
   The mechanical and electrical systems serving the chemistry and physics lab in this early 1970’s building are undersized for contemporary teaching and research, and will be upgraded to address ongoing safety concerns. This project continues a series of phased renovations to Clippinger Hall, which is the primary science classroom/laboratory building on campus. This phase will replace the existing forty four laboratory exhaust fans with three strobic laboratory exhaust fans.

3. ACADEMIC RESEARCH CENER (ILRF) ($9,000,000)
   This project is under construction and will provide new classrooms and research laboratory facilities to serve the colleges of Engineering, Arts and Sciences, and Osteopathic Medicine; and is intended to encourage collaboration between these and other university-wide disciplines. The funding for this project is comprised of $18,568,830 of gift and grants, $2,681,170 of capital improvements dollars from the previous biennium and $9,000,000 in House Bill 562. This project is in conformance with the University’s new strategic academic plan and campus master plan.

4. INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS ($1,900,000)
   Funding for this project will install an additional electric chiller in the West Green Chilled water plant. The new 1250 ton chiller will supplement the existing 2500 ton electric chiller. The additional capacity will serve the new Academic & Research Center and the Porter Hall Addition as well as provide redundancy for the existing facilities previously connected to the West Green Chilled water loop. This utility infrastructure project will address the energy efficiency and carbon footprint reduction commitment made by the University.

B. REGIONAL CAMPUSES

1. STEVENSON CENTER LEARNING COMMONS – CHILLICOTHE ($500,000)
   This project involves an addition to the Stevenson Center for the development of a student learning commons. This area will feature computer work stations and student collaboration areas. A connector to the adjacent Bennett Hall is also planned. This project will amass funds from three biennia to develop one project to be implemented in FY 2011-2012.
2. PARKING AND ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS – CHILLICOTHE ($502,542)
   This project will be the next segment of a series of projects to improve and upgrade the roadways and parking areas within the campus. A master plan for the overall scope of this work was completed in 2003. This project will address paved areas adjacent to Bennett Hall and the Stevenson Center. Pedestrian access will be upgraded as part of this work, including appropriate ADA access.

3. SHANNON HALL INTERIOR RENOVATIONS – EASTERN ($609,112)
   This project will renovate a portion of the existing library into a Learning Commons area, featuring updated computer stations, meeting rooms and student/faculty collaboration areas. The existing student services area will be reconfigured for better workflow and to include the main building information desk within this area.

4. BRASEE HALL LEARNING COMMONS – LANCASTER ($801,485)
   This project involves the expansion and renovation of the existing library space to include a learning resource center, a work force development classroom, and tutoring/testing center. Current collections will be maintained. Also included are enhancements to the physical fitness area, including gymnasium systems, locker rooms and administrative offices.

5. CAMPUS ENTRY & GROUNDS IMPROVEMENTS – SOUTHERN ($325,000)
   The main entrance to the Ohio University Southern Campus is confusing and difficult to negotiate. This project will reconfigure the entry, add parking and landscaping, and improve signage to make a more visible and safer point of entry to the campus.

6. LAND ACQUISITION – SOUTHERN ($170,830)
   The Southern Campus is land-locked. There is no land available for expansion of buildings, parking or green spaces. The surrounding properties are owned by the Ironton City School District and a variety of residential owners. These funds will be designated to purchase private properties adjacent to the campus as they become available. Approval is sought to pursue property purchases and negotiate a purchase agreement. Subsequent approval will be sought from the Board of Trustees for approval to purchase a property once a purchase agreement (contingent on Board approval) has been executed.

7. ACADEMIC BLDG LAB & CLASSROOM RENOVATION PLANNING – SOUTHERN ($58,491)
   The Academic Building at OUS provides laboratories, classrooms and computer classrooms for use by a wide variety of academic programs. The building opened in the early 1990’s, and is in need of renovation. Funds will be used for upgrades to finishes, lighting, technology, furniture and equipment. Funds will be expended in the 2009-2010 biennium to produce design and construction documents.
8. PROCTORVILLE CAMPUS UPGRADES – SOUTHERN ($50,000)
   The project will complete the classrooms left unfinished in a previous renovation. This will
   include drywall, lighting, electrical, finishes and furnishings.

9. HORSE PARK – SOUTHERN ($325,000)
   This project will build a covered horse arena at the existing horse park in Franklin Furnace, Ohio
   to include lighting and bleachers.

10. ELSON HALL PARTIAL 2ND FLOOR RENOVATION – ZANESVILLE ($1,129,666)
    Elson Hall, the major classroom building on the Zanesville Campus, was constructed in the early
    1970's, and is in need of renovation. A master plan for renovation of the 36,000 SF second floor
    has been developed. This project will renovate about 8,000 SF of the second floor, including
    classrooms and labs with new finishes, lighting, HVAC and upgraded equipment and
    technology.
Construction Projects

State Major Capital Projects - Tab 3

Basic Renovation Projects - Tab 4

Resolution for Board approval for hiring consultants, developing construction documents, bidding and awarding contracts for the major capital projects approved by the state.

HB 562 - State Funded Major Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HB 562 State Capital</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens Campus - Major Capital</td>
<td>$19,300,000</td>
<td>$10,710,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens Campus - Basic Renovation</td>
<td>$5,492,315</td>
<td>$5,043,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Athens Campus</td>
<td>$24,792,315</td>
<td>$23,753,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Campuses - Major Capital</td>
<td>$4,140,685</td>
<td>$4,472,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Campuses - Basic Renovation</td>
<td>$1,449,625</td>
<td>$1,222,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Regional Campuses</td>
<td>$5,590,310</td>
<td>$5,694,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ohio University</td>
<td>$30,382,625</td>
<td>$29,547,543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB 562 - Athens Campus Major Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HB 562 State Capital</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laurin Heating Plant Completion</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$4,410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clippinger Lab Renovation - 2nd &amp; 3rd Floors</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Research Center (ILRF)</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Athens Campus Major Capital</td>
<td>$19,300,000</td>
<td>$18,710,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HB 562 - Regional Campuses Major Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HB 562 State Capital</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chillicothe Campus</td>
<td>$963,816</td>
<td>$1,002,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Campus</td>
<td>$504,247</td>
<td>$509,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Campus</td>
<td>$454,650</td>
<td>$461,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Campus</td>
<td>$992,491</td>
<td>$929,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanesville Campus</td>
<td>$1,046,461</td>
<td>$1,120,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Regional Campuses Major Capital</td>
<td>$5,140,855</td>
<td>$4,472,138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interoffice Communication

Date: September 8, 2008

To: The President and Board of Trustees

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

Re: Resolution for Approval of Specific Basic Renovations Projects for Biennium FY 2009 – FY 2010 as appropriated in Amended Substitute House Bill 562

Attached please find:

1.) A resolution for consideration by the Board of Trustees at their October 2008 meeting. The resolution is required pursuant to the hiring of consultants, developing construction documents, bidding and awarding contracts and is being requested for all specific basic renovation projects defined within the resolution and funded through House Bill 562.

2.) A short description of each of the specific basic renovation projects included in the resolution.

House Bill 562, the state’s capital improvement bill, which was passed and approved by the Governor in June 2008, contains a basic renovations appropriation available for use on the Athens campus in the amount of $5,043,296. The five regional campuses each received basic renovation appropriations in House Bill Number 562 in the following amounts: Eastern Campus, $218,674; Lancaster Campus, $306,577; Zanesville Campus, $297,309; Chillicothe Campus, $266,629; and Southern or Ironton Campus, $232,932. The total funds available are $1,322,121 for use on the regional campuses. Following discussions with representatives of the Provost’s office, directors in Administration, the Deans of the regional campuses, the office of the Vice President for University Outreach and Regional Campuses, and the Ohio Board of Regents and review and approval by the University’s Facilities Planning Advisory Committee (FPAC) specific projects were identified for these FY 2009 – FY 2010 Basic Renovations appropriations.

The work proposed with these funds includes improvements to the campus infrastructure and a number of its buildings such as interior renovations; roof replacements; heating, ventilation, and air conditioning improvements, masonry repairs, modifications for accessibility, concrete restoration, emergency lighting, fire alarm upgrades, and roadway improvements.

Please contact me if you have questions about these items. Facilities Department staff will be available at the time of presentation to answer questions as well.
A. ATHENS CAMPUS

1. ACADEMIC SUPPORT IMPROVEMENTS ($500,000)
These funds will be used to upgrade classroom furniture, finishes, technology and academic support areas.

2. ADA ACCESS – MAIN GREEN ($250,000)
This project will improve pedestrian routes across the main college green. It will provide accessible pathways between all of the main green buildings including transit stops and ADA parking areas.

3. ADA FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS ($55,000)
These funds will be used to improve ADA way finding signage, accessibility to public restrooms and interior ADA modifications.

4. AIRPORT MAINTENANCE HANGER ROOF ($250,000)
These funds will be used to replace the existing metal roof at the university Airport maintenance hanger. The existing roof is rusting and has developed leaks allowing water to infiltrate into the building.

5. ALDEN LIBRARY HVAC ($500,000)
In Phase 1 in the previous biennium, a complete assessment of the building’s HVAC system was completed. The HVAC Improvements shall include, but not be limited to, the refurbishing of Air Handling Units 1 & 2 and upgrade of remaining air handlers and fans.

6. BACKFLOW PREVENTERS ($100,000)
The purpose of backflow prevention is to protect the domestic water supply. This project is the continuing effort to upgrade all campus buildings in accordance with the current state and city regulations.

7. CAMPUS INFRASTRUCTURE ($500,000)
These funds will address a number of campus wide concerns in areas of HVAC, elevators, electrical systems, building envelops and roofs. The funds will be used to develop budgets for future projects and implement corrective measures for immediate infrastructure problems.

8. CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER WATERPROOFING ($75,000)
This project will divert the existing ground water and provide waterproofing to the below grade portion of the masonry foundation wall.

9. COMPUTER SERVICES FIRE ALARMS ($150,000)
This project will provide replacement of the existing fire alarm system in the old Chemistry Building, home to Computer Services. Environmental Health and Safety in conjunction with the Facilities Management has determined that the system has antiquated panels and devices. The existing systems are original to the 1992 building renovation and do not comply with codes and campus fire safety standards.

10. CONVO CENTER CONCRETE RESTORATION ($250,000)
This project will continue the restoration efforts of the previous projects. Miscellaneous areas of deterioration will require repairs consisting of full and partial depth patching.
11. CUTLER HALL HIGH VOLTAGE UPGRADE ($50,000)
This project will design the replacement of the existing high voltage armored feeder cables to Cutler Hall, replacement of the secondary electrical distribution panels and provide new circuits to existing rooms.

12. CUTLER HALL OR HANING HALL FIRE ALARMS ($50,000)
This project involves the replacement of the fire alarm system in either Cutler Hall or Haning Hall. The decision of which building receives the fire alarm upgrade will be based on the available summer schedule of each building. Environmental Health and Safety in conjunction with Facilities Management has determined that the system has antiquated panels and devices. The existing systems are original to the building and do not comply with codes and campus fire safety standards.

13. DYSART WOODS FACILITIES IMPROVEMENTS ($55,000)
This small wood framed house serves as the caretaker's home and as a visitors' center for the old growth forest. The funds will be used to make repairs to the soffits, eaves and shingled roof.

14. EDWARDS ACCELERATOR LAB FIRE ALARMS ($100,000)
This project involves the replacement of the fire alarm system in Edwards Accelerator Laboratory. Environmental Health and Safety in conjunction with Facilities Management has determined that the system has antiquated panels and devices in the existing building. The 1990 building addition existing systems are not compatible with the fire alarm system in the original building and do not comply with codes and campus fire safety standards.

15. GENERAL FUND MASONRY ($50,000)
This is an ongoing effort to address the aging masonry on the core campus buildings. These funds will be used to address masonry deficiencies.

16. GENERAL FUND ROOF IMPROVEMENTS ($150,000)
This project will replace the existing failed roof system on a not yet determined building.

17. IRVINE HALL AIR HANDLER VFD UPGRADE ($90,000)
This project will upgrade the existing air handler with a VFD and controls to improve efficiency and reduce utility costs.

18. KANTNER HALL FIRE ALARMS ($150,000)
This project involves the replacement of the fire alarm system in Kantner Hall. Kantner Hall is a theater in the College of Fine Arts. Environmental Health and Safety in conjunction with Facilities Management has determined that the system has antiquated panels and devices. The existing systems are original to the building and do not comply with codes and campus fire safety standards.

19. KONNEKER CENTER STEAM EXTENTION ($225,000)
This project will extend the Ridges steam line from the old Ridges heating plant to the Konneker Center. Phase I will be the design of the total project and the implementation of the building tie in. When the project is complete it will improve the operational efficiency and provide for lower utility costs.

20. MCCCRACKEN HALL DISTRICT CHILLED WATER CONNECTION ($120,000)
This project will extend chilled water piping from the East Green/Nelson chilled water plant to the College of Education in McCracken Hall. This project will allow for the removal of the existing air-cooled chiller in McCracken Hall. The completion of this project will provide increase operational efficiency and lower utility costs.
21. PEDEN STADIUM EMERGENCY LIGHTING ($250,000)
   Peden Stadium is the University's 22,500 seat football stadium. This public arena does not have emergency egress lighting from the east and west Grandstands. This project will design and install code compliant emergency egress lighting.

22. RIDGES ROOF REPLACEMENTS ($330,000)
   This project will help address the deteriorating existing shingle roofs on the Ridges buildings. It will concentrate on building 13 and 14 and replace the shingles, felt, ice & water shield, copper built-in gutters and copper down spouts.

23. ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS ($100,000)
   These funds will be used for sub surface base deficiencies, surface milling, and asphalt overlay on University Terrace at Clippinger Hall and Race Street.

24. RYORS ANNEXES HVAC IMPROVEMENTS ($250,000)
   This project will add a laboratory exhaust system to the existing teaching physiology lab. The laboratory exhaust system will improve the classroom environment for students and faculty.

25. WEST STATE EMERGENCY POWER ($100,000)
   This project will utilize $100,000 from HB 699 identified for the same project in the previous biennium. The combined funding will provide for the installation of a 15 KW transformer and switch at the existing at the West State Street Research Park substation. At the present, there is no redundancy in the electrical feed to the research facilities. This project will provide redundancy and protect the on going research efforts at the Research Park.

26. CONTINGENCY ($193,296)

B. REGIONAL CAMPUSES

1. PARKING IMPROVEMENTS-EASTERN ($218,674)
   This appropriation will be used to continue to renovation of the existing parking facility at Shannon Hall.

2. LIBRARY INFRASTRUCTURE-LANCASTER ($306,577)
   This appropriation will be utilized with the Brasee Hall Library/Gymnasium Renovation. These basic renovation funds will be used to fund the mechanical improvements associated with the Library project.

3. ESSENTIAL SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT PROJECT – ZANESVILLE ($297,309)
   This appropriation will be used to perform miscellaneous building improvements that will be coordinated with the Zane State campus.

4. BASIC RENOVATION – CHILLICOTHE ($266,629)
   This appropriation will be combined with the remaining funding from the basic renovations line for the Chillicothe Campus in the last capital improvements bill, and will be used to continue parking and roadway improvements on the campus.

5. RIFFE CENTER ROOF REPLACEMENT - IRONTON ($232,932)
   This appropriation will be utilized to replace the existing low sloped roof, add insulation and improve the drainage.
Construction Projects

HB 562 – Basic Renovation Projects

- Basic Renovation funds totaling $6.4 million were included in the HB 562 approval
- Basic Renovation funds are used for improvements to campus infrastructure and building systems and interior renovations
- Resolution for approval for hiring consultants, developing construction documents, bidding and awarding contracts for the major capital projects approved by the state

Construction Projects

HB 562 – Basic Renovations by Project Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HB 562 State Capital</th>
<th>Athens</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Improvements</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$306,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Improvements</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC / Plumbing</td>
<td>$940,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Infrastructure</td>
<td>$895,000</td>
<td>$217,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofs</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$322,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Safety</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lots &amp; Roadways</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$218,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural / Waterproofing</td>
<td>$773,296</td>
<td>$386,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Basic Renovations</td>
<td>$5,043,296</td>
<td>$1,322,121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interoffice Communication

Date: September 8, 2008

To: The President and Board of Trustees

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

Re: Resolution for Approval of 15 Year House Bill 251 Implementation Plan

Attachments to this communication include: (1) Sub HB 251 Energy Efficiency and Conservation Guidelines, (2) Campus Sustainability Plan Proposal, (3) HB 251 Implementation Plan, and (4) Resolution to approve HB 251 Implementation Plan.

Over the past couple of years, several things have happened which point Ohio University toward developing a comprehensive Campus Sustainability Plan. The institution has completed the Vision Ohio Strategic Plan which commits Ohio University to move in the direction of sustainability. The President has made a commitment to move the institution toward a more neutral carbon footprint with the signing of the President’s Climate Commitment. The State of Ohio has passed House Bill 251, which seeks to reduce energy consumption by twenty percent (20%) over the next ten years at public colleges and universities. It is this third item that brings us to the Board with the attached resolution for consideration.

In addition to the resolution, attached is also a draft of a proposal that is being developed for a comprehensive Campus Sustainability Plan for Ohio University’s six campuses. This plan will develop goals and objectives by functional areas. At this time, eleven (11) functional areas have been identified for examination and measurement. These eleven areas are: governance, fundraising efforts and gifts, academic and culture, materials management, food, greenhouse gas emissions, energy, transportation, water, landscape and biotic environment, and the built environment.

House Bill 251 requires Ohio University to develop a fifteen year plan for energy conservation and obtain the approval of the plan by the Board of Trustees. This fifteen year plan must receive Board approval before the end of 2008. Because House Bill 251 is one of several initiatives that move the institution toward a more sustainable way of doing business, it was felt that the requirements of the legislated mandate should be looked at as a portion of a more comprehensive effort. The plan to meet the energy conservation requirement of House Bill 251 will focus on three of the eleven functional areas proposed for examination as a part of the comprehensive
Campus Sustainability Plan. These three functional areas include greenhouse gas emissions, energy, and the built environment.

The HB 251 Implementation Plan being brought to the Board of Trustees for approval meets the requirements established by House Bill 251, the Inter-University Council of Ohio and the Ohio Association of Community Colleges, in consultation with the Office of Energy Services of the Department of Administrative Services. This plan establishes goals for the campuses, lays out a strategy to reach those goals, identifies a number of funding opportunities for supporting the goals and strategies, and sets out the reporting requirements for the plan.

In summary, included is a resolution for board action at their regular October 2008 meeting which adopts the HB 251 Implementation Plan.
Introduction

In accordance with the requirements of House Bill Number 251, the Inter-University Council (IUC) of Ohio and the Ohio Association of Community Colleges (OACC), in consultation with the Office of Energy Services of the Department of Administrative Services, have developed guidelines for use by the board of trustees of each state institution of higher education to ensure energy efficiency and reduce energy consumption in both on- and off-campus facilities.

Energy Efficiency and Conservation Guidelines

The following energy efficiency and conservation guidelines are presented to state institutions of higher education:

(1) The goal of each institution shall be to reduce on- and off-campus building energy consumption by at least 20 percent by the end of the fiscal year ended 2014 compared to fiscal (not calendar) year 2004 as the benchmark year. A secondary goal of each institution shall be to obtain, as best possible, a similar reduction of carbon dioxide emission levels. As stated in the House Bill, the goals of each institution should recognize the diverse nature and different energy demands and uses of such buildings and measures already taken to increase building energy efficiency and conservation. Moreover, an institution’s goals should be adjusted to reflect their previously recognized efforts in energy conservation within the context of their academic mission.

(a) It is recommended that mmBTU per gross square foot by campus be the comparison measure for benchmarking, as defined within the Higher Education Information (HEI) system. This shall be calculated each fiscal year. Where possible, it should also factor in heating and cooling degree days, as well as conditioned and non-conditioned space. Benchmarks shall be finalized by the Board of Regents, in consultation with the public colleges and universities.

(2) It is recognized that building design plays a significant role in energy efficiency. As a result, until such time that the state building standards are changed to place more emphasis on energy efficiency, the following goals are set forth for on- or off-campus capital improvement projects with anticipated construction costs in excess of $100,000:

a. For projects with programming / design work commencing after July 1, 2008:
i. Exceed ASHRAE 90.1.2004 (as referenced in the current building code) by 10 percent for new construction projects and 7.5 percent for renovation and other projects.

b. For projects with programming / design work commencing after July 1, 2010:

i. Exceed ASHRAE 90.1.2004 (as referenced in the current building code) by 20 percent for new construction projects and 15 percent for renovation and other projects.

(3) The commitment to energy efficient construction should also be applied to leased off-campus space. For such leases for space of 20,000 square feet for more, the following goals should be observed:

a. For newly built space, the lessor should be expected to observe the goals identified in section (2) above.

b. For existing space, all effort should be made to comply with the goals identified in section (2) above wherever practical.

i. It should be recognized that the lease for existing space should be evaluated on an individual basis and on its own merits, with an emphasis on the overall financial value of the arrangement, with consideration provided to not allow energy efficiency to impact or impede a desirable and financially sound business arrangement.

(4) The evaluation and consideration of best practices related to energy efficiency and conservation provides the opportunity for learning from industry leaders and a basis for continuous improvement measures. Such best practices shall be disclosed bi-annually within the institution’s Six-year Capital Plan, for the capital biennium commencing July 1, 2010, as submitted to the Ohio Board of Regents for the purposes of State Capital Appropriations requests. Furthermore, sections (1), (2), (3), and (5) within these guidelines shall be considered best practices and serve to set the metrics for performance relative to energy efficiency and consumption.

(5) Each state institution’s board shall develop a fifteen-year plan for phasing in energy efficiency and conservation projects by December 31, 2008. The plan should incorporate the requirements set forth within these guidelines, along with consideration that:

a. Each institution is different and must evaluate its own unique operating environment.

b. The plan should include capital budget planning, changes in personnel, changes in level and types of service, as well as innovative initiatives such as, but not limited to, alternative or renewable energy, and the alternative method for awarding performance contracts through ORC 3345:61-66, and others.
(6) Each capital project undertaken and developed within the context of these guidelines shall be evaluated by the institution through a project impact assessment report, disclosing the fiscal effects of the energy efficiency and conservation measures pursued within the project; i.e. life-cycle cost analysis.

(7) Reporting and evaluating results is a key component to monitoring progress and performance of energy efficiency and conservation among all institutions of higher education in Ohio. Each institution shall report its energy consumption as follows:

   a. The standard unit of measure shall be as defined in section (1) a.

   b. In order to maximize the utilization of existing state-wide institutional reporting mediums, energy consumption data shall be reported:

      i. From a historical view: On a fiscal year basis, using a standard template to be developed by the Ohio Board of Regents, including actual energy consumption in units and dollars and carbon footprint information.

         1. In order to provide the comparable annual performance data, it is expected that the actual energy consumption data for fiscal years 2004 through 2008 shall be provided with the fiscal year 2008 HEI submission in February 2009.

      ii. From a prospective view: Bi-annually, commencing July 1, 2010, each institution shall provide a prospective view of their respective accomplishments, future plans, and challenges. The view shall be submitted in a narrative format as part of the institution’s Six Year Capital Plan.

   c. Once the data has been compiled by the Ohio Board of Regents, and reviewed in consultation with the committee, the Regents shall incorporate the results into their annual performance report.

Conclusion

The guidelines set forth above have been developed in an effort to meet the requirements of Sub. H. B. No. 251 (ORC Sec. 3345.69) House Bill Number 251 and the intended energy efficiency and conservation measures. As Governor Strickland noted in his Executive Order 2007-02S, “It is the responsibility of state government to lead by example in reducing energy consumption in this era of steep energy prices, mounting environmental concerns, and persistent energy security risks. By improving energy efficiency, and adopting advanced energy utilization technologies, we can make the most of our existing energy resources and also stimulate activity and investment in the energy efficiency services sector.” We feel confident that these guidelines meet the spirit of the enacted legislation and the Governor’s Executive Order.
In accordance with the requirements of House Bill Number 251, Ohio University has developed the following fifteen year plan for use and approval by the board of trustees to ensure energy efficiency and reduce energy consumption in existing and planned facilities at all Ohio University campuses.

This plan should be understood as one component of our process toward the development and implementation of a comprehensive sustainability plan which will serve as both a long-term vision and a blueprint for campus sustainability efforts across Ohio University’s six (6) campuses. The sustainability plan will reconcile and align the goals of Vision OHIO, the Presidents Climate Commitment and House Bill 251 in order to direct the university’s progress toward broader sustainability targets affecting all functional areas of campus operations, which includes, academics, governance, endowment investment, materials management, food, transportation, built environment, land use and energy generation.

Introduction

House Bill 251, introduced in May 2005 and signed by the Governor in January 2007, aims to promote the State of Ohio as a leader in energy efficiency. It focuses, in part, on energy consumption in state-funded facilities (including those of state institutions of higher education). As such, it addresses the authority of university and college boards of trustees regarding on- and off-campus construction and leasing.

The bill requires that each board of trustees develop its own 15-year plan for phasing-in energy efficiency and conservation projects. The guidelines must incorporate best practices into energy efficiency standards and plans and must provide that project impact assessments include the fiscal effects of energy efficiency and conservation recommendations and plans.

Further, the guidelines must include a goal of reducing on- and off-campus building energy consumption by at least 20% by 2014, using calendar year 2004 as the benchmark year. The bill authorizes the guidelines to recognize the diverse nature and different energy demands and uses of such buildings, as well as measures already taken to increase building efficiency and conservation.

The guidelines also must prescribe minimum energy efficiency and conservation standards for any new, on- or off-campus capital improvement project with a construction cost of $100,000 or more. Those standards must be based on general building type and cost-effectiveness. Additionally, the guidelines must prescribe minimum standards for leased, off-campus spaces of at least 20,000 square feet.

Goals

The primary goal of this fifteen year plan is the reduction of campus facility energy intensity by 20% by the end of fiscal year 2014 as compared to fiscal year 2004. “Energy intensity” is
defined as consumption of mmBTU per gross square foot. Where possible, this measure will also factor in heating and cooling degree days. Both conditioned and non-conditioned spaces will be included in gross square footage totals.

The secondary goal of this fifteen year plan is to obtain, as best possible, a similar reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, hereto forward referred to as “GHG”.

Strategies

In order to reach the goals stated above, Ohio University will utilize the following strategies:

1. Every capital improvement project will be evaluated according to the energy and GHG efficiency of its design as well as its impacts on the efficient use of existing space on campus;

2. For capital improvement projects with anticipated construction costs in excess of $100,000, we will exceed ASHRAE 90.1.2004 standards by 10 percent for new construction projects and 7.5 percent for renovation and other projects. For projects with programming/design work commencing after July 1, 2010, we will exceed ASHRAE 90.1.2004 by 20 percent for new construction projects and 15 percent for renovation and other projects;

3. For leased spaces of 20,000 square feet or more, all effort will be made to comply with the standards outlined in section (1) above;

4. Strive to direct a minimum of 20 percent of capital budget allocations toward innovative infrastructure efficiency projects targeting reductions in energy, water and/or carbon emissions. This may include capital budget projects already identified such as total building rehabilitations which are projected to produce energy intensity savings. Further, additional projects will be developed and implemented as the 10 year capital budget is updated;

5. Strategic metering standards outlined by the department of Facilities Management will be strictly maintained on all capital improvement projects that involve new construction or renovations of existing buildings;

6. Add through redirection and Vision OHIO funding, engineering and sustainability personnel over time in proportion to the total square footage of built spaces on campus. One new energy engineer position will be created through redirection in fiscal year 2009;

7. Explore establishment of an ongoing internal funding stream for resource efficiency projects;

8. Where applicable, external funding opportunities will be researched and pursued to assist in the financing of projects positively affecting our energy intensity, overall energy consumption, and/or carbon footprint;
9. In recognition of our severe dependence on coal, its resultant impacts on our carbon footprint, and rising utility costs, we will explore alternative fuel sources in all critical evaluations of our future energy needs and infrastructure;

10. Aggressively pursue education and outreach efforts which stimulate voluntary conservation and integration between the academic mission of the institution and sustainability goals and projects.

Funding Mechanisms

CAPITAL BUDGET ALLOCATIONS
Ohio University receives a capital allocation from the State of Ohio roughly every two years toward construction, renovation and infrastructure upgrades. In the current biennium, this allocation totaled approximately $27,000,000, including those funds directed toward the regional campuses.

DEBT/PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING
Since 1994, the State of Ohio has allowed Ohio's public colleges and universities to hire companies to improve energy efficiency based on the amount of money the company promised to save, instead of relying on the typical threshold of giving the job to the lowest and best bidder. This law enables state agencies to enter into performance contracting agreements, which guarantee the performance of the building and the expected savings. Projects can be paid for out of actual energy savings under a performance contract. Such projects usually include the installation of energy or water conservation measures in buildings by professional contractors. Equipment is installed at no initial cost to the University, in return for part of the energy savings. Ohio University has made use of this option since 1999 to identify and implement conservation and efficiency projects with paybacks through cost avoidance in the 5-10 year range.

REVOLVING ENERGY FUND OR ENERGY MANAGEMENT FUND
Revolving loan funds involve the allocation of an initial sum of money which then finances conservation and efficiency projects that have a quantifiable monetary savings or avoidance. A portion of the returns from these projects is reinvested into the fund until the project has been paid off. The money is then reused for more projects. Prior to 1999, Ohio University made use of this strategy by reinvesting savings or the costs avoided in an energy management fund.

GRANTS AND GIFT OPPORTUNITIES
With increasing public support for campus sustainability, reducing the institution’s carbon footprint and conserving energy, there are emerging opportunities to pursue grants through various agencies and organizations as well as gifts from individuals. These are particularly appropriate for projects with considerable environmental benefits which may not boast a suitable payback period for implementation based on cost savings or avoidance alone.

Reporting Requirements

Best practices related to energy efficiency and conservation will be disclosed biennially within Ohio University’s Six Year Capital Plan for the capital biennium commencing July 1, 2010, as
submitted to the Ohio Board of Regents for the purposes of State Capital Appropriations requests. The first installation of the best practices report will include a review of prior conservation efforts which have resulted in significant cost and GHG avoidance, including those which pre-date the 2004 benchmark year.

Each capital project undertaken and developed within the context of the guidelines of House Bill 251 shall be evaluated by Ohio University through a project impact assessment report, disclosing the fiscal effects of the energy efficiency and conservation measures pursued within the project, including, but not limited to, life cycle cost analysis.

Ohio University will report its energy consumption to the Ohio Board of Regents as follows:

(a) The standard unit of measurement shall be as defined as mmBTU consumption per gross square foot. Where possible, this measure will also factor in heating and cooling degree days. Both conditioned and non-conditioned spaces will be included in gross square footage totals.

(b) In order to maximize the utilization of existing state-wide institutional reporting mediums, energy consumption data shall be reported
   a. From a historical view: On a fiscal year basis, using the Portfolio Manager software package prescribed by the Ohio Board of Regents, including actual energy consumption in units and dollars and carbon footprint information
      i. In order to provide the comparable annual performance data, it is expected that the actual energy consumption data for fiscal years 2004 through 2008 shall be provided with the fiscal year 2008 HEI submission in February 2009.
   b. From a prospective view: Bi-annually, commencing July 1, 2010, Ohio University will provide a prospective view of our accomplishments, future plans, and challenges. The view will be submitted in a narrative format as part of Ohio University’s Six Year Capital Plan.

Once the data has been compiled by the Ohio Board of Regents and reviewed in consultation with the committee, the Regents will incorporate the results into their annual performance report.

Review Process

Ohio University will review the fifteen year plan on a biennial basis to update targets and strategies as needed.
Glossary of Terms

**ASHRAE 90.1.2004** — a building energy efficiency standard issued by the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE).

**carbon footprint** — the impact of a human activity on the environment measured as the amount of the greenhouse gas carbon dioxide released over a period of time.

**cooling degree days** — an indicator of the annual demand for energy needed to cool a facility. The cooling degrees for a single day are calculated as the number of degrees by which the average outside temperature for that day exceeds the reference temperature (typically 65 degrees F). The annual cooling degree days value is calculated by summing the cooling degrees for each day of the year.

**conditioned spaces** — portions of facilities which are heated or cooled.

**energy intensity** — a measure of the overall efficiency of a facility. It is calculated, in this case, as the units of energy (mmBTU) consumed per unit of facility area (gross square foot).

**greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions** — the atmospheric release of gases associated with increased potential for global warming (e.g. carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, methane, etc.). GHG emissions often result from the combustion of fossil fuels to generate heat or electric power.

**gross square foot** — a measure of total facility area in units of square-feet.

**heating degree days** — an indicator of the annual demand for energy needed to heat a facility. The heating degrees for a single day are calculated as the number of degrees by which the reference temperature (typically 65 degrees F) exceeds the average outside temperature for that day. The annual heating degree days value is calculated by summing the heating degrees for each day of the year.

**mmBTU (million British Thermal Units)** — a unit of energy measurement which can be applied to any fuel source.

**Ohio House Bill 251** — signed into law in January 2007, the legislation: 1) requires the efficient use of energy in existing state facilities, 2) sets energy efficiency standards for the procurement of goods and services, and 3) requires the use energy efficient designs in new capital construction.
CAMPUS SUSTAINABILITY PLAN PROPOSAL
FOR
OHIO UNIVERSITY
September 8, 2008

This proposal to develop a comprehensive Campus Sustainability Plan is intended to help the institution make significant contributions to energy conservation, resource management, and environmental awareness as well as make contributions to the institution’s education and research efforts on Ohio University’s six (6) campuses. The plan would serve as both a long-term vision and a blueprint for campus sustainability efforts. As an institution, Ohio University would be making a commitment to being a leader in sustainability through education, research and action.

INTRODUCTION
The Ohio University Vision Ohio Strategic Plan articulates an institutional commitment to sustainability. The President has made a commitment to move the institution toward a carbon neutral footprint. The State of Ohio has passed House Bill 251, which seeks to reduce energy consumption by twenty percent over the next ten years at colleges, universities, and other state agencies. This proposal is intended to combine the goals of Vision Ohio, the President’s commitment and the requirements of HB 251 into a comprehensive plan that measures the University’s progress toward these goals and requirements and in general toward leadership in movement toward a sustainable future.

This proposal seeks to lay the ground work for the following issues;

- Measurement of Ohio University’s progress toward sustainability;
- Measure the change in the environmental impacts of Ohio University’s activities over the past decade; and
- Identify baseline data and create benchmarks that can be used for internal and external comparison over time.

If these questions are evaluated in an accurate and honest way, they will provide a number of opportunities. The University will be able to document exemplary performance, recognize its leadership, and identify opportunities to build on its successes. It will be able to identify shortcomings, presenting opportunities for action and improvement. Further, conducting evaluations of sustainable performance allows the University to make well-informed changes that will promote progress.

WHAT IS SUSTAINABILITY?
In a report to the United Nations, “Our Common Future,” also known as the Brundtland Report, sustainable development is defined as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” The United States Environmental Protection Agency defines sustainability as “the ability to achieve continuing economic prosperity while protecting the natural systems of the planet and providing a high quality of life for its people.”
Sustainable solutions are understood to meet needs that are environmental, social, and economic.

WHAT IS CAMPUS SUSTAINABILITY?
Campus sustainability refers to the degree to which activities at a particular university or college conserve natural resources, minimize environmental impacts, and lead society toward sustainability through research, teaching, and public service.

THE SUSTAINABILITY PLAN
It is proposed that a plan be developed that is a dynamic document that is updated on a regular basis. A committee to oversee the process should be developed that will broadly represent the campus constituents. This committee would be chaired by the Associate Vice President of Facilities. The committee or group would then work with a broad based coalition of campus change agents representing the faculty, staff, and students. The comprehensive Campus Sustainability Plan would be developed much in the same way that the Vision Ohio Strategic Plan was developed. It is important to note that students would make an STRONG contribution to this plan’s development. In addition, scientists and scholars in Environmental Studies, Voinovich Center, the Russ College of Engineering and Technology, and the Department of Geography as well as other academic units can make important contributions to the plan.

Illustrating how Ohio University is committed to being an example of the principles of sustainability, the comprehensive Campus Sustainability Plan will provide a roadmap for major steps toward achieving sustainability in the years to come. The plan would identify recommendations, goals, objectives, and benchmarks for varying points over the next two decades. The plan’s vision needs to include the development and utilization of emerging technologies while balancing economics with social and environmental impacts. The sustainability plan should provide clear linkage between campus operations and the academic experience of Ohio University’s undergraduate and graduate students.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES BY FUNCTIONAL AREAS
The sustainability’s plan would include a number of goals and objectives to guide the institution in the years to come. These goals and objectives can and should be broken down by functional areas. Identified below and being proposed are eleven (11) functional areas for examination and assessment.

1. GOVERNANCE
   Governance focuses on the extent to which sustainability has been institutionalized into decision making at all levels. Although campus sustainability efforts can originate at all levels of the institution, the commitment of high-level administrators to organizing and guiding sustainability efforts is critical. High-level administrators can create an institutional atmosphere that empowers and inspires opening the door for broad, decentralized action and grassroots innovation for sustainability.

2. FUNDRAISING EFFORTS & GIFTS
   Fundraising efforts can garner gifts to support and enhance sustainability goals. Many colleges and universities have recognized that there can be great enthusiasm and opportunity to generate gifts toward the financing of campus sustainability projects
which promote better environmental stewardship while improving the ecological footprint of the institution as a whole.

3. ACADEMIA AND CULTURE
Academia and culture is intended to assess the extent to which Ohio University embraces sustainability into its curriculum, research, and public service as well as how well it cultivates an environmentally-focused student culture. Measurements of the curriculum should include course offerings related to sustainability and the University’s capacity for building environmental literacy. Assumed here is that Ohio University has a responsibility to foster a sense of environmental consciousness in its students.

4. MATERIALS MANAGEMENT
Materials management is intended to focus on efficient procurement strategies, processes, and systems for the acquisition and responsible use of resources in a manner that supports economy, society, and environment. Materials management assesses the extent to which Ohio University incorporates sustainability into the procurement and disposal of packaging, office supplies, furniture, computer equipment, and chemicals for custodial, landscaping, research, and teaching use. This objective also examines campus trends in solid waste and recycling and its efforts to reduce waste and properly dispose of hazardous waste. Solid waste is a significant problem in our society. Landfills carry high financial and environmental costs. Waste is expensive to collect and transport. It is important to decrease the quantity of waste sent to landfills. It is also important to reuse and recycle materials whenever possible.

5. FOOD
The food area strives to develop a local and organic closed-loop food system by observing sustainability criteria for food purchasing, preparation and service, cleaning, waste disposal, and purchase of equipment and supplies. Food assesses the extent to which Ohio University incorporates sustainability into food procurement and disposal decisions. The purpose of this objective is to evaluate the amount of sustainably produced food purchased by the University, the amount of food wastes reused or recycled by the University, and the institutions initiatives and educational programs regarding food procurement and disposal.

6. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS
Global climate change is a serious social issue facing society today. Greenhouse gases play a major role in this change. Ohio University emits greenhouse gases through energy use, transportation, and chemical use. The greenhouse gas emissions objective is intended to assess the University’s greenhouse gas emissions and examine current efforts to limit emissions and the potential to decrease them in the future.

7. ENERGY
The energy area strives to be a climate neutral campus through energy efficiency, conservation, on-site generation and strategic procurement of clean and renewable energy. Energy examines its use for campus operations. Electricity and steam are the two primary sources of energy. This item will, in part, be driven by the requirements of House Bill 251.
8. TRANSPORTATION
The transportation area is to develop strategies that reduce fuel use, air pollution and carbon dioxide emissions while providing opportunities for alternative transportation including bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Transportation assesses how students, faculty and support staff commute to campus and what Ohio University does to promote and support alternative means of transportation. Transportation is an important indicator of campus sustainability because transportation has a significant environmental impact.

9. WATER
Ohio University should continue to strive to reduce potable water use while protecting and conserving all water resources within the campus watershed through implementation of efficiency measures, collection technologies, re-processing and re-use. Water assesses Ohio University's use of water for campus operations, including steam, irrigation, and domestic use.

10. LANDSCAPE/BIOTIC ENVIRONMENT
Ohio University should strive to foster protection and maintenance of the natural campus environment through restoration, preservation, and education while enhancing the campus as a classroom. Landscape and Biotic Environment assesses the extent to which Ohio University has incorporated sustainability goals into landscape design, maintenance, and whether it is meeting those goals. The assessment should examine plantings, pest management and storm water management. This includes recreational areas, building landscapes, and native habitat.

11. BUILT ENVIRONMENT
Ohio University has and should continue to strive to create outstanding places to study, work, and live. These places should enhance the health and performance of building occupants through sustainable planning, design, construction, operations, and retrofits. Built Environment assesses the extent to which Ohio University has incorporated green building and design goals into existing buildings and new construction projects. The measures should look at the institutional commitment to green building and design, the U.S. Green Building Council Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) program, and space management. The requirements of House Bill 251 are addressed in this indicator as well as the energy objective. Efforts should be made to better utilize what space the institution has available at present. Space management should be tightened up with stronger justification for new space. Where possible, existing space should be used, including renovation to increase efficiency, finding under utilized space and promote multi-use, and where absolutely necessary renovate existing mothballed spaces.
**House Bill 251**

**Implementation Plan**

- Passed in 2004
- Goal: Reduce energy intensity 20% by 2014 compared to 2004
- Energy intensity: MMBTU/GSF
- Required: 15 year strategy approved by Board of Trustees

**Tab 5**

**Avoidance Opportunities**

**Energy Related Initiatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>MMBTU/GSF</th>
<th>Total GHG emissions</th>
<th>Total $ and avoided $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>15% reduction from 2004 to 2014</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GHG: Greenhouse Gas
MMBTU: Million British Thermal Units
GSF: Gross Square Foot

**Energy Intensity Profile: FY04 – FY07 (adjusted for weather variations)**
**House Bill 251**

**Energy Intensity Profile: FY98 – FY07**  
(adjusted for weather variations)

- Change in value FY98 - FY04: +7%
- Change in value FY98 - FY07: +17%

- **Why has MMBTU/GSF increased since 2004?**
  - More coal, less natural gas
  - New services: More lighting, appliances
  - Code requirements for renovations
  - Fewer PM projects
  - Costs for efficiency projects increasing

**House Bill 251**

**How will we reach our goal?**

- Building Standards
- Funding for Projects
- Staffing
- Outreach & Education

**House Bill 251**

**Key Successes**

- Electric savings:
  - Replacement of lighting fixtures with more efficient fluorescent lighting
  - Modifications to HVAC controls
  - Implementation of variable frequency drives

- Steam savings:
  - Reset of hot water temperature
  - Replacement of incandescent exit lighting with energy efficient LED exit lights

**Electric savings:**
- Replacement of lighting fixtures with more efficient fluorescent lighting,
- Modifications to HVAC controls,
- Implementation of variable frequency drives,
- Reset of hot water temperature,
- Replacement of incandescent exit lighting with energy efficient LED exit lights
House Bill 251

Key Successes

Electric savings:
- replacement with more efficient lighting;
- replacement of exit lighting with LED exit lighting.

House Bill 251

Energy Intensity Profile: FY98 – FY07
(adjusted for weather variations)

House Bill 251

Summary: Strategies

- Building standards
- Funding for efficiency projects
- Additional staffing
- Outreach & Education
Interoffice Communication

Date: September 8, 2008

To: The President and Board of Trustees

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

Re: Approval to Acquire 15 Park Place, Athens, Ohio

The property located at 15 Park Place, immediately east of Baker University Center and west of the President's residence, is a facility that formerly served as the Sigma Chi fraternity house. A prospective donor to the University engaged an architectural consultant to work in conjunction with University Planning and Implementation to develop a preliminary program and a preliminary cost estimate for renovation of the facility for University use. The outcome of that study, with input from the Provost's Office, was to program the facility as an International Center which will consolidate services for the University's international students and faculty. Services to be co-located in the facility will include International Services, Education Abroad, the Office for the Associate Provost for International Affairs, Visa Processing, and International Recruitment.

The purchase price for the 0.311 acres and the 10,098 gross square foot facility, as supported by an appraisal dated July 21, 2008, is $675,000. The property will be acquired using funds provided by a donor who will also provide $1.3 million toward the renovation of the facility. The use of the gift is restricted to this purpose.

It is my recommendation that the Ohio University Board of Trustees support the acquisition of 15 Park Place, Athens, Ohio for the agreed purchase price. Toward that end, I have enclosed a resolution for consideration by the Board of Trustees at their regular October meeting, which seeks approval to enter into a purchase agreement with the Sig House Company and to engage appropriate outside counsel for this purchase.

Thank you for consideration of this matter. I will be prepared to answer any questions that you may have prior to or at the board meeting.
Interoffice Communication

Date: September 8, 2008

To: The President and Board of Trustees

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

Re: Authorization to Purchase Certain Parcels of Land and Property Easements Located in the Runway Protection Zone of the Ohio University Airport

The Ohio University Airport (the “Airport”) is requesting authorization to purchase certain parcels of land and property easements located in the Runway Protection Zones (the “RPZ”) of the Airport. Specifically, this resolution authorizes the purchase of two parcels fee simple and the purchase of two avigation (air navigation) easements on 4 parcels. The proposed easements would allow the Airport to clear any existing penetrations to the runway approach surface.

The attached map shows the locations of each parcel. Parcels 2, 4 and 1E are located in the existing RPZ. Parcels 3, 2E, 3E and 4E are located in the future RPZ. The existing RPZ is 49.0 acres in size (1,000 x 1,510 x 1,700) and designed for approach visibility minimums not less than 0.75 miles. The Airport is proposing to install an approach lighting system allowing the approach minimums to be less than 0.75 miles. These lower minimums require a larger RPZ; therefore, the future RPZ for Runway 25 is 78.9 acres (1,000 x 1,750 x 2,500).

Proposed Land Acquisitions

Parcel 2: 0.88 acre, Ohio University Credit Union.

This property interest is a small portion of a 160-acre parcel. The University currently has an avigation easement encompassing 3.146 acres of this parcel. The proposed acquisition of the 0.88 acres would be a part of the existing avigation easement. There is a structure on the property that will most likely be removed; however, it is not a private residence and is not considered historic.

Parcel 3: 11.124 acres, Roger Van Dyke

The proposed 11.124-acre parcel is part of a parcel that is approximately 38 acres in total size located in the future Runway Protection Zone for Runway 25. The parcel is used as pasture land and currently contains no structures or obstructions.
Parcel 4: 0.95 acre, State of Ohio.
The State of Ohio purchased this property as part of the right-of-way acquisition for US Route 50. The property is located in the existing Runway Protection Zone. The right-of-way is no longer needed by the State of Ohio due to the recent runway extension and the relocation of Columbia Rd.

Proposed Avigation Easements

Parcels 1E and 2E: 1.13 acres, David S. and Connie C. Nevil
Both of these parcels are privately owned by the same property owner. There is a private residence on both parcels; however, they would be unaffected by the easement. The proposed easement would total 1.13 acres of an approximately 26 acre parcel. There is one tree on the property that penetrates the runway transitional surface and would be cleared.

Parcel 3E: 0.95 acre, Kenneth A. and Evelyn J. Beckley
This is part of a privately-owned parcel that is approximately 8.32 acres in size. There are currently no obstructions on the parcel that would need to be cleared.

Parcel 4E: 1.09 acres, Jeremy and Teresa Merckle
This is part of a privately-owned parcel totaling 4.71 acres in size. There are currently no obstructions in the parcel that would need to be cleared.

Funding

The property and easement acquisitions described above are eligible for Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grant funding under the Airport Improvement Program. The Airport has negotiated and reached tentative agreements with the property owners for the acquisition of parcels 2, 3, 3E and 4E. The FAA has awarded Ohio University a grant in the amount of $231,704 to accomplish these acquisitions. The grant requires matching funds totaling $23,991. This match amount is available from Auxiliary Services.

The transfer of parcel 4 is being coordinated with the State of Ohio. The University only anticipates the need for minimal funds to accomplish this acquisition. The property that includes parcels 1E and 2E is currently for sale and the property owner has indicated that they do not wish to enter into an avigation easement at this time. This parcel will remain eligible for future FAA grant funding.
The Third Century Campaign (1987-1993)
- Attained $132.7M against a $100M goal.
- Chaired by Will Konneker and Bob Arline.
- Secured 22 gifts of $1+M, including one gift of $10M and two gifts of $5+M.
- Alumni and Friends gave $81M or 61 percent of total gifts committed.
- Planned/director gift commitments totaled $39M or 30 percent of total campaign gift commitments.
- Secured $18.1M in gifts for endowment purposes.
- Volunteer-driven campaign.
- Placed fundraisers in each college.

The Bicentennial Campaign (1997-2004)
- Attained $221.4M against a $200M goal.
- Chaired by James Daley and Chuck Ericks.
- Secured 41 gift commitments of $1+M, including six gift commitments of $5+M.
- Alumni and Friends gave $177M or 80 percent of total gifts committed.
- Planned/director gift commitments totaled $103M, or 46 percent of total campaign gift commitments.
- Secured $41M in gifts for endowment, including eight new endowed chairs and 31 endowed professorships.
- Focused almost exclusively on major gifts versus broad-based support.
- With some exceptions, deans were not involved in significant ways.

Campaign Objective 1: Emphasize Cash Gift Commitments
- Outright gifts
- New pledges
- Planned gifts
Other Campaign Objectives and Principles

2. Enlist campaign volunteers who will widen the family of committed Ohio supporters.
3. Provide opportunities for Ohio faculty, staff, and students to be involved in the campaign.
4. Coordinate centrally the cultivation/solicitation of campaign prospects.
5. Accept all reasonable gifts offered during the campaign period but place the greatest emphasis on gifts for stated campaign purposes.
6. Increase the numbers of mid-level gifts.
7. Provide all Ohio alumni and friends opportunities to make campaign gifts.
8. Appropriately thank and recognize all donors who make gifts to the campaign.
9. Make sure donors are aware of the impacts of their campaign gifts.
10. Inform and engage more Ohio alumni about their university.

Overview

- Use Vision Ohio’s five-year implementation plan’s academic goals to determine:
  - University-wide campaign initiatives and projects.
  - Featured initiatives and projects for individual colleges and units.
- Engage deans and other senior administrators in determining campaign featured initiatives and priorities.
- Get feedback from key donors and others outside the university.

Vision Ohio Themes

- Vision Ohio themes:
  - Strengthening undergraduate education
  - Building diversity
  - Supporting outreach and partnerships
  - Investing selectively in graduate education, research, and creative activity
  - Optimizing resources, including increasing philanthropic support

Vision Ohio Goals

- Vision Ohio Academic Plan Goals:
  - Strengthen undergraduate education
  - Enhance graduate and professional education and research
  - Fortify and align infrastructure to enhance the academic mission
  - Recruit and retain talented and diverse students, faculty, and staff
  - Enrich the environment for students, staff, faculty, and the region
  - Enhance prominence within Ohio, the nation, and the world

University-Wide Priorities

- Consistent with Vision Ohio themes
- Support Vision Ohio Academic Plan Goals
- Dollar targets consistent with overall campaign dollar goal.
- Process:
  - Define university-wide campaign themes and priorities.
  - Vice President for University Advancement recommends campaign dollar targets for each university-wide priority.
  - Review and establish dollar targets.
College/Unit Priorities

- Established by deans/directors in context of university-wide campaign priorities
- Process:
  - Establish campaign priorities consistent with Vision Ohio themes and Academic Plan goals
  - Set dollar goals based on:
    - College/unit track record in securing private gifts.
    - Major gift prospect potential.
    - Campaign priorities' attractiveness to potential campaign donors.

Nucleus Gifts

- Focus on $1M+ prospects: large financial capacity and strong affinity for Ohio.
- Solicit Board of Trustees, and Foundation Board, and Alumni Association Board.
- Use small group meetings and one-on-one solicitations.

Major Gifts

- Focus on $50K-$99K prospects: major gift capacity and inclination to support Ohio.
- Hold small group meetings and one-on-one solicitations.

Middle Gifts

- Focus on prospects that can make $10K to $49K "middle gifts."
- Use personal visits to cultivate and solicit.

Leadership Gifts

- Focus on $100K-$499K prospects: significant financial capacity and strong affinity for Ohio.
- Hold small group meetings and one-on-one solicitations.
- Solicit faculty and staff.

Campaign Gift Strategies
Ohio Fund

- Focus on prospects that can make annual, recurring gifts up to $10K.
- Use broad-based phone, e-solicitation, and direct mail solicitations.
- Continue to build Ohio Fund giving results throughout campaign.

Campaign Leadership

Campaign Volunteer Structure

- National Campaign
- College Unit Committees
- Geographic-Based Committees
- Special Projects Committees
- National Campaign Committee

Campaign Success and Ohio Volunteer Leaders

- Engage all leadership volunteers in productive ways with the campaign.
- Achieve 100 percent campaign gift participation by volunteer leaders.
- Ensure coordination and communication among volunteer leaders, Ohio senior administrators, and University Advancement.

Campaign Programs

- Prospect Development and Coordination
- Awareness Events
- Internal Communications
- External Communications
- Alumni Programs
- Donor Recognition
- Donor Stewardship
- Campaign Education and Skill Development
- Campaign Resources and Financing
Action Steps: Key Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign Objectives</th>
<th>University-Wide Campaign Priorities</th>
<th>Colleague/Campaign Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Objectives</td>
<td>University-Wide Campaign Priorities</td>
<td>Colleague/Campaign Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Objectives</td>
<td>University-Wide Campaign Priorities</td>
<td>Colleague/Campaign Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Objectives</td>
<td>University-Wide Campaign Priorities</td>
<td>Colleague/Campaign Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Objectives</td>
<td>University-Wide Campaign Priorities</td>
<td>Colleague/Campaign Priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Tasks**

- Review and refine dollar projections for types of campaign gifts.
- Based on campaign planning study interviews and other information, refine campaign dollar projections.

**University-Wide Campaign Priorities**

- National Campaign Cabinet
- University Trustees
- Foundation Trustees
- Alumni Association Board
- President Development
- Project Coordination
- Awareness Events
- Internal Communications
- External Communications
- Alumni Program
- Donor Recognition
- Donor Stewardship
- Campaign Education
- Campaign Resources

**Campaign Objectives**
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- Campaign Education
- Campaign Resources
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**Campaign Objectives**

- University-Wide
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**University-Wide Campaign Priorities**

- National Campaign Cabinet
- University Trustees
- Foundation Trustees
- Alumni Association Board
- Project Development
- Project Coordination
- Awareness Events
- Internal Communications
- External Communications
- Alumni Program
- Donor Recognition
- Donor Stewardship
- Campaign Education
- Campaign Resources

**Campaign Objectives**

- University-Wide
- Colleague/Campaign
Action Steps: Key Tasks

(continued)

- Review and evaluate campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
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- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
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- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
- Review and evaluate current campaign financial data and revenue from prior campaigns.
- Identify campaign budget and financial projections.
- Create personal campaign gift commitments.
Action Steps: Key Tasks
(continued)

- Draft and gain approval for donor recognition policies, including gift monging and gift naming.
- Prepare plan to recognize campaign donors, both during and at the end of the campaign.
- Gain approval for and begin implementing donor recognition plan.

- Draft and gain approval for plan to help members understand how they plan their gifts and what impact they had.
- Begin implementing the donor stewardship plan.
- Evaluate campaign donor stewardship program and make any adjustments required.

- Develop and begin implementing campaign education for campaign volunteers.
- Elect the Campaign Development Staff to raise the campaign and the University's awareness board.
- Develop new campaign development staff positions and new non-staff resources needed for campaign.
- Build a campaign budget with yearly reports to the University's Board of Trustees.
- Reallocate to finance campaign expenditures.
- Present campaign budget and financial recommendations to the University and the University's Board.
Interoffice Communication

Date: September 8, 2008

To: The President and Board of Trustees

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

Re: Treasurer’s Report

This mailing includes the Treasurer’s Report materials which will be shared with the Board at the October meeting. Along with the presentation slides are the schedules containing information that is required by our investment policies to be presented on a quarterly basis.

- **Investment Performance Report**

  The investment performance report details the composite return for the following: (i) OHIO’s long-term assets, (ii) the allocation index, also known as the benchmark return, and (iii) the policy index, which is calculated as the target asset class weights times the return of the respective passive benchmark. The fiscal 2008 year-to-date composite return as of June 30, 2008 was -3.8% compared to a benchmark return of -2.5% and a policy index of -3.7%. The calendar year-to-date composite return as of June 30, 2008 was -4.6% compared to a benchmark return of -4.6% and a policy index of -5.7%. 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, and a table for the Investment Pool Composition.

- **Working Capital Performance Report**

  Working capital assets are also referred to as non-endowment investments, and are governed by a non-endowment investment policy. The policy specifies three tiers of liquidity: 25% in the Cash Pool which is invested in highly liquid instruments, 25% in the Liquidity Pool which is invested in fixed income investments with a longer duration, and 50% in the Diversified Pool which is invested using the endowment asset allocation strategy.

- **Investment Loan Fund Detail**

  Outstanding investment loans total $3.8 million as of June 30, 2008. The investment loan program provides departments 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 June 30, 2008

In addition to the required reports, the materials include a supplemental schedule depicting bond principal outstanding as of June 30, 2008. The University has issued tax-exempt bonds and bond anticipation notes, and the principal outstanding totals $196.5 million. This includes $29.5 million in non-recourse debt issued by a subsidiary of the Foundation for a student housing project, University Courtyard apartments. 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. The final graph shows the amortization of bond principal over time, assuming no additional debt is issued. On average, the University will retire $6 million of principal annually over the lives of the current bonds outstanding.

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 Assets

## Investment Performance "Flash" Report

**Periods Ending 6/30/2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Weight</th>
<th>Weight in Fund</th>
<th>Last Month</th>
<th>Last 3 Months</th>
<th>Year to-Date</th>
<th>Fiscal YTD</th>
<th>Last Year</th>
<th>Three Years</th>
<th>Five Years</th>
<th>Since Inception*</th>
<th>Inception* Date</th>
<th>Ending Market Value</th>
<th>Annual Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>Ohio Composite Account</td>
<td>&lt;4.5%</td>
<td>&lt;4.1%</td>
<td>&lt;5.9%</td>
<td>&lt;6.0%</td>
<td>&lt;6.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$221,939,820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>Allocation Index</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$256,913,609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>Policy Index</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$93,180,501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>Domestic Equity Composite</td>
<td>&lt;1.0%</td>
<td>&lt;1.5%</td>
<td>&lt;10.5%</td>
<td>&lt;13.2%</td>
<td>&lt;13.2%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,100,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>Large-Cap Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$69,904,083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>Mellon CF Stock index Fund</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>-11.8%</td>
<td>-13.0%</td>
<td>-13.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>Apr-92</td>
<td>$67,717,201</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>S&amp;P 500</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>-11.9%</td>
<td>-13.1%</td>
<td>-13.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,912,465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>Russell 3000</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>-15.2%</td>
<td>-12.7%</td>
<td>-12.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-02</td>
<td>$1,266,882</td>
<td>1288/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Russell 2000 Growth</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>-11.0%</td>
<td>-12.7%</td>
<td>-12.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,196,419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>Russell 2000</td>
<td>-7.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
<td>-16.2%</td>
<td>-16.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,477,851</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>Cadence</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr-06</td>
<td>$6,912,465</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>Russell 2000 Value</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,806,102</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>International Equity Composite</td>
<td>&lt;0.3%</td>
<td>&lt;2.3%</td>
<td>&lt;12.1%</td>
<td>&lt;20.0%</td>
<td>&lt;20.0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,904,740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>Developed International Equity</td>
<td>-10.5%</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
<td>-13.8%</td>
<td>-17.5%</td>
<td>-17.5%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>May-06</td>
<td>$17,942,994</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>AllianceBernstein</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
<td>-9.6%</td>
<td>-9.6%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>Apr-06</td>
<td>$19,323,368</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>New Star</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
<td>-11.0%</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,228,378</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>Emerging Markets Equity</td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>-7.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>Jun-06</td>
<td>$10,228,378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>-11.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,228,378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ohio University and Foundation Assets
**Investment Performance "Flash" Report**
**Periods Ending 6/30/2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Weight in Fund</th>
<th>Core Plus Fixed Income</th>
<th>PIMCO Total Return Fund</th>
<th>Student Fixed Income</th>
<th>Cash Account</th>
<th>Lehman Brothers Aggregate</th>
<th>Absolute Return Composite</th>
<th>Arden</th>
<th>Federal Street</th>
<th>Liberty View</th>
<th>Mariner</th>
<th>HFRI FoF Index</th>
<th>90 Days T-Bills + 3%</th>
<th>Lehman Brothers Aggregate</th>
<th>Real Asset Composite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight in Fund</td>
<td>Core Plus Fixed Income</td>
<td>PIMCO Total Return Fund</td>
<td>Student Fixed Income</td>
<td>Cash Account</td>
<td>Absolute Return Composite</td>
<td>Arden</td>
<td>Federal Street</td>
<td>Liberty View</td>
<td>Mariner</td>
<td>HFRI FoF Index</td>
<td>90 Days T-Bills + 3%</td>
<td>Lehman Brothers Aggregate</td>
<td>Real Asset Composite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Month</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last 3 Months</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year to-Date</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal YTD</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
<td>-6.8%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Last Year</td>
<td>-9.2%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
<td>-6.8%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception Since Date</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
<td>-6.8%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Market Value</td>
<td>$47,534,330</td>
<td>$1,013,955</td>
<td>$184,138</td>
<td>$49,221,393</td>
<td>$14,403,751</td>
<td>$13,522,901</td>
<td>$7,070,632</td>
<td>$17,686,611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annualized Returns</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes:**
- All fund returns are net of capital gains and fees.
- All returns are annualized except for those marked "n/a".
- "n/a" denotes not applicable or not available.

**Notes:**
- The above returns are estimated based on monthly bond account balances and individual investment returns. Actual returns may vary.
- Fiscal Year ends June 30. All returns are net of fee.
- Alternative investments are reported on a quarterly lag, updated on a current month basis for purchases and distributions.
- **Real Assets** represent the actual assets dedicated to the Private Holdings Flash Report.
- **HFRI FoF Index** is a benchmark for hedge fund performance.
- **90 Days T-Bills + 3%** is a benchmark for short-term liquidity.
- **Lehman Brothers Aggregate** is a benchmark for overall market performance.

---

*All investments are funded by the Endowment. The total market value of the long-term assets is $2.2 billion.*

*Average annualized returns, unless fund inception date is within previous fiscal year.*

*Fiscal Year ends June 30. All returns are net of fee.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Equity</th>
<th>Current Month Market Value (mill)</th>
<th>Actual Weight</th>
<th>Target Weight</th>
<th>Committed Capital (mill)</th>
<th>Vintage Year</th>
<th>Valuation Date</th>
<th>Market Value (mill)</th>
<th>Since Inception IRR</th>
<th>Cumulative Contributed Capital</th>
<th>Cumulative Distributions</th>
<th>Contributed Capital Since Valuation Date</th>
<th>Distributions Since Valuation Date</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIG PEP II</td>
<td>$3.0 1.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.0 2001</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$3.3 16.85</td>
<td>$4.9 4.8</td>
<td>$0.0 -0.3</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adena</td>
<td>$1.0 0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.4 2002</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$1.0 -22.13</td>
<td>$2.4 0.2</td>
<td>$0.0 3.0</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altus</td>
<td>$1.4 0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.0 2003</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$1.1 2.67</td>
<td>$1.0 0.0</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP I</td>
<td>$0.3 0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.1 1997</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$0.5 11.65</td>
<td>$1.1 0.0</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP II</td>
<td>$1.6 0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.5 2003</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$1.0 -5.76</td>
<td>$2.5 0.9</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP III</td>
<td>$0.7 0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.5 2004</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$0.5 -19.22</td>
<td>$0.7 0.0</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>$1.2 0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.0 2002</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$1.3 10.44</td>
<td>$1.2 0.7</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHI</td>
<td>$3.5 1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.0 2004</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$1.7 -6.49</td>
<td>$2.0 0.0</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirtland</td>
<td>$1.8 0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.0 2004</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$1.7 -6.49</td>
<td>$2.0 0.0</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesirow</td>
<td>$0.4 0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.5 2008</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2.3 14.80</td>
<td>$2.4 0.4</td>
<td>$0.5 -0.2</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>$2.6 0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.0 2005</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$2.3 14.80</td>
<td>$2.4 0.4</td>
<td>$0.5 -0.2</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse</td>
<td>$2.1 0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.0 2007</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$0.9 -18.93</td>
<td>$1.0 0.0</td>
<td>$1.3 0.0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siguler Guff DOF II</td>
<td>$5.0 1.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.0 2005</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$4.2 35.02</td>
<td>$3.0 0.0</td>
<td>$0.8 0.0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siguler Guff DOF III</td>
<td>$0.5 0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.5 2008</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$3.0 3.93</td>
<td>$3.2 1.1</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Assets</td>
<td>$21.8 7.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>$13.2 2004</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2.7 17.04</td>
<td>$3.9 2.9</td>
<td>$0.3 -0.8</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIG HighStar</td>
<td>$1.8 0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.2 2007</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$1.8 -11.10</td>
<td>$1.9 0.8</td>
<td>$0.1 0.0</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaktree REOF III</td>
<td>$2.1 0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.0 2002</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$2.7 15.97</td>
<td>$3.0 2.1</td>
<td>$0.0 -0.6</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaktree REOF IV</td>
<td>$0.2 0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.0 2008</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2.7 15.97</td>
<td>$3.0 2.1</td>
<td>$0.0 -0.6</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonfund</td>
<td>$9.4 3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$9.4 3.3</td>
<td>$9.4 9.4</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>$8.3 2.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$8.3 2.9</td>
<td>$8.3 8.3</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pooled Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHI</td>
<td>$4.4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$3.9</td>
<td>$0.2 1.4</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Inn</td>
<td>$2.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>$7.6 4.8</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFO</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12/31/07</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0 1.1</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>$0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Results are reported net of all fees. Alternative Investments are reported on a quarter lag updated on a current month basis for purchases and distributions.
* Includes management fee only and is based on committed capital unless otherwise noted. Definitions of Management Fee differ by manager. Does not include performance carry.
+ Management fee will be reduced to 1.75% at the end of the investment period.
++ For committed years 1-5: 1.00% on secondaries, 0.50% on primaries, thereafter, 0.85% on secondaries 0.50% on primaries on reported value plus unfunded commitments.
# Ohio University

## Endowment Investments

**As of June 30, 2008**

### Endowment Assets by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Endowment</th>
<th>Quasi Endowment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon CF Stock Index</td>
<td>5,834,190</td>
<td>5,577,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio SEMG</td>
<td>179,187</td>
<td>125,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce Small Cap</td>
<td>1,208,080</td>
<td>860,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadence Small Cap</td>
<td>680,675</td>
<td>471,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzoit Small Cap</td>
<td>444,015</td>
<td>341,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AllianceBernstein</td>
<td>1,718,793</td>
<td>1,254,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Star</td>
<td>1,874,139</td>
<td>1,309,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>1,010,429</td>
<td>682,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Equity</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,949,507</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,623,043</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMCO Total Return</td>
<td>4,200,176</td>
<td>3,735,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio SFIMG</td>
<td>127,388</td>
<td>87,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fixed Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,327,564</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,822,895</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absolute Return</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden Endowment Advisers</td>
<td>1,423,922</td>
<td>1,079,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Street</td>
<td>1,271,512</td>
<td>993,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LibertyView Plus Fund</td>
<td>793,079</td>
<td>548,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariner</td>
<td>1,404,100</td>
<td>1,075,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Absolute Return</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,892,613</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,697,700</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adena Ventures</td>
<td>400,083</td>
<td>201,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIG PEP II</td>
<td>110,598</td>
<td>194,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altus</td>
<td>151,208</td>
<td>83,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer Rosenthal McGlynn</td>
<td>140,961</td>
<td>71,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirtland</td>
<td>209,512</td>
<td>106,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>297,454</td>
<td>161,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse</td>
<td>235,116</td>
<td>134,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesirow</td>
<td>46,524</td>
<td>26,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siguler Gulf DOF II</td>
<td>577,141</td>
<td>312,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siguler Gulf DOF III</td>
<td>577,141</td>
<td>312,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Private Equity</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,185,787</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,290,689</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Real Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaktree REOF III</td>
<td>237,988</td>
<td>115,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaktree REOF IV</td>
<td>25,516</td>
<td>15,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIG Highstar</td>
<td>199,852</td>
<td>100,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonfund</td>
<td>1,057,413</td>
<td>589,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>941,359</td>
<td>522,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Real Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,462,129</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,352,162</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Endowment Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,797,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,786,511</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,594,111</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Endowment Assets by Manager

- **Mellon**
- **Royce**
- **Bemzott**
- **Cadence**
- **New Star**
- **AllianceBernstein**
- **Aberdeen**
- **PIMCO Total Return**
- **Arden**
- **Federal Street**
- **LibertyView**
- **Mariner**
- **Alternative**
- **Student**
The Ohio University Foundation
Endowment Investments
As of June 30, 2008

Endowment Assets by Type

- Equity: 17%
- Fixed Income: 48%
- Absolute Return: 8%
- Private Equity: 4%
- Real Assets: 2%

Endowment Assets by Manager

- Mellon
- Royce
- Bernzott
- Cadence
- New Star
- Alliance Bernstein
- Aberdeen
- PIMCO Total Return
- Arden
- Federal Street
- LibertyView
- Mariner
- Alternative
- Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon CF Stock Index</td>
<td>40,237,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio SEMG</td>
<td>815,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce Small Cap</td>
<td>7,969,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadence Small Cap</td>
<td>4,429,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernzott Small Cap</td>
<td>3,048,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Bernstein</td>
<td>11,468,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Star</td>
<td>12,412,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>6,590,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Equity</td>
<td>86,972,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMCO Total Return</td>
<td>30,911,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio SF/IMG</td>
<td>643,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fixed Income</td>
<td>31,554,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden Endowment Advisers</td>
<td>9,169,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Street</td>
<td>8,742,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LibertyView Plus Fund</td>
<td>4,263,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariner</td>
<td>9,040,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Absolute Return</td>
<td>31,216,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIG PEP II</td>
<td>2,153,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altus</td>
<td>878,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenian Venture Partners</td>
<td>2,468,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer Rosenthal McGlynn</td>
<td>804,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHI</td>
<td>3,255,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirland</td>
<td>1,176,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse</td>
<td>1,700,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse</td>
<td>1,385,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesirow</td>
<td>275,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siguler Guff DOF II</td>
<td>3,280,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siguler Guff DOF III</td>
<td>472,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Private Equity</td>
<td>17,861,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Assets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIG Highstar</td>
<td>1,140,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonturf</td>
<td>6,080,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaktree REOF III</td>
<td>1,397,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaktree REOF IV</td>
<td>150,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>5,382,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Real Assets</td>
<td>14,157,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Endowment Assets</td>
<td>181,762,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fund_type</td>
<td>total_market_value (mill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSITE OU</td>
<td>$76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP Morgan Core Bond Fund</td>
<td>$27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People's Bank Core Bond Fund</td>
<td>$6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Third Fixed Income Fund</td>
<td>$5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman Brothers Aggregate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP Morgan High Balance Savings</td>
<td>$37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Day T-Bills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSITE OUF</td>
<td>$8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP Morgan High Balance Savings</td>
<td>$8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Day T-Bills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The working capital investments included in this report are Cash and Liquidity Pool only; the Diversified Pool component of working capital is included with the Flash Report.
### Non-Endowment by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Actual %</th>
<th>Target %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Pool</td>
<td>37,598,248</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity Pool</td>
<td>39,177,228</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversified Pool</td>
<td>45,877,492</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Working Capital Investments</td>
<td>122,652,968</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Actual %</th>
<th>Target %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Pool</td>
<td>37,598,248</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cash</td>
<td>(918,800)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase High Balance Savings</td>
<td>37,598,248</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash Pool</td>
<td>37,598,248</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity Pool</td>
<td>39,177,228</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP Morgan Core Bond</td>
<td>27,278,301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoples Bank</td>
<td>6,538,041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Third Bank</td>
<td>6,561,825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liquidity Pool</td>
<td>39,177,228</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversified Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>23,084,777</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon CF Stock Index</td>
<td>12,920,859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio SFIMG</td>
<td>77,433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce Small Cap</td>
<td>1,777,553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadence Small Cap</td>
<td>684,908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernstein Small Cap</td>
<td>699,020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AllianceBernstein</td>
<td>2,534,030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewStar</td>
<td>2,699,950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>1,415,017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Equity</td>
<td>23,084,777</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Income</td>
<td>6,770,421</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMCO Total Return</td>
<td>6,675,119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio SFIMG</td>
<td>95,301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fixed Income</td>
<td>6,770,421</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Return</td>
<td>6,848,949</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden</td>
<td>2,002,391</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Street</td>
<td>1,834,599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libertyview</td>
<td>1,118,849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariner</td>
<td>1,880,109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Absolute Return</td>
<td>6,848,949</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Equity</td>
<td>2,550,091</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adena Ventures</td>
<td>393,337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIG PEP II</td>
<td>336,254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>167,054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP</td>
<td>137,889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirland</td>
<td>208,693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>323,052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse</td>
<td>279,354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massow</td>
<td>55,236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siguler Gulf DOF II</td>
<td>924,942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siguler Gulf DOF III</td>
<td>27,888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Private Equity</td>
<td>2,550,091</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Assets</td>
<td>3,799,724</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaktree REOF III</td>
<td>212,476</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaktree REOF IV</td>
<td>36,953</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIG Hightower</td>
<td>224,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CommontEnd</td>
<td>1,166,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>1,057,702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Real Assets</td>
<td>2,725,532</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Loan Fund</td>
<td>3,799,724</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversified Pool</td>
<td>45,877,492</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>122,652,968</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Ohio University Foundation Non-Endowment Investments
**As of June 30, 2008**

#### Non-Endowment Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Actual %</th>
<th>Target %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Pool</td>
<td>8,734,238</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversified Pool</td>
<td>14,470,362</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Working Capital Investments</td>
<td>23,204,600</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cash Pool
- Chase High Balance Savings: 8,734,238
- Total Cash Pool: 8,734,238

#### Diversified Pool
- Equity:
  - Mellon CF Stock Index: 3,152,578
  - Ohio SEMG: 57,872
  - Royce Small Cap: 665,964
  - Cadence Small Cap: 363,035
  - Berzott Small Cap: 252,852
  - Alliance Bernstein: 360,137
  - New Star: 1,027,567
  - Total Equity: 7,036,193

- Fixed Income:
  - PIMCO Total Return: 2,398,509
  - Ohio SFIMG: 58,596
  - Total Fixed Income: 2,457,105

- Absolute Return:
  - Arden: 727,681
  - Federal Street: 680,041
  - LibertyView: 348,535
  - Mariner: 708,229
  - Total Absolute Return: 2,455,505

- Private Equity:
  - AIG PEP II: 187,848
  - Althea: 59,600
  - Athenian Venture Partners: 195,395
  - CRM: 67,794
  - DH: 272,450
  - Kirkland: 98,384
  - Lexington: 134,944
  - Lighthouse: 103,939
  - Mesirow: 20,525
  - Siguler Guff DOF II: 260,602
  - Siguler Guff DOF III: 0
  - Total Private Equity: 1,415,474

- Real Assets:
  - AIG Highstar: 86,785
  - Oaktree REOF III: 128,733
  - Oaktree REOF IV: 11,530
  - Commonfund: 460,477
  - Wellington: 408,560
  - Total Real Assets: 1,096,085

- Total Diversified Pool: 14,470,362

**Grand Total:** 23,204,600

---

#### Non-Endowment by Type

- **Cash & Equivalents**
- **Equity**
- **Fixed Income**
- **Private Equity**
- **Real Assets**
- **Other**

#### Non-Endowment by Manager

- **JP Morgan**
- **Mellon**
- **Royce**
- **Berzott**
- **Cadence**
- **New Star**
- **Alliance Bernstein**
- **Aberdeen**
- **PIMCO**
- **Var Absolute Return**
- **Alternative**
- **Student**
## Investment Pool Composition

### As of June 30, 2008

#### Market Values in millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type/Manager</th>
<th>Foundation Endowment</th>
<th>University Endowment</th>
<th>Total Endowment</th>
<th>Foundation Diversified Pool</th>
<th>University Diversified Pool</th>
<th>Total Diversified Pool</th>
<th>Total Long-Term Assets</th>
<th>Foundation Working Capital</th>
<th>University Working Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large-Cap Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellon Stock Index Fund</td>
<td>$40.2</td>
<td>$11.4</td>
<td>$51.6</td>
<td>$3.2</td>
<td>$12.9</td>
<td>$16.1</td>
<td>$67.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio SEMG</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small-Cap Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce Pennsylvania Fund</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadence</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernzott</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AllianceBernstein</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Star</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMCO Total Return</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio SFIMG</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Absolute Return</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Street</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LibertyView</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariner</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adena</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIG PEP II</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aduis</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP I</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP II</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVP III</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHI</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirtland</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighthouse</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesirov</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siguler Guff DOF II</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siguler Guff DOF III</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Real Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIG Highstar</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonfund Commodities</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaktree REOF III</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaktree REOF IV</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Commodities</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>$181.8</td>
<td>$47.6</td>
<td>$229.3</td>
<td>$14.5</td>
<td>$42.1</td>
<td>$56.6</td>
<td>$285.9</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Non-Pooled Endowment Assets at book value | $187.5 | $47.6 | $235.1 | $14.5 | $42.1 | $56.6 | $291.7 | $3.3 | $0.0 |
| **Cash Pool** | 8.7 | 37.6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Liquidity Pool** | - | 39.2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| **Total** | $187.5 | $47.6 | $235.1 | $14.5 | $42.1 | $56.6 | $291.7 | $12.1 | $76.8 |
## Ohio University
### Investment Loan Fund
#### June 30, 2008

<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>- Airport T Hangars</td>
<td>Nov. 2001</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>80,056</td>
<td>159,892</td>
<td>220,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Center for Auto ID</td>
<td>June 2002</td>
<td>177,100</td>
<td>177,100</td>
<td>38,093</td>
<td>116,964</td>
<td>98,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Performance Contract Ph IIIB</td>
<td>July 2002</td>
<td>1,276,818</td>
<td>1,276,818</td>
<td>270,755</td>
<td>1,207,157</td>
<td>340,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Broadband Antenna Tower - Cambridge</td>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>595,200</td>
<td>595,200</td>
<td>113,743</td>
<td>148,322</td>
<td>560,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Airport 2 Aviation Training Upgrade</td>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>432,267</td>
<td>432,267</td>
<td>69,640</td>
<td>394,859</td>
<td>107,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bob Wren Stadium Lights</td>
<td>June 2003</td>
<td>281,121</td>
<td>281,121</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91,625</td>
<td>189,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NASA ACTS Satellite Ph II</td>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td>384,375</td>
<td>384,375</td>
<td>50,164</td>
<td>280,658</td>
<td>153,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Student Training 7 Piper Warriors</td>
<td>Jan. 2005</td>
<td>1,134,000</td>
<td>1,134,000</td>
<td>185,176</td>
<td>356,522</td>
<td>962,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visual Communication Computers</td>
<td>Sep. 2005</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>29,123</td>
<td>3,055</td>
<td>27,773</td>
<td>4,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Performance Contract Ph IV</td>
<td>Apr. 2005</td>
<td>1,267,821</td>
<td>1,267,821</td>
<td>186,343</td>
<td>291,353</td>
<td>1,162,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5,878,702</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,877,825</strong></td>
<td><strong>997,025</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,075,126</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,799,724</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ohio University
#### Bond Principal Outstanding
#### as of June 30, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Project Details</th>
<th>Principal Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Systems BANs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2000</td>
<td>Housing for Ohio, Inc.</td>
<td>$29,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,645,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Series 2000 Projects**
- Housing for Ohio, Inc.
- University Courtyard Apartments

**Series 2001 Projects**
- Airport Terminal 1
- Airport Terminal 2**
- Fine Arts Studio**
- Athena Theater
- Bentley Hall
- Peden Stadium Field Lowering
- HR Training Center**
- Innovation Center
- Margaret Walter Hall
- King Air
- Motor Pool
- Bromley Hall
- Performance Contracting
- Carin Strength & Conditioning Center**
- Utilities Upgrade

**Series 2003 Projects**
- Convocation Center
- Ping Student Recreation Center
- Residence & Dining Halls
- Margaret Walter Hall
- Pickerington Center
- University Center
- Avionics Engineering Center
- ARC Design Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Project Details</th>
<th>Principal Outstanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Series 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,795,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2006A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2006B &amp; C</td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,775,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$196,465,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Series 2004 Projects**
- University Center
- King Air 350
- Lausche 2 Year Project**
- Lausche 15 Year Project
- Performance Contracting A**
- Performance Contracting B

**Series 2006A Projects**
- Chilled Water Loop
- Recreation Facilities
- Child Care Center
- Grover Center
- Regional Campuses
- W. State Street Lab
- Stores/Receiving Demolition
- Track & Turf Field
- HR Training Center

**Series 2006B Projects**
- Residence Hall
- Student Information System
- Performance Contract

**Series 2006C Projects**
- University Center
- College of Communication**
- ARC Design Work**

** = Outstanding debt has been retired
Treasurer’s Report - June, 2008
Investment Strategy Review
Laura Brege – OU Foundation
Investment Committee Chair

Tab 2
The treasurer's report covers the status of the University's financial assets and debt obligations. The schedules provided in the advance materials summarize information required by the investment policies and these schedules are presented to the board at every meeting.

The investment performance report outlines the historical performance of the endowment assets and the diversified pool portion of the working capital.

The working capital performance report details the historical performance of the most liquid working capital assets – the cash pool and the liquidity pool.

In addition to the two performance reports, your materials include pie-charts and tables containing information about the asset allocation and manager structure of the endowment and working capital assets. The Investment Pool Composition table is also provided to show a detailed summary of investments by source.

The investment loan fund provides short-term loans to various OU departments to help further the educational mission of the university.

A summary of Ohio University’s projected outstanding bonds and the total principal remaining on each issue as of June 30, 2008 is included in the materials, followed by a graph depicting the amortization of each bond series over time.
Treasurer’s Report  
As of June 30, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Performance:</th>
<th>FYTD</th>
<th>CYTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Composite</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation Index</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Index</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite x Private Holdings</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Asset Allocation vs. Policy Target: | |
|----------------------------------|------|------|
| Large Cap Equity vs. Policy      | 24.2% vs 23.0% |
| Private Equity vs. Policy        | 8.8% vs 9.0% |
| Real Assets vs. Policy           | 7.6% vs 8.0% |
| Remaining Assets vs. Policy      | 59.4% vs 60.0% |

The Ohio University Composite represents the total performance of the endowment and diversified pool investments. The investment performance report shows the Composite return vs. three benchmarks, the Allocation Index, the Policy Index and the Composite return excluding private equity and real asset investments. The composite returns and the indices are calculated by our investment consultant, New England Pension Consultants (NEPC).

The Composite return is calculated by taking the actual asset class weights times the actual manager net return. Compared to the Allocation index, it measures the effectiveness of the managers. The Allocation index is calculated by taking the actual asset class weights times the return of the respective passive benchmark. The Policy Index is calculated by taking the target asset class weights times the return of the respective passive benchmark. Comparisons measure both the benefit of active management and the effectiveness of the plan’s deviations from policy weights.

The Composite return excluding private equity and real asset investments shows the contribution of the alternative investments to the overall return. Fiscal year-to-date, the return was 100 bps greater with the alternative investments. Certain private equity and real asset investments are at the point in their life cycle where the managers are beginning to make significant distributions, however, some our early vintage year funds have not met expectations.

The Composite return was less than the Allocation index and Policy index for the fiscal year-to-date period ending June 30, 2008. However, the Composite return exceeded the Policy index for the calendar year-to-date period ending June 30, 2008. In the long run, we expect that the portfolio will outperform both the Allocation Index and the Policy Index, but fluctuations are expected.

One of the primary reasons for the discrepancy between the Allocation Index and the Policy Index is that the portfolio has a deviation from its policy allocation. The portfolio continues to be slightly overweight large cap equity and slightly underweight private equity and real assets. Recent investments have been made in private equity and real assets. As these investments are called, we will move closer to our target allocation. Additionally, we will continue to research the private equity and real asset markets for appropriate opportunities.
In your materials, the endowment allocation information is presented on two separate pages with accompanying pie charts, one for the University and one for the Foundation. The bar chart shown here clearly compares the allocations for the University, the Foundation and the investment policy. In all categories, the Foundation and the University have about the same allocation to each broad asset class. Additionally, as described earlier in the investment performance section, it is evident from the chart that both the Foundation and the University asset allocations are nearing the investment policy targets. The equity overweight has been reduced recently as alternative assets have been funded.
## Treasurer's Report

### Working Capital at June 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ohio University Cash Pool</th>
<th>FYTD</th>
<th>CYTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JPMorgan High Balance Savings</td>
<td>4.21%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Day T-Bills</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ohio University Liquidity Pool</th>
<th>FYTD</th>
<th>CYTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JPMorgan Core Bond Fund</td>
<td>7.37%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People's Bank Core Bond Fund</td>
<td>7.07%</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Third Fixed Income Fund</td>
<td>6.89%</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman Brothers Aggregate</td>
<td>7.13%</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the investment performance report, the working capital performance report in your materials is prepared by NEPC. It details the historical performance of the most liquid working capital assets — the cash pool and the liquidity pool.

The cash pool is invested in highly liquid instruments with little or no risk of principal loss (e.g., very high-quality, short-term fixed income and money markets). The Non Endowment Investment Policy requires that we benchmark the cash pool managers to the return on 90 Day U.S. Treasury Bills. As you can see, the University’s cash pool manager has been able to achieve this objective for the fiscal year to date period and the calendar year to date period through June 30.

The liquidity pool is invested with three managers in fixed income instruments (e.g. US Government Bonds/Notes, US Agencies, Corporate Bonds, etc.), with the benchmark being the Lehman Brothers Aggregate Index. JPMorgan beat the benchmark for the fiscal and calendar year to date periods ending June 30. People’s Bank and Fifth Third lagged the benchmark for the fiscal year to date period, but beat the benchmark for the calendar year to date period ending June 30.

The staff constantly monitors the performance of the short term assets and will work closely with the Committee should issues arise.
Unlike the Endowment, the Non-Endowment asset allocation for the University differs widely from that of the Foundation. The University has a much greater need for liquidity to manage the cash outflows related to large expenses, especially payroll.

The diversified pool portion of the University's working capital is currently targeted at 50% of the total and, as shown in the chart above, has a smaller allocation to equity and other less liquid asset classes than the Foundation. The diversified pool portion of the Foundation's working capital is targeted at 75% of the total, hence the large allocation to equity.
The Investment Loan program provides departments with short-term loans to fund small special projects. These funds are lent from the University's diversified pool, and the loan pool is limited to 25% of the diversified pool. The total authorized amount represents the total funds that have been approved for all loans that are still outstanding -- about $3.8 million. The amount drawn is the amount that the individual units have called, about $5.9 million. Since inception of the program, the University has realized about $2.0 million in interest. Cumulative interest earned on the loans that are currently outstanding totals $997K.
## Treasurer's Report

### Bond Principal Outstanding

- As of June 30, 2008:
  - Admin Sys BAN $5,550,000
  - Series 2000 29,500,000
  - Series 2001 23,645,000
  - Series 2003 34,500,000
  - Series 2004 47,795,000
  - Series 2006A 26,700,000
  - Series 2006B&C 28,775,000

$196,465,000

The University has issued tax-exempt bonds and bond anticipation notes. The total projected principal outstanding as of June 30, 2008 is $196.5 million. This includes $29.5 million for Series 2000, issued by a subsidiary of the Foundation for a student housing project known as University Courtyard apartments. These bonds are non-recourse; neither the Foundation nor the University can be held liable for their payment. These bonds are not included in the total bonds and notes payable in the University’s general ledger. They are included on the Foundation’s books.
This graph shows the amortization of bond principal over time, assuming no additional debt is issued. Over the term of the debt, through FY36, the University retires approximately $6 million of principal annually, on average. During the next 5 years, over $54 million will be retired, and during the next 10 years, more than $97 million will be retired.
Date: September 8, 2008

To: The President and Board of Trustees

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

Re: Budget Updates

A report will be given at the October Resources Committee meeting to present an update of the FY 2009 operating budget with a focus on the University's key revenue drivers: Fall enrollments and State revenues, which translate directly into tuition and fee revenue and State subsidies, respectively. Discussion of the FY 2009 operating budget will also include the University's budget management and contingency planning strategies.

Additionally, a brief report will be given regarding the University's FY 2010 budget development process, which is scheduled to begin with the first meeting of the Budget Planning Council on September 19, 2008.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions you have prior to the October meeting.
Budget Updates

FY 2009 Budget Implementation

- Update on Key Revenue Drivers
  - Tuition & Fee Revenues: Fall Enrollments
  - Freshman Class
  - Non-Resident Students
  - Retention Rate
  - State Revenues
  - Response to Recent Reductions
  - Continue Monitoring Activities
- Budget Management & Contingency Planning

FY 2010 Budget Development

- FY 2010 Budget Process Began
  - First Meeting of the Budget Planning Council on September 19, 2008

Agenda

- FY 2009 Budget Implementation
  - Update on Key Revenue Drivers
    - Tuition & Fees (Fall Enrollment Update)
    - State Revenues
  - Budget Management & Contingency Planning
- FY 2010 Budget Development
  - Kick-off of Process on September 19, 2009
Office of Information Technology

IT Improvement Plan Update

Resources Committee
Board of Trustees

J. Brice Bible
Chief Information Officer
Office of Information Technology
October 2, 2008
Purpose

- Comprehensive IT Improvement Plan presented to Board of Trustees, June 2008
- Requested to aggressively pursue partnership opportunities
- Requested to identify funding alternatives (presented by SVPF&A)
- This is a progress report on partnership opportunities
Ohio University Information Technology Improvement Plan

Customer Interface
(Service Desk, Web Services, Advisory Groups)
Source: OIT Base Fund Increases in FY10-11

Student Services
(New SIS)
$23M over 3 years
Source: TBD

Financial and Administrative Services
(e-Business)
$5M over 3 years
Source: TBD

Academic Technology Services
(Instruction and Research)
$1M over 5 years
Source: OIT base funds and TBD

IT Infrastructure
Network (Academic and Research), Systems/Operations, and Security
$17M over 6 years
Source: TBD

Source: TBD
Ohio University
Information Technology Improvement Plan

Student Services (SIS)
$23M over 3 years
## SIS Replacement Project
### Shared Services / Funding Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Component</th>
<th>Shared Services Opportunity</th>
<th>Funding Supplements/ Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Software - $8.6m (PeopleSoft &amp; 4-year maintenance, CRM, SOA, Portal, Housing, Judiciaries, ODPS, IDM, Harco)</td>
<td>• Re-negotiate contracts for state-wide software agreements. (underway)</td>
<td>• Apply replacement software licenses (eg. Informs SIS, Sigma SAM, Recruitment Plus).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hardware - $2.25m</td>
<td>• Currently hosting with Ohio State for Demo and Development databases.</td>
<td>• This budget represents a five year life, or $500k/yr replacement cost. External hosting estimates are $750k - $1m/yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ohio Staffing - $5.7m</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Project resources will be committed to the project full-time where applicable. Units may be able to fund a portion of their own backfill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Office of Information Technology*
## SIS Replacement Project

### Shared Services / Funding Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Component</th>
<th>Shared Services Opportunity</th>
<th>Funding Supplements/ Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4. Consulting Services** - $9.4m | • Would require installing another institution’s configuration (i.e. adoption of another institution’s curriculum).  
• Potential for offering the OHIO configuration to institutions who need to implement a new SIS. |                                                                                                  |
| **5. Operating Expenses** - $875k |                                                                                                           | • Rent expense for project office space represents $600k for a three year period. Potential to internally fund. |

*Note: The Budget Components total $26.9m, which is inclusive of the $4m budget allocation.*

Office of Information Technology
Ohio University
Information Technology Improvement Plan

IT Infrastructure
Network (academic and research),
Systems/Operations, and Security
$17M over 6 years
## Network Upgrade
### Shared Services / Funding Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Component</th>
<th>Shared Services Opportunity</th>
<th>Funding Supplements/ Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cisco Network Equipment $9.3m</td>
<td>• Negotiate a state-wide reseller agreement to take advantage of volume purchase discounts. (underway)</td>
<td>• Potential to offload network support functions from some planning units &amp; distributed IT professionals who operate their own networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. UPS Hardware $474k</td>
<td>• Negotiate a state-wide reseller agreement to take advantage of volume purchase discounts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Network Management and Monitoring Tools &amp; Monitoring Tools $800k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Network Upgrade
### Shared Services / Funding Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Component</th>
<th>Shared Services Opportunity</th>
<th>Funding Supplements/ Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Cabling</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Negotiate a volume purchase discount by committing to specific vendor for entirety of project. (full funding required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.1m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Facilities Upgrades (minimal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Staff (Temporary)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Budget represents the balance of permanent and temporary staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.7m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Network Upgrade
### Shared Services / Funding Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Component</th>
<th>Shared Services Opportunity</th>
<th>Funding Supplements/ Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7. Maintenance Contracts $652k / year | • Negotiate a state-wide reseller agreement to take advantage of volume purchase discounts. (underway)  
  • Negotiate a multi-vendor support agreement with reseller. (underway) | • Potential to combine current maintenance contracts for both central and distributed network equipment. |

*Note: Network Upgrade costs do not allow for future technology upgrades or lifecycle replacement.*
Summary

$23M–$46M needed for IT Improvements

Potential for cost savings as a result of shared service initiatives (e.g. state-wide contract alignment)

Potential for internal cost buy-down (optimizing university-wide IT services, self-funding by units, etc.)

Limited SIS cost-sharing without curricular alignment
Date: September 8, 2008

To: The President and Board of Trustees

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

Re: Hudson Health Center Renovation Update

A brief report will be given at the October Resources Committee meeting to update the Board on research into Hudson Health Center’s renovation and continued service as the home of Student Health Services.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions you have prior to the October meeting.
Hudson Health Center Renovation Update

- Hudson Health Center is being evaluated for renovation
- An architect is being retained to provide more detailed programming, project cost estimation, and phasing work
- This project will be reviewed and prioritized by the Facilities Planning Advisory Council (FPAC) as part of the 10 year capital planning process

Student Health Center Renovation Update

- Hudson Health Center is being evaluated for renovation
- An architect is being retained to provide more detailed programming, project cost estimation, and phasing work
- This project will be reviewed and prioritized by the Facilities Planning Advisory Council (FPAC) as part of the 10 year capital planning process
Date: September 8, 2008

To: The President and Board of Trustees

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

Re: Parks Hall Renovation / COM / UMA Update

A brief report will be given at the October Resources Committee meeting to update the Board on the progress of the College of Medicine and University Medical Associates (UMA) in reevaluating Parks Hall as the UMA home as well as partnership and funding options.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions you have prior to the October meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks Hall / COM / UMA Renovation Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities has been involved in researching the renovation of Parks Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM &amp; UMA are exploring partnership strategies with non-university related entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also exploring funding strategies that do not involve university debt obligations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State of Ohio’s Budget Outlook

- State to adjust its budget by $540M for the remainder of the fiscal year
  - In addition to a $733M budget reduction announced in January, this adjustment brings total cuts to $1.27B

- Gov. Strickland worked hard to “preserve core funds"

- Higher education held largely harmless from September’s state budget cuts

- Ohio University to retain most of its fiscal year 2009 allotments from the state
Impact of State Budget Cuts

- State reductions affecting OHIO’s general operations include the Success Challenge and the Access Challenge programs.
- Other items affected include restricted accounts set up for specific projects.
  - Those cuts add up to more than $845,000.
- Other programs also may be affected pending decisions by supporting agencies.
- University to continue specific contingency strategies in case state can’t fulfill promise.
  - Budget Planning Council examining a budget contingency plan proposal.
Five Year Vision Ohio Implementation Plan (FYVOIP)

- Vision Ohio goals will help us strengthen our academics and put us in a stronger financial position going forward.
- Year One of the FYVOIP aligns our investments with top institutional priorities:
  - University’s implementation plan emphasizes enrollment, recruitment, retention, educational attainment, and improving faculty salaries, IT infrastructure, and overall financial strength.
## Recruit and Retain Talented and Diverse People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create and implement a strategic Human Resources Plan</td>
<td>Increase faculty salaries to the next quartile</td>
<td>Faculty salaries increased to middle of Quartile 3 as University continues commitment of investing $1.2M for faculty salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Align classified and administrative staff salaries with the market</td>
<td>Compensation office established; Consultant engaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create and implement strategic enrollment management plan</td>
<td>Improve quality of first-time enrollees</td>
<td>ACT scores increased from 23.6 to 23.7; Acceptance rate decreased from 82% to 81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve access, affordability, and efficiency</td>
<td>Diversity of in-state, international, transfer, and out-of-state students increased by 2% each year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OHIO UNIVERSITY*
## Strengthen Undergraduate Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve retention and engagement of first-year students</td>
<td>Expand Learning Communities</td>
<td>Participation increased by 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set retention/graduation rates</td>
<td>Retention rate increased from 78% to 79%; Top three graduation rate standing in the state maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invest in targeted undergraduate programs</td>
<td>Indentify undergraduate programs for future investment</td>
<td>Undergraduate Centers of Excellence Review completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Enhance Graduate Education and Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase strategic investments in targeted graduate and professional programs</td>
<td>Identify graduate programs for future investment</td>
<td>Graduate Centers of Excellence Review completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen research and creative activity in targeted areas</td>
<td>Improve research competitiveness</td>
<td>Federally financed research spending increased from 48% to 49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Fortify and Align Infrastructure with Academic Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide dependable and secure network and systems infrastructure</td>
<td>Improve IT infrastructure</td>
<td>75% of network hardware is six years old or less within 10 years; Storage environment reduced from 4+ to 4; Server environment reduced from 14 to 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide appropriate backup and disaster recovery on critical services</td>
<td>20% of critical systems on scheduled disaster recovery program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase annual philanthropic support and develop major campaign</td>
<td>Working with academic leaders, establish fundraising goals</td>
<td>Annual gifts and commitments increased from $18M to $20M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Fortify and Align Infrastructure (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase efficiency, quality, and accountability of academic support units and academic units</td>
<td>Academic support units adopt continuous improvement and customer-focused style</td>
<td>Review of three academic support units completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participate in the Voluntary System of Accountability</td>
<td>Voluntary System of Accountability data reported through “College Portrait” on USO web site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a stronger financial, legal, and compliance infrastructure</td>
<td>Improve the balance sheet and overall financial strength</td>
<td>SB6 Composite Score increased from 3.2 to 3.7; Primary Reserve ratio increased from .239 to .250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve financial controls and risk management environments</td>
<td>Internal Audit findings formally addressed within one year of report; Strategic implementation plan developed for improving control climate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Enhance Prominence Within Ohio, Nation, and World

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearly communicate distinctive identity to stakeholders and use strategic communications to position the university</td>
<td>Undertake academic marketing campaign</td>
<td>Campaign implemented and post-campaign assessment completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop strategic community relations and government affairs</td>
<td>Contact with public officials enhanced; University community educated on how Ohio University can contribute to first year of the USO outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board of Trustees
Ohio University
Athens Campus
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Report on AY 2007-2008
Retention and Enrollment*

*Some of the numbers used in this report are preliminary. On October 3rd, final estimates will be available and an updated version of this report reflecting those numbers will be presented.
Based on preregistrations, first-year retention for AY 2007-2008 appears to be up 1-2%, which would be an increase to a 79% or 80% rate.

Our FYVOIP Retention Goal for AY 2007-2008 was to stabilize retention at the AY 2006-2007 level of 78%.
REASONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:
Retention has become a primary focus of units on campus. Units such as University College have realigned their staff and other resources around the issue of retention.
MATTER OF COMMON CONCERN

Office of Financial Aid

Colleges
Departments
Schools

Office of Housing

Office of Admissions

Division of Student Affairs

RETENTION
REASONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:
Strategic investments were made in promising retention initiatives.
Strategic Investments in Retention
2006-2008

- Student Readiness Inventory
- Learning community expansion
- Attendance Tracking Project
- International Student Airport Shuttle
- UC 115 Enhancement & UC 115/Learning Community Initiative
- Allen Student Help Center
Solution to Future Retention Challenges—FIVE YEAR VISION
OHIO IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

FYVOIP
OBJECTIVE 2

Expand Learning Communities [In place]

Improve academic advising for first-year students [In place]

Document current retention rates in specific General Education courses [Underway]

Increase instructional resources for General Education [In place]

Improve NSEE results [Underway]

Increase UG opportunities in research and creative activity [Underway]

Set retention targets in academic units [Underway]

Increase student/faculty ratios in programs beginning with HHS [In place]
Strong enrollment results in a tough economic climate.
REPORT ON AY 2007-2009 UG Enrollment and Retention

APPLICATIONS
14,046
Largest ever in history of Ohio University

ADMISSION
Selectivity increased
78% admission rate AY 2007-2008
82% admission rate AY 2006-2007
85% admission rate AY 2005-2006

FINAL ADMITS
Stronger in quality and diversity
REPORT ON AY 2007-2009 UG Enrollment and Retention

QUALITY
[Final Admits, AY 2007-2008]
• 23.7 ACT
• 3.37 GPA

QUALITY
[Final Admits, AY 2006-2007]
• 23.6 ACT
• 3.34 GPA
Multicultural UG applications increased by 337 in AY 2007-2008 (19% increase)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>UP/Admits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>UP 194/UP 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>UP 40/UP 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>UP 5/UP 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>DOWN 38/DOWN 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>UP 136 (56% increase)/ UP 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSFER & GRADUATE ENROLLMENT

TRANSFER ENROLLMENT

- 8% increase in transfer applications
- Preliminary estimates suggest that transfer enrollment will increase between 50 to 60 students to over 500.

OUT-OF-STATE

- Steady growth
- 9% increase in out-of-state applications
Almost 3,900 applications
- 8% growth over previous year

Increase in selectivity for Master’s/Doctoral programs
- 4% decrease in acceptance rate
REASONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:

- More systematic approach was taken with yield activities—more oversight and therefore more unit-level accountability
- Strategic investments in promising enrollment initiatives.
Strategic Investments in Recruitment in AY 2007-2008

- Increase in campus visits programs
- International recruitment investments
- "The Promise" Multi-media marketing campaign
- Territory management strategy
- Tele-recruiters
Institutional USO Accountability Measures Report

- Information on how Ohio University’s AY 2007-2008 enrollment aligned with the University System of Ohio’s enrollment goals will be presented to the Board of Trustees as part of a report required by Ohio Board of Regents.

- The report is due November 30, 2008 and its contents must be communicated to the Board of Trustees before it can be submitted.
AY 2008-2009 marks the first year in a predicted decade long demographic decline in projected high school graduates.

Recruitment climate is expected to become markedly more competitive as universities target a shrinking pool of students.
Future of Enrollment

State of Ohio high school graduating class projection

Source: Knocking at the College Door, Projections of High School Graduates by State, Income and Race/Ethnicity; WICHE, ACT and The College Board, March 2008

10% decline
Future of Enrollment

Figure 2.13. Percent Change (Relative to 2004-05) in the Total Number of Projected High School Graduates in Midwestern States

Source: Knocking at the College Door, Projections of High School Graduates by State, Income and Race/Ethnicity; WICHE, ACT and The College Board, March 2008
Solution to Future Enrollment Challenges—FIVE YEAR VISION
OHIO IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

**FYVOIP**
OBJECTIVE 10

- Strategic Enrollment Plan
  [Underway]
- Analysis of current scholarship award programs
  [Underway]
- Centralization of transfer credit review
  [Underway]

- On-line Financial Aid Estimator
  [Underway]
- Continuation of the multimedia marketing campaign—"The Promise"
  [Underway]
- Paperless processing of application materials
  [Underway]

- B.S.N. on the Athens Campus
  [In place]
- Continued investments in targeted recruitment
  [In place]
The science of enrollment and retention is grounded in the art of attention.
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Center for Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation

VPR Comments: Over the years, the Center has remained small in membership (never more than five members). However, the research interests of the faculty are highly complementary, thus creating the synergy and productivity needed for a viable Center. Standard metrics of research and academic productivity indicate reasonable success in terms of external funding, intellectual property generation, publications and number of students graduated.

The Center has been fiscally responsible and indirect costs have been successfully employed to support the Center, including graduate student support, conference travel, publication expenses and equipment.

The recent GERB funding to support the establishment of a Master of Science degree in Forensics Chemistry is complementary to and supportive of the Center’s goals. Because of the growing demand for expertise in Forensics Chemistry, there is great potential for the Center to enhance its external funding, reputation, and recruitment of students.

SCRIPPS COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATION

Scripps Survey Research Center (SSRC)

VPR Comments: The Center is a unique teaching and research resource that generates surveys which provide research training for students, complements faculty and staff research, and generates publicity for the university. Over 350 students have worked as professional operators in the Center over the past five years. Additionally, more than 300 students have gained experience by working in the SSRC to complete class projects. The results of SSRC surveys have been published both in scholarly journals, as well as numerous local, regional, national, and international newspapers.

The cost of the Center, based on FY07 operating expenses, is $93,750 and includes $24,578 for student employee expenses and $50,000 for staff administration salaries. The Center received $100,000 in 2002 from the Scripps Howard Foundation for website development. Therefore there is a concern that the cost/benefit ratio, at least based on an external funding metric, is rather high for this Center.
To broaden and increase the impact of the Center and the potential for external funding, it is important that the Center better position itself within and external to the University. The recent collaboration of the Scripps College of Communication with the Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs is a positive step in this direction.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Institute for Democracy in Education

VPR Comments: As requested in a memo from the Dean dated Nov. 30, 2007, the VPR recommends that the Institute be granted a two-year extension on its five year review. The shift in the Institute's priority to social justice and technology reflects the current interest of the faculty and should provide additional opportunities for external funding. As the institute is reformulated, it is important that the Institute establish funding and scholarly activity metrics that reflect the viability and benefits of the Institute.

RUSS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

Center for Independent, Distributed, and Dependable Systems

VPR Comments: The Center has a membership of eight faculty members from the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (EECS) who have demonstrated significant research productivity within the last five years. Three of the Center members have brought in ~$4.3M in external funding, with additional funding of ~$4.6M from a newly granted, multi-institutional scholarship program for bioinformatics from the State of Ohio. In addition, the publication record of the faculty and the number of graduate students involved in research through the Center indicate a viable research program.

The Center proposes a very ambitious future agenda. To realize these goals, the VPR has the following recommendations:

- The Center should institute a faculty mentoring program to move towards securing external funding for all members.
- To broaden and diversify the expertise of its members to synergistic fields of study, it is important that the Center seek collaborations outside of EECS.
- The Center should pursue external, as well as institutional, support for graduate student research assistantships.
- The Center should work with the relevant departments and Colleges to develop a strategic hiring plan.
- The Center and EECS should conduct a strategic analysis of the feasibility of implementing a Ph.D. program in Computer Science.
To: Renee Middleton, Dean, College of Education
From: James Rankin, Interim Vice-President for Research
Date: December 12, 2007
Re: Five-year Evaluation of the Institute for Democracy in Education

As requested in your November 30, 2007, memo, I am recommending that the Institute for Democracy in Education be granted a two-year extension on its five-year review. This extension will move the review date from 2008 to 2010.

The shift in the Institute's priority to social justice and technology reflects the current interest of the faculty and should provide additional opportunities for external funding.

As the institute is reformulated, it is important that you establish funding and scholarly activity metrics that reflect the viability and benefits of the institute.

Cc: Kathy Krendl, Executive Vice-President and Provost
TO: James Rankin, Interim Vice President for Research
FROM: Renée Middleton, Dean, College of Education
DATE: November 30, 2007
RE: Five-Year Evaluation of the Institute for Democracy in Education

Because of significant changes in the mission and structure of the Institute, I am requesting two-year approval without the full five year evaluation. The Institute is undertaking a major change in focus, and an evaluation this year would provide evidence primarily of work in progress.

Notably, as a major impetus for its efforts, the institute will continue to orient to issues of social justice. But the priority of its specific research and development efforts will change—moving increasingly toward specific issues related to social justice and technology (e.g., issues such as the digital divide in Appalachia, gender and careers in technology-related fields) and focusing secondarily on democracy in the classroom. This change in priority responds to the evolving interests of faculty in the Educational Studies Department, where the Institute is housed. Moreover, it opens up to affiliated faculty members new opportunities for grant support from agencies such as the National Science Foundation and the MacArthur Foundation.

Considering the changes underway, I believe an evaluation in two years would provide University administrators and the Board of Trustees with an opportunity to examine the new direction of the Institute and the work it has started to accomplish under its new auspices. I appreciate your consideration of this request.
To:       James Rankin, Interim Vice President for Research  
From:     Greg Shepherd, Dean, Scripps College of Communication  
Re:       Five-Year Review of the Scripps Survey Research Center  
Date:     April 25, 2008

Attached are the self-study and the review committee's report on the Scripps Survey Research Center. I concur with the review committee's praise of the Center and the conscientious manner with which it responded to the 2002 review. I also think the recommendations made by this year's review committee are on target, and the Center is already at work on most or all of those recommendations. Of particular significance is the partnership recently formed between the Scripps College and the Voinovich School on the administration of the Center and the formation of a strategic plan that will enhance the Center's performance and increase its visibility as a survey research center. I am convinced that the Center has the opportunity to strengthen its reputation, locally, regionally, and nationally, and that the partnership with the Voinovich School is will help the Center realize that opportunity. Voinovich School staff are helping to provide the technological expertise the Center needs to raise itself to a new level of prominence, and the School has access to clients for survey research that will bring additional, and steady, resources to the Center. A quick look at the surveys the Center has produced during the review period demonstrate the benefits its work brings to the university and also, I think, suggests the opportunities we can build upon to insure even greater accomplishments. The Scripps Survey Research Center has my unqualified recommendation for renewal of its center status.
April 10, 2008

TO: Dr. Gregory J. Shepherd, Dean
    Scripps College of Communication
FROM: SSRC Five-Year Assessment Committee (Benjamin R. Bates, Hong Cheng,
      and Barry Tadlock)
RE: Report of Assessment Committee for Scripps Survey Research Center

Based on reading the Scripps Survey Research Center’s self-study and meetings with Professors Jerry L. Miller, Anirudh V. S. Ruhil, Sara L. Boyd, Cary Frith, and Guido H. Stempel III of the Center, the assessment committee notes with approval the conscientious efforts, considerable accomplishments, and constant improvements the Center made during the five years (2000 to 2007+) under review. The committee commends the Center on the significant research support it gave to faculty, the valuable survey experience it provided to undergraduate and graduate students on campus, and the extensive publicity its works have generated for Ohio University over the years.

The attached self-study of the Center indicates SSRC’s activities. The assessment committee has noticed that during those five years, the SSRC closely followed the seven recommendations the previous assessment committee had made for the improvement of the Center.
The following are the recommendations that this assessment committee would like to make:

1. SSRC should position itself clearly, both internally and externally. Internally, it should continue to serve the way a university library normally does—not limiting its service to any particular program—in order to better fulfill the Center’s mission as a “laboratory for undergraduates and graduate students in all ten colleges across the Ohio University campus.” Externally, the Center’s positioning strategy should be based on its strengths and opportunities in the state of Ohio, the nearby multi-state region, and the global community.

2. SSRC should communicate more effectively and promote itself more proactively on campus and in the region. On the one hand, it needs to broaden and deepen students, faculty, and administrators’ awareness of its existence and activities, to improve its Web site substantially, and to invite speakers to campus to address trends and issues in survey research. On the other hand, it should initiate more active outreach in the Appalachian region, especially regarding health communication, environment, and energy research.

3. SSRC may consider, in the long term, developing strategic partnerships nationally (with similar centers in other universities) and internationally (through collaboration with the International Studies programs at the University).

4. SSRC should develop a strategy to deal with the challenges posed by the increasingly popular online survey and make use of the opportunities it has provided. This may necessitate even closer collaboration with the Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs of the University than what already exists, given that the VSLPA already possesses the capacity to field online surveys.

5. SSRC should reassemble its Advisory Committee for a wide-ranging support from other colleges on campus, as well as the University’s regional campuses, in addition to that of the Scripps College of Communication.

6. SSRC should work to secure stronger and more stable financial support from the Scripps College, the Scripps Howard Foundation, and other colleges at the University to become more viable in performing its duties and carrying out its plans. Meanwhile, the Center should be more active in finding ways to generating funds through its outreach in the region, nation, and even abroad.

7. SSRC should work to enhance its partnership with the Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs for both expertise (such as that in online survey mentioned above) and financial support, including the possible establishment of a certificate program in public opinion surveys and a grant to support junior faculty’s research.
Executive Summary and Introduction:

The Scripps Survey Research Center is housed and administered through the Scripps College of Communication at Ohio University. The program is currently under the supervision of Jerry L. Miller (Associate Professor in the School of Communication Studies), Anirudh V.S. Ruhil (Senior Research Associate of the Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs) and Sara L. Boyd (Assistant Director of Technology and Data Services of the Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs).

The following mission statement comes from the material submitted for the 2002 review:

The mission of SSRC is to serve students, faculty, the journalism and mass communication professions, and the public as a public opinion research center. It can, and does, assist in the conception of studies, preparation of questionnaires, preparation of the computer-assisted programming necessary to conduct studies and the compilation and distribution of results. The center also can assist in, or arrange for data analysis.

The SSRC has experienced a year of transition beginning with a brainstorming session during the Spring of 2007. Decisions with respect to personnel and program direction have molded the SSRC in a manner that is consistent with the original prospectus (Appendix A) and responds positively to the 2002 five-year assessment (Appendix B).

Recommendation 1

The initial mission statement for the center indicates that a primary use is to be for undergraduate instruction. There has been such use on a limited basis, but greater opportunity for such use needs to be provided.

Students enrolled in POCO 201 (Introduction to Political Communication) routinely participate as telephone operators as part of a class assignment. This assignment introduces students to the SSRC in particular, and to applied survey research more generally, and provides a valuable experience in human communication. Prof. Jerry L. Miller, School of Communication Studies routinely teaches this course and includes a section on survey research that contributed to the academic value of the hands-on
experience. The maximum number of students enrolled in this course (two sections per year, one in the Fall and Winter quarters) is approximately 100. In the Fall of 2005, with the support of the Scripps College of Communication and the College of Arts and Sciences, the two sponsoring colleges of the POCO Political Communication Certificate Program, POCO students were allowed to write and conduct their own survey and assist in distributing the data to media outlets. Dr. Stemple served as the liaison between the students and the SSRC as well as the various media outlets. Data from these surveys has been reported in the Columbus Dispatch, Cleveland Plains Dealer, and the Akron Beacon (In addition, the data has been picked up by local newspapers The Post, The Athens Messenger, The Athens News as well as local radio stations.)

In addition to the formal undergraduate experience with survey research provided to students via POCO 201, another 350 Ohio University students have worked for the SSRC over the past five years. These individuals too have received training on the software system, earned money to help supplement their income, and developed a valuable employment record. By furnishing these opportunities, the SSRC enhances the undergraduate academic experience on our campus.

In order to capitalize on this long-established history of working with students, as well as to more formally include the SSRC in the university’s academic mission, the SSRC plans to establish a curriculum in survey research methodology for undergraduate and graduate students. This curriculum, as currently envisioned, will include a two-course sequence of courses that cover survey and sampling methodology, survey administration, and survey data analysis and presentation. Both courses will be multidisciplinary in nature and hence are expected to draw students from units across the campus. Indeed, we also envision providing similar courses, albeit in a time-compressed format, during the summer months for individuals and agencies engaged in program/policy evaluation in the social, economic, and health development fields.

Recommendation 2

Short-term use by faculty needs to be facilitated. An effort needs to be made to reach faculty in such areas as political science, sociology, health administration, education, and marketing. This may require additional funding.

Appendix C includes a detailed list of surveys completed by the SSRC and those sponsored by faculty. A brief review of the faculty listed in Appendix C reveals a large majority of them to be housed in the Scripps College of Communication. This is not at all surprising given that these are the faculty most familiar with the SSRC, unlike other academic units on campus. Indeed, the SSRC has also been somewhat successful courting regional clientele -- non-profit organizations, hospitals, local governments. However, as we move ahead, the SSRC is planning to advertise its resources and capacity more broadly across campus and beyond our immediate region. This should result in greater use of SSRC by faculty and students engaged in, for example, grant-funded research.

1 Prof. C. Ann Gordon, formerly of the Political Science Department at Ohio University, has also taught this course in past years.
(primarily OU faculty), and graduate students working on their thesis/dissertation research. The SSRC has reserved funding for webpage development and a more prominent position in the research mission of OU graduate and undergraduate programs.

**Recommendation 3**

_We suggest creating a course cross-listed in several departments that will have as it focuses the creation and completion of a statewide survey annually. Part of this would involve soliciting from faculty in the entire campus ideas to be included in the survey. We would anticipate that this would produce several publishable manuscripts._

Funding and other logistical issues continue to impede progress with respect to this recommendation. Consequently, we are moving forward on this recommendation in a different vein. In particular, we are working towards establishing an adequately-funded survey that would be fielded every six months, and shift its focus according to premeditated cycles from, for example, health to politics to economic and other issues (though not necessarily in this order). Units underwriting portions of the survey costs will be involved in sampling and survey instrumentation. The resulting data will thereby, it is hoped, be as much of academic value (in terms of generating top-tier publications in academic outlets) as newsworthy (in terms of providing a pulse of our region, our state).

**Recommendation 4**

_Expanded activities will create a need for a full-time technician in the near future._

Funding continues to be a concern in this area as well. Although employing a full-time technician may have been a feasible option in the past, this is no longer. Instead, the SSRC will utilize existing staff supervising the SSRC (in addition to their primary duties elsewhere), and one or more graduate students to operate the SSRC. Rather than compromise the quality of SSRC’s operation, the modified administrative structure will increase efficiency and thereby better serve our academic mission.

**Recommendation 5**

_There will be a need for a permanent director with an academic home somewhere in the [Scripps] College of Communication. This person would be director half-time and would teach in the appropriate school half-time._

For the moment, Miller, Ruhil, and Boyd will continue to supervise/co-direct the SSRC program. This management team provides an appropriate balance between the academic goals of the SSRC as outlined in the original prospectus (Appendix A) and the practical needs with respect to securing funds successfully to meet the academic mission. For example, the positions held by Ruhil and Boyd in the Voinovich School provide additional academic support and access potential cliental that often make use of the SSRC. Of course, should the need arise and the budgetary situation allow, SSRC will seriously consider the possibility of retaining a “permanent” director.
Recommendation 6

We recommend making startup funds available to enable young faculty to make use of the SSRC.

Although a commendable idea, this particular recommendation depends upon the involvement of and dedicated support from the various academic units at OU. There is the possibility of an omnibus survey that could serve a similar purpose. Again, should the revenue situation improve, the SSRC may find itself in a position to provide this opportunity to tenure-track faculty by way of furnishing small research grants, teaching opportunities, and the like.

Recommendation 7

The SSRC should look long term to cooperating with survey centers at other Universities. The plan to put data and results in a web site should help such an effort.

The SSRC Webpage has been in operation for some time now and does attempt to make SSRC’s survey data available to the general public. These efforts will be expanded as we update the SSRC website with an eye to better advertising the survey center’s resources and disseminating survey-specific data and publications.

Additional Strengths

There are two distinct strengths of the SSRC. One, as outlined in Appendix C, is the number of projects completed by the SSRC. The SSRC has completed at least 62 surveys for various Ohio University faculty and departments, local and state organizations, and the Scripps Howard News Service. A second strength of the program concerns the number of stories that have been pick-up by various news agencies/media outlets across the nation and reports in academic journals.

NewsLibrary.com lists 487 items about the Scripps Research Center in 2006 and 404+ for 2007. These articles are based on SSRC surveys and are printed in the Philadelphia Inquirer, Boston Herald, Atlanta Constitution, Knoxville News Sentinel, Dallas News, Milwaukee Sentinel, Minneapolis Star and Tribune, Rocky Mountain News, San Francisco Examiner, Cleveland Plain Dealer, Toledo Blade, Columbus Dispatch, Cincinnati Post, Times Star, Pittsburgh Post Gazette and many others. Of course, the list includes the Athens Messenger.

Other Newspapers that carried stories based on data collected by the SSRC:
Long Beach Press Telegram
Grand Rapids Press
Detroit News
Fort Wayne Journal Gazette
Of particular note is the survey completed last summer on the 9/11 conspiracy. This survey made newspapers literally around the world, including Britain, France, Malaysia and Japan. The story coming from this survey motivated a response by the U.S. Department of State. The Department of State presented their point of view, including a brief description of the SSRC survey in the New York Times. All of these stories carry the name of Ohio University. We estimate that the circulation of newspapers that carry stories from a given survey range from 8 to 10 million.

Finally, the Army announced a year ago that they were relaxing requirements on tattoos. Their official announcement contained only one explanation—a reference to a two-year-old survey by the Scripps Survey Research Center.

The scholarly activity, as suggested above in response to the 2002 review and in Appendix C, is strong. In the past five years, Dr. Stemple had four articles in the Newspaper Research Journal (NRJ) and one in Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, and a book chapter based solely on data collected through the SSRC (most are co-authored by faculty members). Dr. Dan Riffe has had two NRJ. Ann Gordon, Jerry Miller, Ben Bates, Brian Quick, Sara L. Boyd, Roger Aden, Scott Titsworth, and Bill Reader have either published or presented (at regional and national conferences) their findings from survey-data collected through the SSRC. As emphasized earlier, SSRC hopes to increase the use the survey center for research and teaching.
On behalf of the faculty and staff affiliated with the SSRC, I would like to thank the 5-year assessment committee for the time and effort extended throughout this review process. The SSRC is a tremendous resource for our faculty and students at Ohio University and citizens throughout the region. I believe the SSRC has served its purpose credibly and will continue to provide a valuable service by generating scholarship and data public opinion research.

If you have any questions or concerns, or would like to meet with affiliate faculty or staff, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Jerry L. Miller, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Co-Director Scripps Survey Research Center
School of Communication Studies
740-593-4831
Jerry.Miller.1@ohio.edu

PS: This report includes information provided by: Cary Frith, Guido Stemple, Ani Ruhil, Sara Boyd, Jerry Miller and others.
APPENDIX A

DATE: January 22, 1997

TO: Sharon S. Brehm, Provost

FROM: T. Lloyd Chesnut, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

SUBJECT: Establishment of the Scripps Survey Research Center

Attached is a copy of a proposal and a resolution for the Board of Trustees regarding the establishment of the Scripps Survey Research Center at Ohio University. I have reviewed the proposal and recommend taking it to the President and the Board.

The Scripps Survey Research Center will link instruction and research across the five schools within the College of Communication, as well as provide a needed laboratory for undergraduates and graduate students in all ten colleges across the Ohio University campus—providing a valuable instructional and research resource to the university community.

The Center will be housed in and supported by the College of Communication. The dean of the College of Communication will appoint a director of the center, who will report to the dean. The faculty advisory board will consist of faculty representing Communication, Business, Education, Arts and Sciences, ILGARD and the Center for Community Service and Education.

by
Enclosures
ESTABLISH SCRIPPS SURVEY RESEARCH CENTER

RESOLUTION 1997 -

WHEREAS, Ohio University has established expertise to link instruction and research across the five schools within the College of Communication, as well as provide a needed laboratory for undergraduates and graduate students in all ten colleges across the Ohio University campus, and

WHEREAS, the establishment of a survey research center will provide a valuable instructional and research resource to the university community, and

WHEREAS, the Center will provide tangible proof of Ohio University’s determination to provide state-of-the-art instructional facilities and research opportunities to students and faculty.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees establishes the Scripps Survey Research Center.
January 21, 1997

TO: Lloyd Chestnut, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

FROM: Kathy A. Krendl, Dean

RE: Attached Proposal for Survey Center

I am attaching the prospectus for the Scripps Survey Research Center to be housed in and supported by the College of Communication. The mission of the center is to provide a valuable instructional and research resource to the university community.

Please give me a call if you have any questions about the proposal.
Prospectus for Establishing the Scripps Survey Research Center at Ohio University

I. Statement of Need

The survey research center will link instruction and research across the five schools within the College of Communication, as well as provide a needed laboratory for undergraduates and graduate students in all ten colleges across the Ohio University campus. Collaboration will occur between faculty and students throughout the university who share teaching and research interests in public opinion and behavioral research. Social science research courses in Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Communication and Education will all benefit from the center. Access to the facility will improve undergraduate and graduate student research skills, as well as their opportunities to become involved in faculty research. The center will also serve as a research tool for The Institute for Local Government Administration and Rural Development (ILGARD). This organization serves local government, state agencies, and non-profit organizations in Ohio. Faculty and students work with the Institute to become involved in applied research specifically focused on service to the region. In addition, specific programs in the College of Communication will utilize the center as an integral instructional resource. For example, Political Communication students will use the center to conduct political polls and to complete their senior research projects. Students in the organizational communication sequence in the School of Interpersonal Communication will have access to the center in their senior practicum course which involves conducting a survey and preparing a final report for a particular client. Recent clients have included school systems, city government, social service agencies, and other non-profit groups. The School of Communication Systems Management maintains and operates a number of telephone switches to provide students with hands-on laboratory experience. One of their switches will be connected to the computer equipment in the survey research center in order to allow students to study and maintain the system as part of their laboratory experience.

II. How the Need will be Met

Approval of this project will strengthen Ohio University's ability to serve its faculty, its current and future students, its alumni and citizens throughout the nation. It will provide tangible proof of Ohio University's determination to provide state-of-the-art instructional facilities and research opportunities to students and faculty.
III. The Unique Value of the Program to Ohio University

The goal of the proposed center is to support both teaching and research at Ohio University. Since 1992, the Scripps Howard Foundation and the E.W. Scripps School of Journalism have conducted a series of public opinion polls. These polls have addressed a wide array of subjects including topics such as gun control, gambling, political priorities, and gender roles in America. The results of the polls have been widely publicized throughout the region, the state, and the nation, in newspapers such as the Atlanta Constitution, the Chicago Tribune, the Philadelphia Enquirer, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, and the Akron-Beacon Journal. Poll data are also sent to the Roper Repository database at the University of Connecticut. This has all been accomplished without significant investments in technology. Students and faculty in the college and throughout the university would benefit from a survey center, a permanent site dedicated primarily to computer-aided interviewing, bringing instruction in behavioral research throughout the university into the modern era.

IV. Identification of Personnel and Departments

Students, faculty and staff in the College of Communication are trained to manage, design and maintain computer-telephony technology and make it available for use in courses and research projects throughout Ohio University. The center will be housed in and maintained by College of Communication personnel. A director for the center will be appointed to provide administrative oversight of the center's resources. In addition, an advisory board of appropriate faculty representatives from Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Communication, ILGARD, and the Center for Community Service and Education will be appointed to establish policies and guidelines for the center.

V. Estimated Fiscal Resources and Sources of Funding

The McClure School of Communication Systems Management will provide technical support and maintenance for the technology and infrastructure. The College of Communication will allocate funds to support the center's management and operations.
VI. Space and Equipment Needs and How They will be Met

The College of Communications will provide space for the survey center. Equipment for the center will be purchased through technology funds in the College of Communication.

VII. Administrative Control and Lines of Authority

The dean of the College of Communication will appoint a director of the survey center. The director will report to the dean. The faculty advisory board will consist of faculty representing Communication, Business, Education, Arts and Sciences, ILGARD and the Center for Community Service and Education.
August 7, 2002

TO: Jack Bantle, Vice President of Research

FROM: Kathy A. Krendel, Dean

RE: Scripps Survey Research Center

I am writing in response to the five-year review of the Scripps Survey Research Center. As Professor Stempel notes in his cover letter, the Center recently received an award of $100,000 from the Scripps Howard Foundation to support its efforts in conducting surveys and making the data immediately available on a Web site. This innovation promises to bring significantly more visibility to the Center. In addition, Professor Stempel has now assumed the director’s role and already the Center has generated external funding for survey work. He has also opened negotiations with a number of other potential clients. In short, the Center is experiencing a rebirth under Professor Stempel’s leadership, and I am optimistic that it will become a vital research tool to scholars across campus.

Thus, I support the Review Committee’s recommendations to encourage greater use of the Center for undergraduate instruction. A new General Education course on reasoning would seem a logical step in the direction of integrating it as an instructional resource. I also support the idea of a state-wide survey involving faculty and graduate students from across the campus. Furthermore, because Professor Stempel is retired, we need to address the need for a permanent director of the Center who would be qualified to teach in the area of survey research, as well as encourage others to use the resource as an instructional and research tool. More visibility for the Center on the local and national levels will be essential to its success, so recommendations to promote its use by faculty, as well as opportunities to link with other survey centers across the country, are also important recommendations to pursue.
July 1, 2002

Dr. John A. Bantle
Vice President for Research
120 Research & Technology Building
Campus

Dear Dr. Bantle:

Enclosed is the report of the committee that did the five-year review of the Scripps Survey Research Center. In addition, there is a report that Thomas Hodges, director of the center for the past two years, prepared and a background paper I prepared for use of the review committee.

I am delighted to report that in the interim since the committee met we have received notification from the Scripps Howard Foundation that they will provide $100,000 in funding so that we can pursue putting the center on the web. They are giving us $40,000 for the current year and $30,000 for each of the next two years. In addition to Bob Stewart, the School of Journalism's web master, we will have the help of Robert Benz, general manager for interactive media for Scripps Howard and their web expert, and Thomas Hargrove, the survey expert of the Scripps Howard News Service.

Sincerely,

Guido H. Stempel III
Director
Scripps Survey Research Center
Report of Review Committee for Scripps Survey Research Center

Members of the Committee: Daniel Rifle, Ann Tickamyer and Guido H. Stempel III

The committee notes with approval the progress made by the Scripps Survey Research Center (SSRC). The center was authorized in 1997, but actually went on-line in June 1998. The attached report indicates the activity of the center.

The committee makes these recommendations:

1) The initial mission statement for the center indicates that a primary use is to be for undergraduate instruction. There has been such use on a limited basis, but greater opportunity for such use needs to be provided.

2) Short-term use by faculty needs to be facilitated. An effort needs to be made to reach faculty in such areas as political science, sociology, health administration, education, and marketing. This may require additional funding.

3) We suggest creating a course cross-listed in several departments that will have as its focus the creation and completion of a state-wide survey annually. Part of this would involve soliciting from faculty in the entire campus ideas to be included in the survey. We would anticipate that this would produce several publishable manuscripts in various academic areas.

4) Expanded activities will create a need for a full-time technician in the near future.

5) There will be need for a permanent director with an academic home somewhere in the College of Communication. This person would be director half-time and would teach in the appropriate school half-time.

6) We recommend making startup funds available to enable young faculty to make use of the SSRC.

7) The SSRC should look long term to cooperating with survey centers at other Universities. The plan to put data and results in a web site should help such an effort.
Center/Institute: Scripps Survey Research Center  
Director: Thomas E. Hodges, Jr.  
E.W. Scripps School of Journalism  
College of Communication

Affiliated Faculty:  
- 01-02  
  Jack Bantle, VP Research  
  Thomas Hargrove, White House correspondent Scripps  
  Howard News Service, Washington D.C. Bureau  
  Dan Riffe, E.W. Scripps School of Journalism, COMM  
  Guido Stempel, Emeritus, E.W. Scripps School of Journalism,  
  Ann Tickamyer, Sociology  
(see attached list for faculty associated with the center from 1996–2000)

Mission: The Scripps Survey Research Center serves students, faculty,  
the journalism and mass communication professions, and the  
public as a public opinion research center. It can, and does,  
assist in the conception of studies, preparation of  
questionnaires, preparation of the computer assisted  
programming necessary to conduct studies and the  
compilation and distribution of results. The center also can  
assist in, or arrange for data analysis.

Future Activity: In addition to our ongoing studies, e.g. the Scrippps  
Howard News Service-Ohio University poll, the center will: attempt to  
broaden its base of support among academics, but especially  
from the journalism and mass communication professions with  
such services as fast turn-around public opinion surveys for  
television news programs, especially in smaller-market cities;  
to attract additional market-based studies such as hospital  
needs in Appalachia; and to attract additional studies from  
academics at OHIO and other universities in the region.
Center/Institute: Scripps Survey Research Center
Director: Thomas E. Hodges, Jr.
E.W. Scripps School of Journalism
College of Communication

Affiliated Faculty:

01-02
Jack Bantle, VP Research
Thomas Hargrove, White House correspondent Scripps Howard News Service, Washington D.C. Bureau
Dan Riffe, E.W. Scripps School of Journalism, COMM
Guido Stempel, Emeritus, E.W. Scripps School of Journalism, Ann Tickamyer, Sociology
(see attached list for faculty associated with the center from 1996 – 2000)

Mission: The Scripps Survey Research Center serves students, faculty, the journalism and mass communication professions, and the public as a public opinion research center. It can, and does, assist in the conception of studies, preparation of questionnaires, preparation of the computer assisted programming necessary to conduct studies and the compilation and distribution of results. The center also can assist in, or arrange for data analysis.

Future Activity: In addition to our on-going studies, e.g. the Scripps Howard News Service- Ohio University poll, the center will attempt to broaden its base of support among academics, but especially from the journalism and mass communication professions with such services as fast turn-around public opinion surveys for television news programs, especially in smaller-market cities; to attract additional market-based studies such as hospital needs in Appalachia; and to attract additional studies from academics at OHIO and other universities in the region.
APPENDIX C

Surveys Done by Scripps Survey Research Center, 2002-2007

2002
Three surveys about various aspects of cancer prevention and treatment as part of partnership between College of Communication and American Cancer Society.

Survey of public attitudes about problems, needs and future of Athens as part of the city’s long-range planning. Funded by city.

Three surveys with the Scripps Howard News Service

Survey for Ohio Newspaper Association on use of news media and political ads.

Survey of Hocking County residents on their concerns (with Ilgard).

Survey for University College of students admitted for Fall 2003 to find out what their course preferences were for their first quarter on campus.

2003
Survey of students on smoking, drinking, sexual activity and other health issues. I believe this was funded by the partnership with American Cancer Society.

Three surveys with Scripps Howard News Service.

Survey of parent control of children’s TV watching for TV doctoral student Yun.

Advertising study sponsored by an advertising agency for Jan Slater and Diana Knott.

Survey of reading projects in Appalachia for Appalachia Reads project.

Survey on school funding with Poco 201 class.

2004
Survey for Rural Action of grocers and restaurants to determine market for produce grown in Southeastern Ohio.

Member satisfaction survey for Society of Professional Journalists.

Survey of non-members of Society of Professional Journalists to determine possible interest in joining SPJ.

Three surveys with Scripps Howard News Service.
Survey of public attitudes toward Marietta Memorial Hospital

Survey on lawn care for Prof. Paul Robbins of the Department of Geography at Ohio State to be used in book. (The survey center at Ohio State had done earlier surveys for him, but left him high and dry when they ceased operation.)..

Survey for Prof. Robbins on use of national forests in four New England States.

Survey on voting with Poco 201 class.

Customer satisfaction survey for Ohio Bureau of Motor Vehicles.

Survey on attitudes about football by residents of Nebraska

2005
Survey with Jour 806 class on environment issues.

Health care survey with ARIC (with Ilgard)

Survey of Athens residents to see if they would support a tax for an aquatic center.

Survey for United Appeal of licking County on quality of life in the county.

Three surveys with Scripps Howard News Service

Poco 201 survey

Survey with 806 class on Ohio issues (Riffe)

Survey on diabetes (with Ilgard)

Survey on Athens residents’ attitudes on Halloween

Survey on attitudes about smoking (Quick and Bates, Inco)

Survey of public attitudes about Marietta Memorial Hospital.

2006
Survey on Diabetes prevention (with Ilgard)

Survey on media use in Jackson County.

Two Poco 201 surveys on Ohio politics.

Three surveys with Scripps Howard News Service
*Survey on tobacco (with Illgard)

Survey on energy conservation (with Illgard)

Surveys of faculty, staff and students on Vision Ohio (Provost's Office funded)

Survey of Athens County residents about Farmers’ Market

Jour 806 survey on Media use for political information (Riffe)

2007

Two surveys with Scripps Howard News Service

Survey on cool finding with Poco 201

Survey of image of Zane State College

Survey of Appalachian residents on fire prevention

Reader interest survey of Norwalk and Huron County residents

Two surveys for Society of Professional Journalists to be completed in August

**Classes That Have Used Scripps Survey Research Center**

Poco 201 for last five years.

Jour 806 for last three years

UC 115--3 or 4 sections for last three years


**Faculty Who Have Used Scripps Survey Research Center.**

Roger Aden, School of Communication Studies

Ben Bates, School of Communication Studies

Bojinka Bishop, E. W. Scripps School of Journalism

Jerry Miller, School of Communication Studies
Faculty Who Have Had Questions in Polls with Scripps Howard News Service

Joe Bernt, E. W. Scripps School of Journalism
Mia Consalvo, School of Telecommunications
Doug Daniel, E. W. Scripps School of Journalism
Ann Gordon, Department of Political Science
Marilyn Greenwald, E. W. Scripps School of Journalism
Jerry Miller, School of Communication Studies
Bill Reader, E. W. Scripps School of Journalism.
Daniel Riffe, E. W. Scripps School of Journalism
Guido H. Stempel III, E. W. Scripps School of Journalism

(All of these efforts have led to publication of book chapters or journal articles or convention papers.)
TO: Rathindra N. Bose, Ph.D.
FROM: Jerry L. Miller, Ph.D.
       Anirudh V.S. Ruhl, Ph.D.
DATE: September 2, 2008
RE: Five-Year Review Addendum

The following information to complete the five-year review is provided as requested via e-mail, Tuesday, August, 2008.

1. Annual operating expenditures for the Center. Please provide a breakdown and justification for major budget categories for FY 2007.

The following assessment is based on data generated from the attached 2007 Expenditure Summary Sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense</th>
<th>Breakdown of Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>Service Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Services (Annual software service and maintenance contract with Sawtooth Technologies, the author of the server- and client-side survey software used in the survey lab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$24,578</td>
<td>Employee Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$163</td>
<td>Workers Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>Part-time Student Employment (Telephone Operators—graduate and/or undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$409</td>
<td>Retirement Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6</td>
<td>Medicare Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,206</td>
<td>General Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,489</td>
<td>Other Professional Charges (printing, web-development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120</td>
<td>Data Communication Charges (main phone port)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$187</td>
<td>Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,053</td>
<td>Communication and Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$307</td>
<td>Computer Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50</td>
<td>Telephone Installation Charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,271</td>
<td>Long Distance Telephone Charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,695</td>
<td>Salaries (Funded by Dean's Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guido Stempel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Owens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Source and amount of funding for the Center, including internal and external funds for at least FY 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$65,960</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>Survey Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55,210</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocated Reserve (Remaining balance of the $100,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In addition, please provide a brief summary of the cost/benefit of the Center to the University

The benefits to the University and the Scripps College of Communication far outweigh the expenses. The primary benefits include professional opportunities for students, a valuable research vehicle for both students and faculty, and local/regional/national/international publicity for attention Ohio University via our collaboration with the Scripps-Howard News Agency.

Professional opportunities for our students are provided through course related assignments and through employment opportunities. As detailed above, a major expense related to the center is a result of hiring students to complete calls related to surveys secured through the center. Over 350 students have worked as professional operators in the center over the past five years. Additionally, more than 300 students have gained experience by working in the SSRC to complete class projects. Many times these students write, administer and analyze that data gathered from these surveys.

The SSRC serves as a valuable resource for scholarship (faculty and student). As outlined in the review, a number of OU faculty have hired the SSRC to assist with survey-based research. Over the past several years, data collected via SSRC-conducted surveys come from approximately 62 different surveys. The results of these surveys have been published both in scholarly journals as well as numerous local, regional, national, and international newspapers. In sum, the SSRC not only enables student and faculty research but also serves a promotional purpose by drawing attention to Ohio University.

A number of changes have occurred over the past year that are worth noting as they capitalize on the original mission of the SSRC and will impact funding. First, the Scripps College of Communication and the Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs have joined efforts to increase the visibility of the SSRC on campus, the region, and nationally. While the need to provide human resource support in administering the center is an important part of this collaboration, it also shares the funding burden of the graduate student hired to work for SSRC through the academic year. In doing so, the graduate student employee is receiving a critical opportunity to acquire professional
management and technical skills and experience. This is one of SSRC’s important goals: to enhance our academic mission.

The SSRC has many opportunities to increase the educational mission of our students by serving as a laboratory for undergraduate and graduate students interested in survey research. It is our hope to create a graduate-level curriculum of two to three courses in applied survey research methodology to address this need. This curriculum will plug an important gap currently in existence at OU: The lack of any rigorous formal training in survey sampling, design, management, and analysis.

The Scripps-Voinovich collaboration is also designed to increase the use of the SSRC by our university colleagues, and to provide a necessary service for public/private institutions in need of survey research. This is an important goal since by doing so the SSRC will move towards a more balanced cost-revenue footing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CostCenter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>010000/0602</td>
<td>040144 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>($4,000.00)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($4,000.00)</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010000/0602</td>
<td>040881 MISCELLANEOUS INCOME</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($8,250.00)</td>
<td>($5,500.00)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($8,250.00)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010000/0602</td>
<td>182000 PART TIME STUDENTS</td>
<td>$3,916.00</td>
<td>$7,459.71</td>
<td>$24,002.72</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($20,086.75)</td>
<td>512.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010000/0602</td>
<td>189000 OTHER PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,489.00</td>
<td>$1,489.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($1,489.00)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,916.00</td>
<td>$8,938.71</td>
<td>$25,481.73</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($21,575.73)</td>
<td>(550.56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010000/0602</td>
<td>220000 RETIREMENT CONTRIBUTIONS</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$90.75</td>
<td>$405.52</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($406.52)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010000/0602</td>
<td>230000 WORKERS COMPENSATION</td>
<td>$227.40</td>
<td>$50.50</td>
<td>$172.68</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($173.68)</td>
<td>(502.50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010000/0602</td>
<td>240000 MEDICARE INSURANCE</td>
<td>$57.00</td>
<td>$1,56</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$51.00</td>
<td>89.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$34.00</td>
<td>$1,145.31</td>
<td>$577.60</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($493.50)</td>
<td>(587.82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010000/0602</td>
<td>300000 SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$187.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($187.00)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010000/0602</td>
<td>314400 COMPUTER SUPPLIES</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$287.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($287.00)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$474.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($474.00)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010000/0602</td>
<td>500000 INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,052.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($2,052.00)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010000/0602</td>
<td>561000 TELEPHONE INSTALLATION</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($50.00)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010000/0602</td>
<td>582000 TELEPHONE LONG DISTANCE</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,816.44</td>
<td>$10,272.84</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($10,272.84)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010000/0602</td>
<td>589100 DATA COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$39.90</td>
<td>$119.70</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($119.70)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$1,854.34</td>
<td>$12,462.54</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($12,452.54)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010000/0602</td>
<td>798000 ALLOCATED RESERVE</td>
<td>$55,210.89</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$55,210.89</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$55,210.89</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$55,210.89</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010000/0602</td>
<td>990100 INTERNAL TRANSFER MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($2,500.00)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>($2,500.00)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td>$59,210.89</td>
<td>$10,854.34</td>
<td>$33,556.67</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$22,654.32</td>
<td>38.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CostCenter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: 16 June 2008

To: James Rankin, Interim Vice President for Research

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

Subj: CICI 5-year review

We are pleased to submit the self-study document, review committee report, and our comments for the Center for Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation (CICI). This is the third time that CICI has been reviewed since its initial establishment. As a note, Howard Dewald was a member of CICI when it was established and continued through the period during which the second five-year review was submitted in 2002.

Peter Harrington, CICI Director, prepared a self-study document in April 2008. A review committee was constituted and provided with copies of the self-study document and previous five-year review. Donald Miles, Professor of Biological Sciences chaired the review committee. (Of note, Professor Miles has been a member of all three five-year reviews of CICI). Kevin Crist, Professor of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering in the Russ College of Engineering and Technology and David Tees, Associate Professor of Physics and Astronomy in the College of Arts and Sciences were the two other members of the committee. The review committee submitted its report on May 27, 2008.

CICI has operated and continues to operate with members exclusively from the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. In the time since the last five-year review, there has been considerable change in the membership of CICI. Professor Peter Harrington became the CICI director at the start of AY 2002-2003. Over the years of its existence, CICI has remained small in membership (never more than five members) with modest levels of funding. The self-study report provides detailed analysis of the spending pattern of CICI funds, mostly in support of graduate students, conference travel, publication expenses, and equipment.

More recently the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry received Graduate Education and Research Board (GBRB) Future Growth funding in support of establishing a Master of Science degree in Forensic Chemistry. This effort involves the faculty affiliated with CICI and can be expected to be complementary to and supportive of the goals of CICI.
We concur with the review committee that CICI has opportunities for collaboration elsewhere on the Ohio University campus. Further, we concur that CICI could expand its outreach efforts.

We understand the desire of CICI and the Department of Chemistry to be able to hire additional faculty that potentially could seek membership in CICI. In the College of Arts and Sciences, requests for faculty positions are reviewed annually by a college-level staffing committee and are authorized based on many factors including programmatic integrity.

The College of Arts and Sciences supports the renewal of CICI for another five-year period.

cc: Peter Harrington, CICI Director
    Tadeusz Malinski, Chair, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
    Members of the 5-Year Review Committee
Date: May 27, 2008

To: Ben Ogles, Dean, College Arts and Sciences

From: Review Committee [Donald B. Miles (Chair), David Tees, Kevin Crist]

Subject: Five-Year Review of the Center for Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation (CICI)

This report constitutes the third five-year review for the Center for Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation (CICI). This report is based on the following information:

(a) A Self-Study Report for the Center for Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation by the Center Director, Prof. Peter Harrington (7 April 2008).

(b) Supplemental Information for the Five-Year Review provided by the Center Director (29 April 2008) as requested by the Committee.

(c) A letter from Tadeusz Malinski, Chairman of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

(d) Verbal Information supplied to the Committee by the Center Director during the Review Meeting on 14 May 2008.
Executive Summary

The Review Committee examined the Self-Study and the Supplementary Information provided by the Center Director and conducted an extended meeting with Prof. Harrington on 14 May 2008. The findings of the Committee are provided below. We discuss four key attributes of the center:

(1) Evaluation of the current viability of the Center
(2) Evaluation of the potential future viability
(3) Evaluation of current and future funding strategies
(4) Recommendation regarding the continuation of the Center

After reviewing the information presented to the committee, we recommend that the Center for Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation be continued with the support at the current level. The committee is encouraged that filling two vacant faculty lines is a priority for the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. The committee supports the hiring of two additional analytical chemists that will greatly enhance the funding potential for CICI as well as assist in recruiting high quality graduate students.

As in past reviews of CICI the review committee recommends that the center increase its visibility within the University. Recent efforts by the Center's director to recruit foreign graduate students are laudable. However, this may affect the ability of the Center to support graduate students using Department of Defense funds. The committee noted the opportunity for collaboration with other faculty in the University (e.g., Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering, EECS and Mathematics), which should be explored, perhaps by inviting prospective members to attend and present at center meetings. One means for accomplishing this would be the creation of a CICI seminar series. The potential for funding postdoctoral scholars as well as short term visiting professorships is another avenue for enhancing the visibility of the Center. Furthermore, given the important applied aspect of the Center's research, we recommend the Center establish a stronger liaison with industry.
Evaluation of the current viability of the Center for Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation (CICI)

As in past reviews, the Committee finds the Center for Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation (CICI) to be an active and viable contributor to the research and academic mission of Ohio University.

The Center for Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation (CICI) was formally established by the Ohio University Board of Trustees on April 3, 1992. There are currently three active faculty members in the CICI. The participating faculty are: Dr. P. Harrington (Professor of Chemistry), Dr. Glen Jackson (Assistant Professor of Chemistry), and Dr. Hao Chen (Assistant Professor of Chemistry). Harrington has been Director of CICI since 2004. There has been substantial faculty turnover in membership in the CICI in the past five years. The previous director Dr. Small and Dr. McCord left Ohio University for other programs. Faculty membership was further reduced when Dr. Howard Dewald became an Associate Dean at the College of Arts and Sciences. The death of another faculty member resulted in additional turnover. There have been two recent faculty hires (Jackson and Chen). The current director is working with The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry to seek at least one new hire whose research interest will complement the current membership of CICI. In addition, it is anticipated that a new staffing line could be funded by the fee-based MS program in Forensic Chemistry. The replacement of two faculty in the Analytical/Forensic curriculum is a priority for the department (as per letter from Prof. Tadeusz Malinski). These faculty lines would boost membership in CICI. However, the reduction in the number of established faculty members, and an expanded teaching service loads has negatively affected the research productivity of the remaining members of CICI. It appears as though the Center has weathered the tumultuous turnover and productivity is rising.

The current viability of CICI can be assessed by standard metrics of research and academic productivity. Those standard metrics include number of patents awarded, publications in refereed journals, invited talks and contributions to conferences and symposia, number of graduate degrees granted and external funding requested and received. The research productivity of the Center was presented in Tables 1 and 2 of the self-study and Tables 2, 3, and 4 in the addendum and will be summarized below. Since the last review, CICI members published 67 manuscripts in refereed journals and made 82 contributions to conferences and meetings. The faculty members of the Center were awarded $1.82 million in total funding. One faculty member (Jackson) received a prestigious CAREER award from NSF in 2008. The researchers of CICI actively sought external funding as evidenced by the 52 research proposals that were submitted for funding. As in past years, the majority of research funds are from Federal sources.

The Center for Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation is also actively involved in the educational mission of Ohio University. Since the last review, an average of 7 undergraduates per year and 90 15 graduate students per year were involved in CICI research. As of 2007, there were 13 graduate students working on CICI projects. Harrington has graduated 2 MS and 6 Ph.D. students in the last five years. More graduate degrees are likely to be granted as Jackson and Chen progress in their career. The names of students (undergraduate and graduate) appeared on 44 papers. In addition, there was postdoctoral support in three of the six years.
(2) Evaluation of the potential future viability

A past review of doctoral programs in the State of Ohio conducted by the Ohio Board of Regents resulted in the designation of two focus areas for the doctoral program offered by the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry at Ohio University: "Chemical Analysis and Structure" and "Chemistry of Biological Systems and Processes." The Center for Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation falls within the first area of focus, which makes it a critical contributor to the training of future graduate students. Furthermore, the development of a Forensic Chemistry Master of Science Degree coincides with the shift in emphasis of the Center towards the discipline of forensic science, thereby making it an important part of this new program. Because of the growing demand for expertise in Forensic Chemistry, both in academic and industrial settings, there is great potential for CICI to enhance its National and International reputation. The high integration of the Center with the academic and research goals of the department means it is poised to continue making significant contributions to the research and academic mission of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry and Ohio University.

In the first two review cycles, the center had at least four faculty members. Currently the Center consists of three members. The Director of the Center is hopeful that future hires in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry would have a research emphasis that would be well suited for membership of CICI and fill two vacancies in the Analytical Chemistry Program. The review committee recommends having at least four faculty members in CICI, as this was mentioned by the previous Center Director as the minimum critical mass for sustained research productivity.

The emphasis on mass spectrophotometry and small intelligent instruments also creates the potential for the Center to take advantage of funding opportunities from industry and homeland security.

The Committee recognizes the difficulty in recruiting high-quality graduate students. The efforts by Dr. Peter Harrington to emphasize attracting international students is consistent with Vision Ohio goals of enhancing diversity and raising graduate student numbers.

(3) Evaluation of current and future funding strategies

The Review Committee does not foresee dramatic changes in the cost/benefit ratio of the next five year period. The Center has a healthy balance sheet and expenses have not exceeded revenue in the since the last review (Harrington, pers. comm.). The major use of revenue has been to support travel expenses by students and faculty to attend and present papers at conferences and meetings. The Center has also been able to provide matching funds for Research Challenge Grants and support expenses related to the acquisition of equipment. The recent NSF CAREER award to Glen Jackson will provide $70,000 in overhead return to the Center. The Center has been conservative in its use of funds. Thus, the Review Committee expects the Center to be fiscally sustainable in the next five years.
(4) Recommendation regarding the continuation of the Center

As a result of the Review Process, the Review Committee unanimously recommends that the Center for Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation be continued with support at its current level.

The Committee notes that the Center has increased its visibility through Web representation and presence as well as through support of travel by CICI members to plenary session and prestigious events such as the Oxford Roundtable on Criminal Law and Justice. Additional methods to increase visibility would include establishing a seminar series, supporting symposia and workshops based at Ohio University. These activities have the potential to include other colleagues within Ohio University and other institutions, and the individuals in industry. The potential for increased collaboration with other departments, e.g., chemical engineering, computer science, should be explored to create additional research opportunities for interaction with other faculty and recruitment of high quality graduate students. The expansion of research interests into disease detection and food safety represents an opportunity to collaborate with faculty in the College of Osteopathic Medicine and HHS.

The current level of interaction with industry is commendable and should be expanded to increase the Center's visibility and long-term viability. Finally, the committee notes that the ability of CICI to be competitive for center based grants offered by the Department of Homeland Security as well as other agencies will be enhanced by the hiring of at least one new faculty member.
OHIO Center for Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation

Peter de Boves Harrington, Director
Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry
College of Arts & Sciences

Present Members
- Glen P. Jackson, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry
  College of Arts & Sciences
- Hao Chen, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry
  College of Arts & Sciences

Mission Statement
The mission of the Center of Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation (CICI) is to foster research collaborations between faculty members interested in the areas of the development of smart sensors and intelligent instruments, and to enhance the educational goals of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry at OHIO University. The research areas of current CICI members include the design and construction of novel, portable mass spectrometers for on-site chemical testing, the advancement of ionization and fragmentation methods in mass spectrometry, chemometric and data enhancement of ion mobility spectrometers and mass spectrometers, and novel application developments in forensic and biological mass spectrometry. CICI also supports the department’s nationally-competitive forensic chemistry program for educating graduate and undergraduate students. CICI will play a significant role in the nascent Master of Science program in Forensic Chemistry that was sponsored by the OHIO Growth Fund. CICI has an international reputation and is important to help OHIO maintain a global perspective and competitiveness.

Abstract
CICI has been rebuilding and shifting in the direction of forensic science. CICI will develop new enabling technologies for law enforcement and homeland security. It will complement and focus the efforts of the Analytical/Forensic faculty in the department. CICI experienced a dip in productivity as measured by funding and publications, but it is now looking promising once the newly hired professors have achieved their first initial successes at OHIO. CICI will support the new MS program in Forensic Chemistry. The international reputation of CICI will help attract the best undergraduate and graduate students to OHIO as well as faculty for the much needed positions in our department. Lastly, CICI will provide a foundation to foster large multi-investigator projects at OHIO.

Funding
From 2002-2007 CICI has garnered $1.8 million in external funding during a time that CICI was devastated by the loss of senior faculty, one death, and a greater departmental teaching and service load. CICI accomplished this task at a time where the competitiveness for federal funding has been increasing and the availability of funding has been waning.
Brief History (1992-2007)
The Center of Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation (OHIO) was founded in 1992 to promote the use of chemical instrumental methods to other areas outside of chemistry. Two prominent examples would be the use of near-infrared spectroscopy (NIRS) to the noninvasive detection of glucose in blood for diabetic patients and ion mobility spectrometry for law enforcement for detection and identification of explosives and illegal drugs. Generally, patients and first responders are rarely trained to a high level in chemistry, so are not able to interpret the data furnished by these instruments. Instead, embedded in the operating software are algorithms that convert the chemical information into simple outputs, such as green lights and red lights that are useful to the operators of these instruments. This important role is fulfilled by CICI and is especially relevant now that microfabricated instrumentation and sensors are available. The research area explored through CICI fills an important and under-explored area of research; very few groups in the US are devoted to developing the algorithms and to allow these sensors to be used by unskilled operators.

For the first decade, CICI attracted funding from the US Army, the National Institute of Justice, and the National Institutes of Health. The main contributors to CICI were Professors Gary Small, Bruce McCord, and Pete Harrington. In 2003, CICI suffered devastating losses, when two of the most productive members of CICI (and the Department) decided to leave OHIO for other programs. Professor Gary Small left for the University of Iowa to facilitate research overlap with his collaborator Mark Arnold. Associate Professor Bruce McCord left for Florida International University to join a larger forensic chemistry program. Gary and Bruce had significant numbers of publications and consistently received substantial external funding.

When Bruce left, the Forensic Chemistry program was without a director. Pete stepped up to replace Bruce and direct this prestigious program that is the oldest program in the nation that has a baccalaureate degree in forensic chemistry. Because of budget constraints, only one faculty member could be replaced at a time. In 2004, the search to replace Bruce failed. In 2005, a repeated search was successful in hiring Assistant Professor Glen Jackson. In 2006, the search to replace Gary was successful in hiring Assistant Professor Vladimir Alexeev. Tragically, Vladimir passed away after only one quarter at OHIO. In 2007, Alexeev was replaced with Assistant Professor Hao Chen.

The staffing problem was further exacerbated by losses to administration when Professor Howard Dewald became an Associate Dean at the College of Arts and Sciences, CICI lost a productive member and Howard’s reduced teaching load strained the Analytical/Forensic Division within the Department. Howard also was a past CICI member. In 2004, Professor Tadeusz Malinski accepted the position as
Chair of the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry, but relinquished his teaching responsibilities further straining the Analytical/Forensic Chemistry Division, which covers the largest number of courses in the Department.

**Future Directions**

The utility of building small intelligent instruments is widely acknowledged to be the next big growth area in chemical instrumentation. Portable Instruments can be used by emergency responders, security personnel at airports and security checkpoints, military personnel, forensic scientists and environmental scientists, and can therefore be used to benefit our homeland security and our quality of life. Within the area of portable instrument development, Glen received national recognition recently when he received a National Science Foundation CAREER Award for $562,000. As part of this grant, Glen will be building an inexpensive handheld mass spectrometer. A key component to his design is the use of chemometric methods to manipulate the data collected on the instrument, and to optimize its performance. Through CICI-enriched collaborations, Pete will be assisting with the data management and evaluations once the portable instrument is in testing mode.

Pete also plans to develop new methods for analyzing sophisticated data. He also plans to work on develop a miniaturized gas chromatograph with a differential mobility detector for onsite analysis of bomb detonation sites and fire scenes. He also hopes to receive a miniaturized IMS-MS once they come online from one of his colleagues companies. He also will continue to work in the areas of disease detection and food safety.

Hao plans to develop a mass spectrometric method for *in-situ* detection of forensic biofluids (e.g. urine, blood, and bacteria) without sample pretreatment, which will involve 1-2 undergraduate students.

**Current Activities and Status**

Pete Harrington is the Director of CICI and has administered the Forensic Chemistry program since 2004. In 2005, the OHIO Forensic Chemistry program was accredited by the American Academy of Forensic Sciences. In 2008, Pete was promoted to a full member of the academy and appointed to the Forensic Science Education Programs Accreditation Commission (FEPAC). He helped found the International Forensic Science Education Consortium (IFSEC) in 2007. Through IFSEC, 3 OHIO undergraduates did a two-week training program at the Shanghai Institute of Forensic Science in 2007. Pete presently has ongoing collaborations with the National Institutes of Health, the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, and the Department of Agriculture. In addition, he has collaborators in Beijing, Shanghai, Rome, and Paris. He will spend three months in Aix de Provence.
In the fall of 2008, working with Professor Nathalie Dupuy on the forensic characterization of olive oils at the Paul Cézanne University.

Glen Jackson was hired in 2004 as an Assistant Professor and has already secured two NSF grants. His first NSF proposal was for the development of a rapid-scanning ion trap mass spectrometry that works by using intelligent adaptation of the instrument control software. He has also received a National Science Foundation CAREER Award, which starts in May 2008, to construct a portable mass spectrometer. Glen also was invited to participate in a recent Oxford Roundtable Oxford Roundtable on Criminal Law and Justice in 2007, and has taught workshops on forensic applications of mass spectrometry at educational conferences for practicing forensic professionals. CICI directly supported the research activities of Prof. Jackson in several ways: 1) through investing in his original start-up funds, 2) through investing in research challenge awards, and 3) through matching funds totaling more than $10,000 for the acquisition of state-of-the art instrumentation. The instruments supported with CICI funding have benefited both graduate research and undergraduate research and teaching missions.

Hao Chen was hired in 2007 as an Assistant Professor. His specialization is in mass spectrometry. Hao is investigating desorption electrospray ionization (DESI) for selective biomolecule detection using novel gas phase ion chemistry. Hao will investigate chiral recognition, reaction mechanism elucidation, and chemical modification of nanomaterials and surfaces. Hao also works on proteomics using novel ambient ionization methods for neutral peptide fragments. Hao also will develop protein footprinting methods to study protein-protein interactions using novel laser-generated oxidative probes. Hao also has benefited from the Research Challenge matches offered by CICI and a contribution to his start-up costs.

**CICI Benchmarks**

The numbers of peer-reviewed publications are given for the CICI members by year in Table 1. In 2003, the departmental average number of published papers per faculty member that were not members of CICI was 1.3 and if the other analytical faculty (Dewald and Malinski) are removed the departmental average is 0.7. The impact of the loss of Analytical/Forensic faculty is apparent in Table 1, as well as the trajectory of the junior faculty coming up to speed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrington</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCord</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External funding in thousands of dollars is given in Table 2.

Table 2. External Funds with Cost Recovery Contributing to CICI in Dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrington</td>
<td>$98,000</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$48,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
<td>$233,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCord</td>
<td>$336,000</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexeev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$568,000</td>
<td>$832,000</td>
<td>$259,000</td>
<td>$48,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Departmental average in 2003 was $132,000 per faculty member and with the Analytical faculty excluded the average was $108,000 per faculty member. For the Department 2003 was a good funding year.

CICI expenditures are given from the Oracle ledger in Table 3. The year 2002 was only available on microfiche because it predated the Oracle system. Many of the costs were mislabeled, for example Foreign Travel charges appear under domestic travel and entertainment under travel. CICI traditional used funds to support graduate student and faculty travel to scientific conferences.

In the past, graduate students had been supported by CICI when their contracts fell between funding cycles. In 2005, CICI used funds to support graduate students for extenuating circumstances. During this period, the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry had admitted more graduate students into their program then it was possible to support. The budget deficit was so large that the Department had to renege on some of the offer letters. CICI funds were used to offset this huge deficit even though only a few analytical/forensic offers were made. Supplies and equipment were used in part as Research Challenge matches or faculty start-up contributions.

In 2006, CICI contributed to the $21,000 service contract required to move the MALDI-MS (Mass Spectrometer) from the R-Tech building to Clippinger and revive this instrument.

Foreign travel is used to support partially funded Plenary and Invited speakers to conferences. In 2007, this expenditure was the largest. It supported Glen's invitation to the Oxford Roundtable and included the costs of Pete (Invited for two sessions) and Glen who were both invited speakers at The 33rd Meeting of the
Federation of Analytical Chemistry and Spectroscopy Societies (FACSS-2006) in Orlando, FL. The foreign travel appears to be mixed in with domestic travel. In addition, some of the costs helped pay for Pete’s first meeting to organize the International Forensic Science Educational Consortium in China. CICI picked up the tab of the College of Arts and Sciences when the travel funds were empty and the College could not honor its commitment. It also covered part of Pete’s travel costs to the International Symposium on Analysis and Detection of Explosives, Paris, France in 2007.

One other interesting cost that CICI covered was travel for Pete and Glen to pick up a broken MALDI-MS instrument from the National Institutes of Health and move it to OHIO where Glen successfully, with CICI’s help, traded this instrument with other nonfunctioning mass spectrometers in the Department for a refurbished isotope ratio mass spectrometer (IR-MS). Methods using this unique instrument are rapidly emerging as tools for individualization for Forensic Chemists. OHIO is the only forensic chemistry program in the US that posses such an instrument. The IR-MS will also contribute to the undergraduate teaching mission of the department; a laboratory session will be devoted to this instrument/method in CHEM 487B (Forensic chemistry laboratory) later in the spring quarter.

Pete was a Plenary Speaker in Lake Balaton, Hungary in 2006 at the Symposium on Computer Applications and Chemometrics in Analytical Chemistry and a Plenary Speaker in Aguas de Lindol, Brazil at the Chemometrics in Analytical Chemistry Conference. This cost also included a trip to Honolulu, Hawaii for Pete to present as an invited speaker at the International Symposium on Ion Mobility Spectrometry in 2006.

Table 3. Detailed List of CICI Expenditures by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$4,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Comp</td>
<td>$216</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Supplies</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Supplies</td>
<td>$207</td>
<td>$3,479</td>
<td>$2,964</td>
<td>$142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$7,193</td>
<td>$9,667</td>
<td>$3,014</td>
<td>$6,790</td>
<td>$16,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Travel</td>
<td>$3,549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Registration</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$1,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>$388</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Repairs</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2007, we have enacted a new policy that limits CICI contributions to faculty travel to $1,500 per year for each faculty member. As a Center, we decided to try and reserve funding for new instrumentation that can be accessible to OHIO University.

**Students**

A large number of students benefit directly from CICI activities by pursuing undergraduate research in the CICI research groups. A greater number benefit indirectly because CICI members have been investigators on a large number of instruments that are used in the undergraduate laboratories. In 2007, CICI members and funds helped obtain an inductively coupled plasma-optical emission instrument that is used in the Department’s laboratories but also is used to support projects in Environmental Science (Prof. Lopez) and Civil Engineering (Prof. Mitchell). CICI faculty also assisted in the acquisition of a near infrared spectrometer and digital microscopes. Table 4 gives the students involved in CICI projects by year with the designation of u for undergraduate, g for graduate students, and p for visiting scholars and post-doctorates.

**Table 4. Number of CICI Undergraduate (u) and Graduate Students (g) and Visitors (p).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCord</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexeev</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2005, Pete had a visiting student from France work in his group for the summer and in 2005 he had a visiting student from Leipzig work in his group for 6 months. In 2008, he has a visiting professor from Norway and a graduate student from Germany and Hao has a visiting professor from China. CICI has a very global and international nature and reputation.

During the past 5 years, Pete has graduated 2 MS and 6 PhD students from his group. One MS student works for the Drug Enforcement Agency and the other is pursuing a PhD in chemical engineering. His PhD students have all been promoted to senior scientist status within a year or two of employment. They all work in the
US and were directly after or during completing their doctorate. The students are employed by pharmaceutical firms, such as Amgen, Noven, and Aptult, homeland security laboratories such as Battelle, General Dynamics, and Draper laboratories. The education and experience that the students receive on CICI projects prepares them well for a future career in the sciences. Many of the undergraduates have gone onto receive or earn doctorates from schools such as John Hopkins, Illinois, and Rochester Universities.

**Future Activities**
The interests of the CICI members are highly complementary and synergistic. Hao is an expert in reaction chemistry and ionization methods for ionizing specific analytes in complex or challenging media. Ionization is the first, and most important step for mass analysis (and subsequent chemical identification). For example, he has developed methods for ionizing and detecting amphetamine on solid surfaces, and important biological markers in urine and solid surfaces. Glen specializes in the development of mass spectrometric instrumentation, and more specifically on making the instruments operating more quickly and in miniaturized forms. Pete specializes in data collection and manipulation, especially in pattern recognition and making comparisons between different sets of data. Together, these faculty members have expertise spanning every aspect of mass spectrometers and ion mobility spectrometers, and have several collaborations underway to optimize their synergistic activities.

Glen and Pete are currently collaborating on a project involving the fast separation and mass-spectrometric detection of jet fuels. They are planning a collaboration to interface an ion mobility drift tube to a miniature mass spectrometer (as part of Jackson’s NSF CAREER award). Jackson and Chen are currently collaborating on a project involving the ionization and analysis of ionic liquids—a novel class of solvents that has received a lot of media attention in recent years. Jackson has submitted two invention disclosures since starting at OHIO, and each disclosure is being pursued by OHIO for patent submission.

CICI would like to develop business partnerships to assist nascent technologies developing in OHIO. Professor Harrington has participated in several SBIRs and CICI previously worked on a special project subcontracted by Battelle. Professor Jackson is presently working with a company for the development of its miniature ion trap mass spectrometer, and has recently been elected to the Research Advisory Board of a fast growing biotechnology company called Protea Biosciences.

**Funding Commitments and Needs**
CICI has succeeded without any additional requests for university or internal support, other than indirect cost recovery. CICI is currently up to its largest enrollment since the departures of Gary, Bruce, and Howard. CICI is working with
the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry to add at least one more new hire with a research interest that will complement the current members of CICI. CICI will continue to seek out major funding from the State of Ohio and the federal government. CICI will play an important role in attracting the best undergraduate and graduate forensic/analytical students to OHIO. In addition, it provides a framework for research and faculty in the Analytical/Forensic Division in the Department. The activities of CICI will be important for retaining our most productive faculty, help with initiating the MS program in Forensic Chemistry, and help the Department maintain state-of-the-art instrumentation that is required to remain competitive in the modern era or University Research.

With Glen's substantial funding, CICI should be receiving $70,000 in overhead return from him alone in the next 3-years. Pete is expecting funding from the second half of 2008 from the US Air Force, US Department of Agriculture, and the National Institutes of Health.

CICI will be important for filling a new staffing line that will be funded by the return on the fee-based MS program in Forensic Chemistry. Once our new hires have become established, CICI will provide the framework for large center based grants targeting Homeland Security and Forensic Science applications. Pete and Hao are presently working on a proposal for forensic sampling by mass spectrometry using selective DESI.
DATE: September 17, 2008

TO: Kathy Krendl, Executive Vice President & Provost

FROM: Rathindra Bose, Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate College

SUBJECT: Review of Centers and Institutes – 2008

Four Centers and Institutes are up for five-year reviews during the 2007-2008 academic year. The attached report includes a brief summary for each Center. I 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 October meeting.

1. Scripps Survey Research Center – Continue
2. Center for Intelligent Chemical Instrumentation – Continue
3. Institute for Democracy in Education – Postpone review until 2010, as per request by the Dean
4. Center for Intelligent, Distributed, and Dependable Systems – Continue

RNB:cmc

cc. Tom Davis, Secretary to the Board of Trustees
Activity Report for the Period 2003-2007
Center for Intelligent, Distributed and Dependable Systems (CIDDS)

Director: Lonnie Welch, School of EECS, College of Engineering and Technology
Assistant Director: Chang Liu, School of EECS, College of Engineering and Technology

Active Faculty
Prof. Razvan Bunescu, School of EECS, College of Engineering and Technology
Prof. Frank Drews, School of EECS, College of Engineering and Technology
Prof. Klaus Ecker, School of EECS, College of Engineering and Technology
Prof. David Juedes, School of EECS, College of Engineering and Technology
Prof. Avinash Kodi, School of EECS, College of Engineering and Technology
Prof. Jundong Liu, School of EECS, College of Engineering and Technology

Brief Mission or Goal Statement
Conduct basic and applied research in selected areas of information technology. Our objectives include technology transition and commercialization of research products.

Brief History
Information Technology (IT) is one of the primary enabling technologies for knowledge discovery and economic growth. The School of EECS is well positioned to address the challenges and to exploit the opportunities within the growing field of IT. The EECS Laboratory for Intelligent, Real-Time, Secure Systems and the Internet Research Group have significant research accomplishments in the IT areas of distributed computing, real-time and control systems, artificial intelligence, computer vision, and information security. In 2003, the laboratories united to form the Center for Intelligent, Distributed and Dependable Systems (CIDDS). Since its creation, the center has distinguished itself in the areas of bioinformatics, medical image analysis, high performance computing, and learning technologies. CIDDS affiliates have earned ~$4.3M in external funding and 138 scholarly publications, with an average of $851,800/year and 28 publications/year.

Summary of Plans for the Next Five Years
We desire to double our research productivity. To accomplish this we need a PhD program in EECS, five computer science faculty positions, a graduate research assistant for each CIDDS-affiliated faculty member, and administrative assistance. It is proposed to rename the center as the Center for Scientific Computing and Learning Technologies, to reflect the research foci of the center.

Table 1. Summary of funding received by the center during the previous five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>$4,259,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>$607,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$4,866,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Mission/Goal Statement

1) Perform basic research in selected areas of information technology, resulting in algorithms, mathematical models, theories and software prototype systems.
2) Perform the applied research necessary to make basic research results useful in real-world contexts; our objectives include technology transition and commercialization of research products.
3) Form partnerships for development of the information technology industry in southeast Ohio.
4) Enhance the ranking of Ohio University in information technology research.
5) Provide enhanced educational experiences to students by involving them in the discovery of knowledge.

CIDDS is a computer science research center that performs basic and applied research. The center is known for its accomplishments in several areas:
- bioinformatics: design of computer algorithms to analyze biological data, and discovery of information in genomes,
- medical image analysis: techniques for understanding biomedical image data,
- high performance computing: use of supercomputers to solve complex problems, and
- learning technologies: information technology to support teaching and learning.

Figure 1. The CIDDS research model.
The primary objective of CIDDS is to perform basic and applied research that results in new knowledge. As shown in Figure 1, the theory and practice of our discipline are impacted when we produce new knowledge. The new theoretical and practical knowledge are incorporated into our undergraduate and graduate training activities. The effect of all of these activities is prominence, which includes recognized domain expertise and renowned programs.

III. Current Activities and Status

With the prudent use of Ohio University investments, CIDDS faculty have been successful in accomplishing the center's primary objective. CIDDS affiliates have earned ~$4.3M in external funding and 138 scholarly publications, with an average of $851,800/year and 28 publications/year (for details see Appendix A (funding) and Appendix B (publications)). A few of our specific accomplishments are highlighted in the remainder of this section.

- **bioinformatics** (Professors Welch, Ecker, Drews, Juedes and Bunescu; 10 graduate students and 2 undergraduate students):
  - novel algorithms and methods for analysis of genomic and proteomic data
  - incorporation of the algorithms into web-based software tools
  - use of the software tools in
    - cancer, diabetes and influenza research
    - agricultural research
  - establishment of a comprehensive bioinformatics curriculum at Ohio University
  - receipt of base funding for bioinformatics from the Ohio University GERB program
  - creation of the Ohio Collaborative Conference for Bioinformatics
  - development of a statewide initiative— the Ohio Bioinformatics Consortium
  - statewide recognition for bioinformatics research and curriculum
  - internal collaboration with the Biomedical Engineering Program, the Molecular and Cellular Biology Program, Edison Biotechnology Institute, the Genomics Facility, the Department of Environmental and Plant Biology, and the Department of Biological Sciences
  - external collaboration with researchers at the National Human Genome Research Institute (NHGRI), Centers for Disease Control, Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, OSU, and BGSU

- **medical image analysis** (Professor J. Liu; 3 graduate students):
  - new algorithms for analysis of MR and CT-scan images
  - brain analysis software tool, sATK (short for Subcortical Analysis Toolkit), used for identifying tumors
  - national recognition— sATK used by researchers at the University of Kentucky and Vanderbilt University

- **high performance computing** (Professors Welch, Ecker, Drews, Juedes and Kodi; 5 graduate students):
- developed algorithms and software (middleware) for dynamic resource management of real-time mission-critical systems
- national and international recognition of middleware
- NASA, Navy and DARPA funding
- patents
- built a bioinformatics cluster computer at Ohio University
- collaboration with the Ohio Supercomputer Center to lead in developing a statewide bioinformatics computing infrastructure and curriculum

- **learning technologies** (Professor C. Liu; 10 graduate students):
  - STEAM project
    - innovative use of technology to teach middle school science
    - 8 graduate students per year
    - NSF-funded
  - VITAL lab
    - creative use of interactive digital technology for teaching and learning
    - recognized expertise nationally

IV. Planned Future Activity

Over the past five years, CIDDS faculty developed research foci that unite the aforementioned areas. It is proposed to **rename CIDDS as the Center for Scientific Computing and Learning Technologies**, to more accurately describe the research.

With this new identity, we desire to accomplish the following objectives:

- **bioinformatics**:
  - develop new computational models of genomes
  - develop algorithms that incorporate new discoveries in genomics
  - incorporate new models and algorithms into software tools
  - discover previously unknown functional elements of genomes
  - discover genetic causes of diseases
  - make discoveries that improve the field of agriculture
  - continue to enhance bioinformatics curriculum and research infrastructure at Ohio University
  - continue to lead in developing a statewide bioinformatics initiative
  - achieve national recognition for bioinformatics research
  - obtain state and federal funding for bioinformatics research

- **medical image analysis**:
  - continue research in brain structure analysis
  - carry out research in diffusion tensor imaging (DTI), a new imaging technique that can be used to evaluate white matter in the human brain
  - develop a new DT-MRI analysis tool
  - algorithm and mathematical model development
  - software tool development
- employ software for studying neurodegenerative diseases including Alzheimer's Disease (AD), Parkinson's Disease (PD) and Multiple Sclerosis (MS)
- make software tools available via the NIH Neuroimaging Informatics Tools and Resources Clearinghouse
- strengthen and extend research partnerships (the MRISC of University of Kentucky, Vanderbilt University Imaging Science Institute, and premier medical research institutions in Ohio)
- obtain NIH funding

- **high performance computing:**
  - national and international recognition of high performance bioinformatics software
  - continue to enhance the Ohio University bioinformatics computing infrastructure
  - continue collaboration with the Ohio Supercomputer Center to provide a statewide bioinformatics computing infrastructure and curriculum
  - design power-aware and performance-adaptive reconfigurable optical interconnects for inter-chip, board-to-board communication
  - develop energy and area-efficient network-on-chips (NoCs) using circuit and architectural techniques for chip multiprocessors (CMPs)
  - develop multi-domain (electrical, optical, wireless) tools and simulation methodologies for high-performance computing
  - obtain state and federal research funding

- **machine learning and natural language processing:**
  - create systems that can be trained with a minimal amount of human supervision
  - automatically extract structured knowledge from
    - vast textual repositories such as Medline and the World Wide Web
    - genomes

- **learning technologies:**
  - build a national and international reputation of excellence in research and development of immersive, interactive, and engaging learning technologies
  - obtain sufficient amount of external funding to sustain our current staffing level
  - strengthen our multidisciplinary team of researchers and promote interdisciplinary collaborations
  - attract new researchers from around the campus to join our team and provide concrete support to improve their chances of initial successes with their VITAL projects
  - establish an organizational structure and a reward system that support and reward scholarly activities and proposal writing
V. Funding Commitments and Needs

When CIDDS was established in 2002, five CS faculty positions and five years of start-up funding were requested. Unfortunately, between 2002 and 2007, the number of CS faculty positions was reduced by one! Promised start-up funding from the Vice President for Research was also reduced significantly, due to Ohio University budgetary crises. A PhD program in Computer Science was also urgently requested in the CIDDS proposal; this program still does not exist. Despite these disappointments, CIDDS faculty have been successful in attracting sponsored research projects and in producing a significant number of publications. The research culture created by CIDDS has resulted in a higher-than-average productivity of CIDDS-affiliated faculty members. Clearly the investment in CIDDS has paid substantial dividends, primarily the achievement of national prominence of Ohio University’s Computer Science program.

Given the constraints, the first five years of CIDDS was a success. This success could be multiplied by at least a factor of two, if the university invests to remove several limiting factors. Specifically, we recommend that the university

- expand the EE PhD program into an EECS PhD program
- provide each CIDDS faculty member with a permanent Research Assistant
- hire CS faculty in each of the following areas:
  - bioinformatics: 2 faculty positions
  - medical image analysis: 1 faculty position
  - high performance computing: 1 faculty position
  - learning technologies: 1 faculty position
- provide assistance in account management, grant writing and web development
- continue to provide 25% release time to the Director and Assistant Director

We have proven our ability to perform basic and applied research, to achieve national prominence, and to establish impressive metrics in areas such as funding and publication. All of this was accomplished in spite of not receiving the needed Computer Science faculty positions, the resources promised by the VPR, or the CS PhD program. Thus, it is requested to not only continue the operation of the center, but to empower the center with the requested investments in order to provide the faculty, student and staff resources necessary to exceed the $1.5M/year mark, to increase self-sustainability, and to surpass the 50 publications/year goal.
### Appendix A. Funding Received by the Center During the Previous Five Years

#### Table 2. Bioinformatics projects—external funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Principal Investigator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Toledo</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>Collaborative Conferences on Bioinformatics</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genologics Inc.</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>Collaborative Conferences on Bioinformatics</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Collaborative Conferences on Bioinformatics</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State University</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Collaborative Conferences on Bioinformatics</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Collaborative Conferences on Bioinformatics</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University Research Office</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Collaborative Conferences on Bioinformatics</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Department of Development</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Collaborative Conferences on Bioinformatics</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University College of Mathematics &amp; Physical Sciences</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Collaborative Conferences on Bioinformatics</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Department of Development</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Collaborative Conferences on Bioinformatics</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$67,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Research Office</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Collaborative Conferences on Bioinformatics</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison Biotechnology Institute</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>Collaborative Conferences on Bioinformatics</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University 1804 Fund Program</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>Bringing Together the Cell and the Computer</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARHI Diabetes Research Initiative</td>
<td>$9,600</td>
<td>The effect of obesity and diabetes on protein expression in adipose tissue</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Graduate Education and Research Board</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
<td>Bioinformatics Initiative</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Research Priorities</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Bioinformatics Initiative</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Research Priorities</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Bioinformatics Initiative</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Research, Ohio U.</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>Medical Image Analysis</td>
<td>Jindong Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$375,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Medical image analysis projects -- external funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Principal Investigator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>$21,308</td>
<td>Brain Growth through Intensity Learning</td>
<td>Jindong Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>$13,808</td>
<td>Registration Techniques for Deformation-Based Morphometry</td>
<td>Jindong Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>Advanced Image Segmentation and Registration</td>
<td>Jindong Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$61,100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Medical image analysis projects – internal funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Principal Investigator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Research, Ohio U.</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>Medical Image Analysis</td>
<td>Jindong Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. High performance computing - external funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Principal Investigator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naval Sea System Command (NAVSEA)</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Support of the Navy Open Computing Architecture</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>$290,751</td>
<td>Integrated Network-Based Ohio University Network Detective Service</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>Open Experimental Platform for Adaptive Reflective Middleware Systems</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency</td>
<td>$476,430</td>
<td>Distributed Scheduling Aspects for Time-Critical Targeting</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency</td>
<td>$199,859</td>
<td>Support of NSWC HiPer-D Requirements via Enhancement of RM and Quo for Cooperative Operation - Phase II</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARPA PCES</td>
<td>$330,162</td>
<td>Distributed Scheduling Aspects for Time Critical Targeting</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,191,800</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Learning technologies projects - external funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Principal Investigator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Learning Network</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Ohio University Second Life Professional Learning Community</td>
<td>Chang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Learning Network</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>Appalachian Ohio K-12 Second Life Professional Learning Community</td>
<td>Chang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Learning Network</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>Appalachian Ohio K-12 Professional Learning Community (Phase II)</td>
<td>Chang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Learning Network</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Supplements to Second Life Professional Learning Community</td>
<td>Chang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton Review</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Princeton Review Second Life Outreach Project</td>
<td>Chang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filene Research Institute</td>
<td>$21,772</td>
<td>Teenager Financial Education</td>
<td>Chang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Technology Service</td>
<td>$53,856</td>
<td>Teen Grid Education Partnership</td>
<td>Chang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) P3 (People, Prosperity, and the Planet) Grant Program</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>&quot;Improving Environmental Awareness of Water, Waste, and Land Issues in Appalachian Ohio (WWL Ohio) through a High School Student Contest of Computer-Simulated Environmental Models&quot;</td>
<td>Chang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation (NSF)</td>
<td>$1,679,396</td>
<td>Track 1, GK-12: Science and Technology Enrichment for Appalachian Middle-schoolers (STEAM).</td>
<td>Chang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Learning Network (OLN)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Second Life as Pedagogical Tool for Improving Statistics Homework Sessions</td>
<td>Chang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Commission on Minority Health</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>Minority Health Month</td>
<td>Chang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Projects Grant, ACM SIGCSP</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Facilitating Curriculum Material Adoption Using 3-D Virtual Collaboration Environments,&quot;</td>
<td>Chang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation (NSF)</td>
<td>$74,999</td>
<td>CCLI-A&amp;I: Sustained Service Learning Projects in Software Engineering Project Courses</td>
<td>Chang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eTech Ohio</td>
<td>$960</td>
<td>Reaching Out-of State Audience via the Second Life 3-D Online Virtual World</td>
<td>Chang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,939,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8. Learning technologies projects - internal funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Principal Investigator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University 1804 Undergraduate Learning Fund Program</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>A Pilot Service Learning Project in Engineering</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University 1804 Undergraduate Learning Fund Program</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>Teacher Evaluation in Active Learning Courses</td>
<td>Lonnie R. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Office of University Partnerships</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Partnerships in Virtual Worlds</td>
<td>Chang Liu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9. Ohio University startup funding for Assistant Director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School of EECS</th>
<th>VP for Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 and thereafter</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Ohio University startup funding for Administrative Assistant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VP for Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6 and thereafter</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Ohio University startup funding for travel to seek new funding sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School of EECS</th>
<th>VP for Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6 and thereafter</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Plan for phase-in of indirect cost return to the center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Indirect Cost Return to the Center</th>
<th>Indirect Cost Return to the VP for Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6 and thereafter</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. Publications by the Center-affiliated Faculty During the Previous Five Years

2007


[10] En Ye, Chang Liu, and Jennifer A. Polaek-Wahl, “Enhancing Software Engineering Education Using Teaching Aids in 3-D Online Virtual Worlds,” In...


2006


[4] V. Young, C. Liu, "Student and Faculty Attitudes Towards Classroom Use of Tablet PCs," The 2006 Annual Meeting of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers (AIChE), November 12-17, 2006, San Francisco, California.


2004


September 17, 2008

Dr. Rathindra Bose, Vice President for Research and Creativity
120 RTEC
Ohio University
Athens OH 45701

Dear Dr. Bose:

The Center for Intelligent, Distributed, and Dependable Software (CIDDS) has completed its first five-year review and submitted it to the Russ College of Engineering and Technology. I am pleased to endorse the review and submit it for your consideration.

Dr. Lonnie Welch, CIDDS Director, prepared the center's self-study document. The self-study was reviewed by a committee chaired by Dr. Betty Sindelar, Department of Physical Therapy, and which included Dr. Sarah Wyatt, Department of Environmental and Plant Biology, and Dr. Jerry Shoup, Pennsylvania State University – Harrisburg campus. The self-study and review committee report are attached.

The center, started in 2003, has been very active in the areas of software research and teaching. The initial center activities revolved around high performance computing. Recently, however, center faculty expanded their research into the areas of bioinformatics and interactive virtual environments. These new areas of research have opened new and exciting areas that emphasize multi-disciplinary research on the Ohio University campus and across the University System of Ohio. Especially noteworthy is the center's role in Ohio University being selected to receive one of the first Choose Ohio First Scholarship Program awards for the statewide bioinformatics network.

The review committee has also recommended and I support the development of strategic plans to aid the center's future growth. The review committee recommendation that the center add more faculty from across campus, increase the number of graduate assistantships, and add administrative assistants through research funding, indirect cost return, and some institutional support is also endorsed.

In summary, I recommend that the Center for Intelligent, Distributed, and Dependable Software be authorized to continue its operation.

Sincerely,

Dennis Irwin
Dean, Russ College of Engineering and Technology

Xc: James Rankin, Associate Dean
Shawn Ostermann
Lonnie Welch
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW OF THE
CENTER FOR INTELLIGENT, DISTRIBUTED AND DEPENDABLE SYSTEMS (CIDDS)

September 15, 2008

Review Committee:
Betty Sindelar, Chair
Jerry Shoup
Sarah Wyatt
Executive Summary

The Center for Intelligent, Distributed and Dependable Systems has provided a venue for faculty to participate in basic and applied research in the areas of information technology. As for any center, both teaching and research activities have been accomplished over the five years of the review period. Multiple graduate students (masters and doctoral levels) have been involved within the research labs of core faculty. The Center began the Ohio Collaborative Conference on Bioinformatics, thereby bringing statewide recognition to the program. Center faculty members have acquired funding, both internal and external, and disseminated information through conference presentations and publications. The Review Committee believes that the future growth of the Center would benefit from university support as delineated below and from the following changes within the Center:

Recommendations

1. the immediate addition of an administrative assistant through institutional support

2. the continuation of the 25% release time for the Center’s Director and Assistant Director

3. the development of a PhD computer science program or tract in EECS

4. the generation of documents or policies to aid in the future expansion of the Center. These items would include fiscal accountability, Center membership, mentoring for members, and strategic planning. The Review Committee urges the Center to seriously consider the expansion of the Center faculty to include other disciplines housed at OU.

5. the acquisition of graduate student research assistantships (GA). It is our opinion that the financial responsibility for these positions should be shared between the university and the Center.

The Center has provided a collaborative environment where faculty members with similar interests can find resources and support. It has served the University well and should be continued. In the opinion of the Review Committee, future fiscal responsibilities and faculty positions should be shared between the University and the Center based on its funding successes.
Evaluation of Current Viability of Center

The Center seems to be a viable and productive group of eight faculty from EECS. They have been particularly productive in Bioinformatics and Medical Imaging. They have produced over 100 presentations at meetings/workshops, roughly 8 book chapters (4 for the same book), and 16 manuscripts in the five years. Half of the journal manuscripts were published in 2007, which indicates a good completion of projects as they move from presentation to full publication stage. In addition, there is a progression of publications in more prestigious journals over the years.

The faculty has been very active in presenting at symposia and conferences over the review period which leads to peer interaction, to staying current in the field, and to promotion of the OU program.

The faculty also has been productive in gaining funding, both internal and external. They have received a little over $4.2 million in external funding and $600,000 in internal funding. Most of the projects have been collaborative in nature and include co-investigators from the Center.

The Center was instrumental in starting the Ohio Collaborative Conference on Bioinformatics and in bringing statewide recognition to Ohio University for its work in bioinformatics.

The teaching mission of the Center has been accomplished through the mentoring of masters and doctoral students on research projects. Over the five years of the review, information from the CIDDS Director indicates that about 0.5 PhD students and 1.2 masters level students graduated per year.

Concerns: The Review Committee was unable to assess how the research dollars especially the indirects were used to develop and expand the Center over the last five years. A clear financial plan was not evident. Also the collaborative nature of the Center was not well detailed. The Review Committee could not clearly see how the Center advanced the individual's agenda beyond what each person could accomplish.

Evaluation of Potential Future Viability

Based on the past record of activity, the Review Committee believes that the future viability of the Center is good. Members of the Center have demonstrated past ability to obtain internal and external funding. There is no reason to expect that this trend will not continue.

Plans to expand into a PhD computer science program in EECS will certainly address expanding student learning opportunities connected to the Center. The infusion of more doctoral students into the research labs of Center faculty will aid the growth of future work capabilities. Increasing the number of graduate research assistants (GA) would help attract and retain high quality graduate students to the program. The Review Committee would caution against converting too many graduate teaching assistantships (TA) to GAs resulting in the dilution of the GAs ability to help in the research environment. While the Review Committee supports the addition of GAs for the Center, we also support the concept that a percentage of the GA financial consideration should be borne by external funding generated by the Center.
Given the daunting agenda proposed for the future, additional resources will be needed for the Center especially in the area of administrative assistance. The Review Committee would recommend that the Center be provided with an assistant at this point in time and then develop a plan with the University to phase in another assistant as external funding and student enrollments increase. The Review Committee would also strongly support the continuation of the 25% release time for the Center’s Director and Assistant Director.

Concerns: The Center has requested the addition of 5 new faculty members with no time-line for this process. In addition, the justification for such a large influx of new faculty lines was not well established within the documentation presented to this Review Committee. The stance of the Review Committee on this matter is that further dialogue on this issue is needed between the home department and the Center. Need and financial responsibility from the Center should be considered in this process.

Evaluation of Current and Future Funding Strategies

The Center has delineated a good track-record of acquiring internal and external funds for research. However, only 3 out of the 8 active faculty members are listed as obtaining these funds. The Review Committee would encourage the Center to develop a mechanism to assist in the mentoring of less successful members so that more grants across the group can be achieved in the future.

The Center has proposed a very ambitious future agenda that encompasses a very wide scope of interests and areas that don’t necessarily overlap or intertwine. The Review Committee would recommend prioritizing the presented list to maximize the resources available at the Center and to focus in on the specific needs for future growth. An agenda that targets specific types of grants and granting agencies could also help to provide structure and focus as the Center expands in the future.

Further, several of the proposed areas of study do not seem to fall within the expertise of the current faculty of the Center. To this end, the Review Committee would strongly support the expansion of the core faculty to include members from outside of the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science. Expanding across disciplines within the core faculty will also help to better position the Center for external grant competition in this day of multi-disciplinary research. To maintain a level of quality and productivity, the Review Committee would recommend the development of criteria for admission to and retention in the Center.

Recommendations

The Review Committee strongly recommends that the Center be continued. In addition, we support the following:

1. the immediate addition of an administrative assistant through institutional support

2. the continuation of the 25% release time for the Center’s Director and Assistant Director
3. the development of a PhD computer science program or tract in EECS

4. the generation of documents or policies to aid in the future expansion of the Center. These items would include fiscal accountability, Center membership, mentoring of members, and strategic planning. The Review Committee urges the Center to seriously consider the expansion of the Center faculty to include other disciplines housed at OU.

5. the acquisition of graduate student research assistantships (GA). It is our opinion that the financial responsibility for these positions should be shared between the institution and the Center.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>MIDDLE NAME</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>YEAR OF AWARD</th>
<th>YEARS OF SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leona</td>
<td>&quot;Lee&quot;</td>
<td>Cibrowski</td>
<td>Associate Dean Emerita</td>
<td>College of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>Diggle</td>
<td>Associate Director Emeritus, Avionics Engineering Center</td>
<td>Russ College of Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Administrator Emerita, Student Services Office</td>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>R.</td>
<td>Gilmore</td>
<td>Executive Director Emeritus, Division Campus Recreation</td>
<td>College of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>&quot;Margy&quot;</td>
<td>Goodwin</td>
<td>Assistant Dean Emerita, Student Services</td>
<td>College of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Kohn</td>
<td>Distinguished Senior Research Scientist Emeritus, Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>College of Osteopathic Medicine</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td></td>
<td>Witkowski</td>
<td>Assistant Dean Emerita, Budget and Administration</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combined Years of Service:** 156
DATE: September 16, 2008

TO: Roderick McDavis, President

FROM: Martin T. Tuck, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Recommendations for Emeriti Status

On behalf of Provost Kathy Krendl, I am pleased to recommend emeriti status for the individuals whose nominations are attached. They have rendered dedicated service to Ohio University in a variety of departments and disciplines and have the support of their respective deans and chairs or directors.

Should you concur with our recommendations; the names of the nominees will be submitted to the Board of Trustees at their October meeting.
Quarters to Semesters

http://www.ohio.edu/provost/upload/Q2S-Transition-Team-Charge-Draft-Timeline.pdf


## Composition of the Q2S Transition Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team Members</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Faculty, Co-chair</td>
<td>Thomas Carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dean, Co-chair</td>
<td>David Descutner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 UCC Representative</td>
<td>David Thomas*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chair/Director Representative</td>
<td>Connie Esmond-Kiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Sergio Lopez*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Faculty Senate Executive Committee</td>
<td>Tracy Leinbaugh*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Faculty Senate Executive Committee</td>
<td>Jeremy Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Faculty Senate Executive Committee</td>
<td>Geoff Buckley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Faculty at-large (regional campus)</td>
<td>Pam Sealover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Executive Staff/Vice President</td>
<td>Brice Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Associate/Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Tom Scanlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Administrative Senate</td>
<td>Brenda Noftz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Classified Senate</td>
<td>George Cheripko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Graduate Student Senate</td>
<td>Pete Wickman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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Quarters to Semesters Conversion: Assumptions, Constraints, and Principles

In developing a blueprint for its semester transition, Ohio University can draw on a body of documentation and analysis related to planning and implementing a successful academic system transition. The assumptions, constraints, and principles in this document draw on work done in 2006-2007 by Ohio University faculty, staff, and students who served on the Academic Calendar and Systems Committee, along with reports and plans produced by universities that have completed or are in the process of undertaking a change to semesters.

The conversion from quarters to semesters should be understood in light of three general assumptions:

1. The conversion should be viewed as an opportunity to engage in a comprehensive review and revision of the curriculum.
2. The conversion should be neutral in terms of the size and structure of the curriculum and the resources needed to deliver that curriculum to the same number of students.
3. The conversion's success, given the interrelated character of the curriculum and specific program requirements, depends on departments/schools consulting with one another in a coordinated way to ensure that their curricular revisions do not adversely affect the resources of another academic unit.

The tension between the first assumption's call for curricular review and revision and the second assumption's requirement of neutrality in curricular size, structure, and resources can be resolved if departments/schools adhere to the constraints and principles identified below and if they adopt the coordinated approach outlined in the third assumption.

The conversion task is to take the overall curriculum needed to complete a degree and divide it into two units (semesters) per year instead of three (quarters). The conversion should be neutral at the aggregate level. Since an increase in base funding will not accompany the conversion to semesters, the conversion will require a series of constraints and principles that will set limits on how departments/schools and colleges convert the curriculum and how they staff sections so that the curriculum can be delivered with the same aggregate number of faculty to the same number of students.

Conversion Constraints

Constraint 1 – Conversion in place by Fall 2012

Given recommendations made by universities that have completed a conversion to semesters, the time it will take to review and update the curriculum, and the implementation schedule of our student information system, the fall of the 2012-13 academic year is when the semester system will commence.
**Constraint 2 – Students must not be disadvantaged**

The paramount assumption for the conversion is that it should be neutral, in terms of both cost and time-to-degree completion, for regularly enrolled students pursuing degrees at the time of the conversion.

**Constraint 3 - One Third Reduction**

The FTE definition under quarters is 45 and under semesters it is 30, which means that the conversion ratio for the curriculum must be the same (3 to 2) to create a neutral conversion. While every curricular component will not be evenly divisible by 3, the conversion of the curriculum must meet this one-third reduction at some aggregate level (department/school – college – university).

**Constraint 4 – Same Number of Weeks Per Year**

The amount of time available for instruction during the year should not change. This means that three 10-week quarters should become two 15-week semesters.

**Constraint 5 - Cost – Revenue Neutral**

The conversion should be analyzed in terms of the impact on tuition and subsidy revenues to ensure that negative effects on the budget are minimized. With subsidy currently frozen and the new funding formula under the U50 shifting at least partially away from credit hour production, the degree of loss or gain the university might experience will be difficult to calculate until the new funding formula is in place and its effects can be modeled.

On the cost side, it must be assumed that there will be no additional revenue for hiring additional instructional staff, which means that the curriculum must be redesigned so that the same number of students can move through the curriculum and graduate at the same rate using roughly the current number of faculty.

**Constraint 6— Use 120 SH as the Minimum Number of Hours to Graduate**

The total number of semester hours (SH) to graduate must be proportionally equivalent to the current number of quarter hours (QH) to graduate. If the conversion factor is applied to the total number of hours to graduate, the current 192 hour requirement would become 128.

It is worth noting that a survey of other Ohio semester schools found that the minimum hours to graduate range from 128 (Miami, Akron) to 124 (Shawnee, Toledo, YSU), and from 122 (BGSU) to 121 (KSU) and 120 (CSU).

The conversion would be an opportunity to consider a further reduction in the minimum number of hours to graduate. For example, if the most common credit hours for a course change from the current 4 to 3 under semesters, a student load of 5 courses per semester (15 hours) would result in a total of 120 hours to graduate, which is similar to the current quarter system where a student can take 16 credits each quarter and end up with the 192 hours necessary to graduate. If 128 credits are required to
graduate under semesters, students will need to complete an additional eight hours beyond the “normal” pace of 15 credits per semester by taking some 1, 4, or 5 credit courses at some point over the four years.

As a starting point, the minimum hours to graduate will be assumed to be 120. After the USO finalizes its funding system by the end of 2008, the financial implications of holding to this 120 hour assumption will be evaluated against alternative minimum hour requirements for graduation.

Constraint 7 – Uniform Weekly Schedule

To meet current state efficiency standards for utilization of facilities, three-hour courses should follow a uniform scheduling pattern to make student course registration easier and more predictable. This will mean that the three hour semester courses should be scheduled either:

- MWF for 50 minutes with courses starting on the hour or
- TTH for 80 minutes with courses starting every 1.5 hours beginning at 8:00 am

Conversion Principles

In addition to the above constraints, a set of guiding principles must be adopted if the curriculum is to be successfully converted and those constraints honored. Variables such as the number of credit hours per course, the number of courses within requirement areas (general education, majors, etc), section size, and the number of sections taught by each faculty member are interrelated and must be balanced simultaneously to accomplish a neutral conversion that does not adversely affect resources in another academic unit.

For example, proportionally expanding the number of credits or courses in an area would result in a need to increase faculty loads. Similarly, a proportional decrease in faculty loads could be achieved if the number of credits and/or courses is proportionally decreased. Proportionally increasing one requirement area such as general education or a major would result in a need to redistribute faculty resources from one area to another.

Given the overall assumption of a neutral conversion and the limitations imposed by the constraints required for such a conversion, these variables must be balanced by the academic programs when converting the curriculum. There is no single, correct way to convert a program from quarters to semesters, and so a department/school will have multiple choices to make but must balance those choices to maintain the neutral conversion. The following principles provide guidance for how the different variables will need to be balanced as the curriculum in each program is converted.

Conversion Principle 1– Proportional Conversion of Curricular Components

Within the total hours to graduate, the proportion for various curricular components (majors, concentration areas, minors, general education, etc) should remain as close to neutral as possible.
If a major currently requires 54 hours of major courses, a 30 hour area of concentration, and 15 hours of electives, this would convert to a 36 SH major, a 20 SH area of concentration, and 10 SH of electives. A purely mathematical conversion, to be sure, will more often result in fractions of courses, and curricular integrity might limit which components can be reduced by the 3:2 factors, which can be reduced more, or which must be reduced less. To comply with the principle that a student cannot be required to take more time to graduate, however, the conversion of curricular components must be neutral at the aggregate level. Thus, if some curricular components within the requirements to graduate cannot be fully reduced by one-third, then others will have to be reduced proportionally more to compensate.

In general, a curriculum with 3 QH courses would convert to semesters by repackaging each group of 3 current courses into 2 semester courses. With semesters expanding to 15 weeks, this conversion is contact hour neutral because the conversion is taking the same total content and dividing it in half instead of thirds, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarters</th>
<th>Semesters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a curriculum with 4 QH courses, the most straightforward conversion would be to change to 3 SH courses. This achieves a reduction of 25%, which is short of the required 33%. To achieve the complete reduction, for every 9 courses required under the quarter system the new curriculum would need to be reduced to 8 courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarters</th>
<th>Semesters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This conversion would also be contact hour neutral, which means faculty would have the same amount of time to cover the same material as under the quarter system.

For a curriculum with 5 QH courses, the simplest conversion would be to create 4 SH course units. This would achieve only 20% of the needed 33% reduction, and so an additional reduction by repackaging every 6 courses into 5 would be required to create a contact-hour neutral conversion.
A special reduction case would occur when there is a required three-course sequence. In this case, the reduction could be achieved by keeping the credit hours the same by converting three 10-week courses (30 weeks) into two 15-week courses (still 30 weeks).

Clearly, few curricula fit neatly into these conversion scenarios since they may not have a group of 3 QH courses divisible by 3, 4 QH courses divisible by 9, or 5 QH courses divisible by 6. Or they will have a mixture of courses with 3, 4 and 5 QHs or a mixture of annual sequences and other courses. Converting these curricula, will entail using the methods shown above to combine credit hours and course reductions to create a group of requirements that are neutral with respect to contact hours.

It is also possible that some small majors might not be able to meet exactly the 3:2 reduction, but in that case other majors within the department or college might have to be reduced to compensate. In other words, the conversion should not result in an increase in the proportion of the total hours to graduate devoted to a particular program, department/school or college relative to the other units in the university unless there is a matching shift in faculty resources.

**Conversion Principle 2 — The Majority of Semester Courses Must be 3 Hours**

The survey of semester schools in Ohio shows that the most common course is 3 SH. Currently, 60% of our quarter system curriculum is 4 OH. This suggests that the most logical conversion would be to change our 4 OH courses to 3 SH since that seems to be the typical model and would make the transfer of credit both simpler and aligned with the expectations of the Board of Regents.

It would be possible to keep our courses at 4 credit hours if we were willing to make the corresponding adjustments in faculty workload and major requirements. Using a 4 SH standard would drop the number of courses needed to reach 128 from around 43 with 3 SH courses to 32 with 4 SH courses. This would require an additional reduction of the curriculum into fewer, larger course “packages,” thereby reducing the number of selections and perhaps further constraining the distribution across disciplines and curricular components.

**Conversion Principle 3 — Conversion Should be Faculty Workload Neutral**

Under the conversion, each college would need to develop a workload policy based on a semester system that is approved by the Provost and applies to all groups of faculty (Group 1 through 4 and Early
Retired). Just as there are a variety of workloads under the current quarter system, workloads under the semester system would also vary but should be converted to their equivalents under the quarter system.

**Conversion Principle 4 – The Conversion Should be Neutral with Section Staffing and Seat Availability**

In addition to the conversion of required curriculum components, the number of sections that a department/school must deliver should balance with both the faculty workload and the number of enrollments in the program. As requirements are converted and course content is repackaged into fewer course units, the impact on student demand for electives and service courses in other units will shift. Therefore, departments/schools with a mixture of required major courses and electives or service courses will need to create a course scheduling plan whereby the annual sections offered matches the available staffing and maintains the instructional capacity to handle the student enrollment in the various program components. This will require the department/school to make choices with respect to the frequency of course offerings, the balance between the number of required and elective courses, section size, and the workload of faculty. As one of these elements is changed, the other must be adjusted to allow the annual sections offered to be staffed with existing faculty resources and to satisfy the student demand so that student graduation is not delayed.
Special Case: Conversion of General Education Requirements

Since components of Tier I are single courses that are currently 4 OH or 5 OH, there is no exact 3:2 (67%) conversion possible. 4 OH courses would need to be converted to 3 SH (a 75% reduction), and 5 OH courses would need to be converted to 4 SH (an 80% reduction) as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>SH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATH 109</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENG 151</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 113</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ENG 151A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 115</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ENG 152</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 117</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENG 153</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 118</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENG 153A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 120</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ENG 153B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 121</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 122</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 147</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 130</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 121</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same would be true of Tier III courses, which are typically 4 OH and so would convert to 3 SH. This means that the Tier I courses will consume a higher proportion of the 128 SH required to graduate than they did under the 192 OH system. To preserve the relative size of general education within the 128 SH, the conversion of Tier II would need to be adjusted. The direct 3:2 conversion of the current 32 OH Tier II requirement would be 21.33 SH which means that it will not be an even conversion. To balance the size of the total general education program against the 128 SH to graduate, the calculation of the size of Tier II could be approached as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OH</th>
<th>OH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier I Math</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier I English</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier II</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier III</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of 192 23.4% 24.0%

Depending on whether the current Tier 1 Math requirement is viewed as 4 OH or 5 OH, general education requirements account for 23.4 to 24% of the graduation requirements. Currently, only MATH 113 and 115 are 5 OH courses.
If the Tier I and III courses are converted to 3 or 4 SH, the derived size of the Tier II requirement would be somewhere between 18 and 21.67 SH, depending on whether we consider the current Tier I MATH to be 4 or 5 QH and whether English converts from 5 to 4 or 3 credits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>SH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier I Math</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier I English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier II (derived)</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tier II (derived)</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.67</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conversion of English to 3 SH is shown because the other current semester schools in Ohio (Akron, BGSU, Miami, KSU, Shawnee, Toledo, YSU) have 3 SH English courses as opposed to 4. The advantage of this conversation would be the option of adding an extra hour to Tier II requirements. It is also important to note that general education courses such as English composition are part of the State of Ohio Transfer Assurance Guide (TAG) requirements. Transfer students will likely come in with 3 SH English composition courses, and if our English composition courses are 4 SH those students would receive credit for 4 SH for the transfer of a 3 SH course.
QUARTERS TO SEMESTERS TRANSITION TEAM CHARGE AND DRAFT TIMELINE

It is anticipated that the Board of Trustees will give approval at their October meeting for the university to begin a transition from quarters to semesters. As a consequence, a group representative of the university community, the Quarters to Semesters Transition Team, has been convened to create a framework for the transition process. Specifically, the transition team will be asked to provide recommendations on the following matters listed in order of priority:

1. Development of a coordinated approach that schools and departments would take to convert their majors, their major-specific courses, and their general education courses.
2. Implementation of a comprehensive advising program that would focus on the needs of “transition” students.
3. Establishment of a semester system academic calendar (specifying when the year begins and ends, and the timing of breaks and final exams) which will consist of two regular 15 week semesters along with summer sessions.

Attached to this charge is a draft of a semester conversion timeline that provides a broader context for the work of the transition team. The proposed timeline builds on the experiences of other institutions that have completed a successful transition from quarters to semesters. In accordance with the timeline, the Quarters to Semesters Transition Team will begin its work in Fall Quarter and is charged with creating, by the start of Spring Quarter, a transition framework that incorporates and addresses effectively the matters identified above.

While there are many important matters that influence a successful transition to semesters, there are three key issues that require special attention: holding harmless students who will be subject to the transition; ensuring that the teaching obligations of faculty match those that are currently in place; and being thoughtful and creative in how we approach our curriculum as a semester institution. The assumptions, constraints, and principles contained in the document entitled “Quarters to Semesters Conversion: Assumptions, Constraints, and Principles,” once the transition team has reviewed and endorsed them, will provide guidance on these significant issues.

The work of the Q2S Transition Team will be aided by the expertise of Ohio University staff who will serve as ex officio members. During Fall Quarter, the team will also be able to work with Dr. Andy Jorgensen, associate professor of Chemistry at the University of Toledo. Dr. Jorgensen, who oversaw the University of Toledo’s successful conversion from quarters to semesters, has agreed to serve as an informal advisor for the Q2S Transition Team. The team is also encouraged to use standing committees and councils as partners in its work including, but not limited to: University Academic Advising Council (advising matters); Enrollment Management Advisory Committee (enrollment matters); Assistant Deans Council (student services matters); Graduate Council (graduate matters); Chairs & Directors Council; and University Curriculum Council (curriculum conversion matters and curriculum processing).
DRAFT Academic Calendar Conversion Timeline
[For discussion purposes, timeline is subject to change]

2008-09 Academic Year
Year 0-Planning Year

2008-09 Fall Quarter:
• Board of Trustees makes the decision to convert to semesters beginning the 2012-13 academic year.
• Calendar Conversion Project Director is hired.
• Outside Consultant (from a university comparable to Ohio U. who has made a recent calendar conversion) is hired and begins working with the institution.
• Transition team is established.
• Calendar Conversion Office is established.
• Departments should select faculty member(s) from their department to oversee curriculum conversion through one full calendar year.
• Begin discussions with UCC to establish course/curriculum (academic program) conversion guidelines.
• Project: Automation of UCC Processes underway with target of being ready for pilot for Winter Quarter. (UCC, OIT, Registrar)
• A review of the retake policy should be undertaken to determine if our current policy can be enforced for students who retake courses under quarters and semesters.

2008-09 Winter Quarter:
• Course/curriculum conversion guidelines established, approved by Provost and distributed to colleges and departments/schools.
• Begin process of converting the university general education curriculum into a semester format.
• Administrative plan developed.
• Begin creating (on-line) course/curriculum approval forms. Pilot online forms and processes as a result of the Automation of UCC course/change approval process project.
• Begin preparation of the Student Semester Transition Guide.

2008-09 Spring Quarter:
• With conversion guidelines in hand, departments/schools begin planning their course/curriculum conversion.
• Pilot of online course/curriculum forms complete and automation process fully in production.
• Finish changes to the general education curriculum.

2008-09 Summer Quarter:
• Department/schools continue planning course/curriculum conversion.
• Student Semester Transition Guide is completed and distributed to students attending precollege.

2009-10 Academic Year
Year 1-Curriculum Conversion

2009-10 Fall Quarter:
• Departments/schools finish course/curriculum conversion and submit this information to colleges for approval.

2009-10 Winter Quarter:
• Colleges begin process for approving course/curriculum conversion from departments/schools.

2009-10 Spring Quarter:
• Colleges finish approving course/curriculum conversion and submit information to UCC for final approval.
• UCC begins process of approving course/curriculum conversion.
• Note: The approval process can occur throughout the year assuming the Automation of UCC Processes is working effectively. For example, once a department/school has approved a course it would automatically be routed to the college for approval and then to UCC. Thus, the approval process should be working on a continuum.

2009-10 Summer Quarter:
• UCC continues approving course/curriculum conversion.
• Finalize the 2011-2012 Undergraduate catalog (last catalog produced with quarter based curriculum). This assumes there can be a deadline for quarter curriculum changes.
• As a result of the automation of the UCC process the data will reside in an Oracle database.

2010-2011 Academic Year
Year 2-SIS Loading/Catalog Production

2010-2011 Fall Quarter:
• UCC finishes approving course/curriculum conversion.
• Registrar's Office begins to load semester course equivalencies to quarter courses in the DARS T/A software.
• Registrar's Office begins encoding semester curriculum (degree requirements) into DARS.
• PEOPLESOFT LIVE AT END OF FALL.

2010-2011 Winter Quarter:
• Begin the process of loading courses/curriculum into the on-line catalog database. Begin preparing the 2012-13 undergraduate/graduate catalogs.
• Encoding DARS continues.
• Encoding semester to quarter equivalencies in DARS T/A continues.
- Convert the semester courses from the Oracle database into PeopleSoft SIS.
- Begin encoding semester course prerequisites in PeopleSoft SIS.

**2010-2011 Spring Quarter:**

- Encoding DARS continues.
- Encoding semester to quarter equivalencies in DARS T/A continues.
- Encoding prerequisites continues.
- Updating the 2012-13 catalog(s) continues.
- Departments/schools complete advisor training.

**2010-2011 Summer Quarter:**

- Encoding DARS continues.
- Encoding semester to quarter equivalencies in DARS T/A continues.
- Encoding prerequisites continues.
- Updating the 2012-2013 catalog(s) continues.
- Quarter to Semester Transition Guide available to students.

**2011-2012 Academic Year**

**Year 3 (final year) - Advising/PeopleSoft Loading**

**2011-2012 Fall Quarter:**

- Departments/school begin advising transition students. Contracts are prepared with each student detailing the courses required to complete their degree under a semester system.
- Encoding DARS continues.
- Encoding semester to quarter equivalencies in DARS T/A continues.
- Encoding prerequisites continues.
- Updating the 2012-2013 catalog(s) continues.
- Scheduling of fall 2012-2013 semester classes begins.

**2011-2012 Winter Quarter:**

- The 2012-13 catalog (first under semesters) goes live.
- Advising continues.
- Encoding DARS continues.
- Encoding semester to quarter equivalencies in DARS T/A continues.
- Encoding prerequisites is finalized.

**2011-2012 Spring Quarter:**

- Students register for 2012-13 fall semester classes
• DARS with semester curriculum available.

2011-2012 Summer Quarter:

• First term offered in a semester format

2012-2013 Academic Year
Year 1 of semesters

2012-2013 Fall Quarter:

• Semester classes begin
Q2S—Quarters to Semesters—Information and FAQs for Currently Enrolled Ohio University Students

During the coming months, you will hear lots of discussion about the academic-calendar transition—or, more simply stated—the change from quarters to semesters at Ohio University.

The Ohio University Board of Trustees must give final approval to the change to semesters. The three other state institutions still on quarters (Wright State University, Ohio State University, and University of Cincinnati) are also in the process of acting on the recommendation by the Ohio Board of Regents for a universal academic calendar. To ensure the best outcome for Ohio University students and faculty in a change to semesters, the planning process for the change is underway.

As we begin the planning process there are a number of unknowns, but here are some things that Ohio University students can count on:

- Any current student, including those starting fall 2008, whose graduation will occur before the fall of 2012, should not be affected in any way by the academic calendar transition. If you do graduate after fall 2012, you will be affected by this process and will be considered a “transition” student.

- The process is slated to take four years. There will be no incremental changes during this time. All of your degree requirements in place now will remain in place for the duration of the four-year planning process. When we move to semesters, the changeover will occur all at once - at a single point in time.

- The Quarters-to-Semesters Transition Team, a group of faculty, students, and staff, has been tasked with the critical function of recommending guidelines and identifying resources that will ensure that any Ohio University transition student making acceptable progress toward a degree will not be disadvantaged by the conversion from a quarter-based calendar to semesters.

- Transition students will be fully informed of how to complete their degrees through the use of intensive advising and new technology designed for that purpose.

The faculty, staff, and administrators of Ohio University are committed to your success. The paramount “Guiding Principle” of the conversion to semesters is stated as follows:

If your graduation will take place in fall of 2012 or after, and you:

- Maintain a full-time course load;
- Earn passing grades;
• Meet with your advisor and follow advising directives as well as the graduation requirements spelled out in the catalog;

**Then you** should be able to graduate within the same anticipated timeframe regardless of the academic calendar transition.

**FAQS**

**Why is Ohio University moving from a quarter- to a semester-based academic calendar?**

Many current Ohio University students prefer the present quarter system. Students often point to the advantages of having shorter periods of instruction and an academic calendar that provides a long winter break. Most currently enrolled students will finish out their degrees with these advantages in place. The conversion will have the most significance for students who are enrolled at the university beginning in fall 2012.

The creation of the University System of Ohio in March 2008, with strong bipartisan support across the state, has already ensured that the education of future Ohio University students will be different in many ways than the education of current Ohio University students.

One of the major goals of the University System of Ohio is to create new academic opportunities that allow students to take advantage of the resources of state universities regardless of the location of their home institution. When a student at Ohio University would like to take a class that is not offered at our institution the University System of Ohio wants to enable that student, through the use of distance education technology, to have access to that course at another Ohio university. The University System of Ohio also aims to build new degree programs that span institutions. A common calendar is the first step in creating new and important opportunities for future generations of Ohio University students.

Although future students of the university will not enjoy the advantages of shorter periods of instruction or a long winter break, they will have opportunities that current Ohio University students do not have, such as:

• Additional class time for the faculty to explore in greater depth the topics of study. This also gives students more time to absorb the class material and build a more solid base of knowledge to assist in future classes and careers. It is often hard to finish major projects and papers in 10 weeks. Semesters give students greater breathing room in doing more in-depth work.
• The chance to be more competitive for internships and permanent positions because of an earlier end to the academic year.

• Greater ease of transfer between institutions and academic exchange programs, with an academic calendar consistent with the majority of colleges and universities in the United States, in Ohio, and around the world.

What if I don’t graduate until after 2012?

If you do not graduate by fall 2012, you will be considered a transition student like all students starting at Ohio University after fall 2008. Ohio University is committed to making the process as smooth as possible for all transition students and to ensuring that you will not be disadvantaged in the process. This is not the first time that Ohio University has changed its academic calendar, and several other major universities have recently made a calendar change. Be assured Ohio University will be prepared to assist you throughout the process.

What is the Quarters-to-Semesters (Q2S) Transition Team?

The Q2S Transition Team is a group of students, faculty, staff, administrators, and a member of the Athens community. The group is charged with helping the university to articulate its blueprint for the four-year semester conversion process.

Will the financial aid of transition students be altered by the conversion to semesters?

If you are a transition student, you will receive the same financial aid annual amounts per eligibility as established by the awards you receive. However, the amounts will be divided between two semesters as opposed to three quarters.

Will tuition and fees be higher under a semester-based academic calendar?

No. The cost to attend Ohio University for an entire academic year is unaffected by the academic calendar. Tuition and fees as well as financial aid and scholarships will be divided between two semesters versus three quarters in an academic year. Ohio University will continue to offer a monthly payment plan that will allow students and their families the ability to budget education expenses over the course of an academic year.

When will Ohio University transition from a quarter- to a semester-based academic calendar?
Pending approval by the Ohio University Board of Trustees, tentative plans have targeted fall 2012 as the effective conversion term to begin a semester-based academic calendar. Again, this means that if you are a current student you should not be affected by the transition. If you do not graduate by fall 2012, you will, however, be a transition student. In that case, be assured that Ohio University will make every effort to ensure that the process is as seamless for you as possible.

**What is the difference between a quarter- and a semester-based academic calendar?**

Under both the quarter and the semester academic calendars, the academic year is approximately 30 weeks in addition to summer sessions of varying lengths. Our quarter calendar comprises three 10-week quarters and two summer sessions, while a semester calendar comprises two semesters and generally 1-3 summer sessions. The overall classroom contact hours (actual time spent in instruction) will remain the same over the course of an entire academic year.

**If I am a transition student, will my anticipated graduation date change as a result of the transition to a semester-based academic calendar?**

No. Ohio University is committed to working with you and all enrolled students on the quarter calendar to ensure all can meet their graduation date. If you are involved in the transition, you can expect to complete your degree in four years under the semester-based academic calendar, assuming that you make acceptable progress in your academic program.

**How will this affect my winter and summer break schedules?**

It will not affect your winter and summer break schedules unless you are a transition student. The typical semester-based calendar has a fall semester that begins in late August and ends in early December, and a spring semester that begins in mid-January and ends in early May. It is one of the tasks of the Quarters-to-Semesters Transition Team to make recommendations on the timing of winter and summer breaks.

**If I am a transition student will I have to take more hours under a semester-based academic calendar?**

No. A course conversion process will be undertaken that includes a commitment to transition students to maintain the current number of classroom contact hours over the course of a year. Under both the quarter and the semester academic calendar, the academic year is approximately 30 weeks in addition to summer sessions of varying lengths. Our quarter calendar comprises three 10-week quarters and two summer sessions, while a semester calendar comprises two semesters and 1-3 summer sessions. The overall
classroom contact hours (actual time spent in classroom instruction) will remain the same over the course of an entire academic year.

Who will be affected by the transition to a semester-based academic calendar?

Any student enrolled in the university when the transition takes place (fall 2012) as well as those who enroll after this date will be affected.

What if I have specific questions about the effect of the transition on my academic progress?

You need to be concerned about the effect of the transition only if you will still be pursuing your degree in fall 2012 or beyond. We are at the very beginning of this process, so the extent to which specific questions can be answered is limited. The Q2S Transition Team will complete its work before the start of spring quarter 2009. At that time, answers to specific questions will be more readily available.

In the interim, you are encouraged to maintain regular, ongoing contact with your academic advisor. As the conversion process unfolds, a concerted effort will be made to keep advisors informed about ways to assist transition students.
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Affordability

Inter-University Council Preliminary Data
Ohio School Cost Comparison
Average Freshman Tuition

Average (without Miami) = $7,596
Ohio School Student Need Comparison

% Students with an Expected Family Contribution (EFC) in Pell Grant range (<4,111)

Average = 26.65%

Central SSU CSU YSU UT UA WSU KSU BGSU UC OU OSU Miami
Internal Aid Support*
Relative to Ohio University

*First time, full time, subsidy eligible dependent freshmen
External Aid Support*
Relative to Ohio University

*First time, full time, subsidy eligible dependent freshmen
Includes scholarships from endowed funds or gifts to the University (as defined in the HEI Financial Aid unit data definition) — including grants such as Choose Ohio First, NSF, etc. Excludes any 3rd party aid or aid for which the institution does not determine the recipient such as employer payment/reimbursement, club scholarships, etc.
Ohio School Discount Rate
(Internal + External aid/cost)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Discount Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>$1,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSU</td>
<td>$1,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>$1,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU</td>
<td>$2,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGSU</td>
<td>$1,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>$2,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>$3,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>$3,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT</td>
<td>$11,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>$2,029/ per student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Affordability
Student "out of pocket" cost after discount

Average (without Miami) = $6,084
### Additional Challenges for Ohio Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Resident Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>$8,907</td>
<td>$8,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Ohio University students with EFC &lt; tuition/fees</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Ohio University FAFSA filers qualifying for Pell</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Ohio University FAFSA filers qualifying for OCOG</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix E
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>FACULTY TRUSTEE</th>
<th>VOTING AUTHORITY</th>
<th>STATUTORY LANGUAGE</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OHIO INSTITUTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State University</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>Two faculty representatives sit on the Board of Trustees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee State University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>No (No Faculty Trustees, but official Faculty &quot;Representatives&quot;)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>Per Board Bylaws, the chairperson of the university faculty senate and two elected representatives of the university faculty serve as official faculty representatives to the board of trustees with the right to suggest proposals for consideration by the board and the president, and to attend, with voice, all meetings of the board and its committees including academic affairs and finance. Faculty representatives are not entitled to attend executive sessions of the board. There are also student, alumni and foundation representatives with these same rights and restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toledo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>One individual representing the union and the Faculty Senate sits on the Board of Trustees' Committee Meetings, but, not Board Meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown State University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTION</td>
<td>FACULTY TRUSTEE</td>
<td>VOTING AUTHORITY</td>
<td>STATUTORY LANGUAGE</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Non-Voting/Advisory</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>Two faculty members; Past Faculty Senate Chair; past Faculty Senate Chair of AU-Montgomery Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>Faculty Senate elects a member to act as liaison to Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University at Bloomington</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>University Faculty Council provides report at meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Provides for Gubernatorial Appointment of Faculty Trustee, but, silent on voting authority</td>
<td>Gubernatorial appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of MO - Columbia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>Faculty Senate representative observes Board of Curators' meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Hampshire</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Faculty Trustee Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>FACULTY TRUSTEE</th>
<th>VOTING AUTHORITY</th>
<th>STATUTORY LANGUAGE</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (in second year of term)</td>
<td>Provides specific requirements</td>
<td>One faculty member shall be a voting member and one faculty member shall be a nonvoting member it being the legislative intent that a faculty member serve one year as a nonvoting member before becoming the voting member. The nonvoting member must be an immediate past president of the Faculty Senate or the equivalent at a UT institution. The voting position rotate among the institutions of the University of Tennessee, the voting and nonvoting faculty members shall be appointed in accordance with a prescribed sequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Silent</td>
<td>Representative of Faculty Senate provides an informational update at each Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER INSTITUTIONS

<p>| University of Kentucky (and all public institutions in Kentucky) | Yes | Yes | Requires two faculty members, one staff member and one student. | The board shall consist of 16 members appointed by the Governor, two members of the faculty of the University of Kentucky, one member of the University of Kentucky nonteaching personnel, and one member of the student body of the University of Kentucky. The voting members of the board shall select a chairperson annually. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>FACULTY TRUSTEE</th>
<th>VOTING AUTHORITY</th>
<th>STATUTORY LANGUAGE</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State System</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Stipulates specifics.</td>
<td>Under present law there are 25 Trustees (24 voting, one non-voting). Five Trustees are ex officio members: the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the Assembly, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the Chancellor. The CSU Statewide Alumni Council appoints an Alumni Trustee. The Governor appoints a Faculty Trustee from nominees proposed by the Statewide Academic Senate. The Alumni and Faculty Trustees serve for two years. The Governor appoints two Student Trustees from nominees proposed by the California State Student Association. The sixteen remaining Trustees are appointed by the Governor, confirmed by the State Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Stipulates the chair of the Faculty Senate and the President of the Student Senate.</td>
<td>The Board is composed of 13 Trustees, six of whom shall be appointed by the Governor and five of whom shall be appointed by the Board of Governors. The other two members shall be the President of the University of Florida Student Government and the Chair of the University of Florida Faculty Senate. The appointed members shall be confirmed by the Senate of the State of Florida.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State System</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Requires the Governor to appoint a Faculty Trustee from nominees provided by the Statewide Academic Senate.</td>
<td>Under present law there are 25 Trustees (24 voting, one non-voting). Five Trustees are ex officio members: the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the Assembly, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the Chancellor. The CSU Statewide Alumni Council appoints an Alumni Trustee. The Governor appoints a Faculty Trustee from nominees proposed by the Statewide Academic Senate. The Alumni and Faculty Trustees serve for two years. The Governor appoints two Student Trustees from nominees proposed by the California State Student Association.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: September 11, 2008

TO: Dr. Tom Davis, Secretary to the Board of Trustees

FROM: Kathryn Gilmore, CPA, CIA, Chief Audit Executive

SUBJECT: Audit Committee Charter and Board of Trustees By-laws

The use of an audit committee charter is a Sarbanes-Oxley initiative and is recommended by the Institute of Internal Auditors and others as a best practice. PriceWaterhouseCoopers' "Leading Practices for Colleges, Universities and Other Not-for-Profit Educational Institutions" was used as a resource for this charter.

The charter was originally reviewed by the Audit Committee at the April Board of Trustees' meeting. As a result of Audit Committee Chair, C. Robert Kidder's, recommendations it was revised and reviewed by the Audit Committee at the June meeting.

Following the June Board of Trustees' meeting the Secretary to the Board, the Director of Legal Affairs, and the Chief Audit Executive met to review consistency between the Board of Trustees bylaws with the proposed charter. In addition changes were made to the proposed charter for purposes of clarity.

The changes to the Audit Committee Charter are as follows:

II Composition

a. June Meeting - The Board of Trustees chairperson (chairperson) will nominate three audit committee members, including the chair.

b. June Meeting - If possible, at least one member of the audit committee should be designated as the "financial expert," defined as a person who has an understanding of financial statements, internal controls, and audit committee functions. The financial expert designation shall be determined by the chairperson through a review of the committee member's qualifications as
reflected in the member’s resume or through an interview with the member.

b. Revision - At least one member of the audit committee should have expertise in understanding financial statements, internal controls, and audit committee functions. These qualifications shall be determined by the chairperson through a review of the committee member’s resume or through an interview with the member.

III Responsibilities – a. External Audit

June Meeting - The audit committee shall also review other audit work performed by the external auditors.

Revision - The audit committee shall also review work performed by the external auditors.

Recommended Changes to the Ohio University Board of Trustees By-laws Article VI. Standing and Special Committees Section 1. (c) Audit follow. These changes are designed to broaden the audit committee’s responsibilities to include accountability and compliance procedures as well as the whistleblower policy:

By-laws

Responsibilities will include the oversight of the internal audit functions, annual or other periodic audits of financial operations, the recommendation of the appointment of an external audit firm to the Board of Trustees, the receipts of the reports of the internal auditor and the external audit firm, and the university’s whistleblower policy.

Proposed Changes

Responsibilities will include the oversight of the internal audit functions, annual or other periodic audits of financial operations, the recommendation of the appointment of an external audit firm to the Board of Trustees, the receipts of the reports of the internal auditor and the external audit firm, and the university’s accountability and compliance procedures.

I look forward to presenting the charter for discussion to the Governance Committee at the upcoming Board of Trustees meeting.
I. PURPOSE

The Audit Committee is appointed by the Board of Trustees to consider and make recommendations for action by the board related to the audit committee’s oversight responsibilities. The audit committee will oversee: the university’s process for the recommendation to the board for the appointment of the external audit firm; external audits of financial operations, including the receipt of related reports; the internal audit function, including receipt of its reports; the effectiveness of the university’s internal control and risk management system and its process for monitoring compliance with laws and regulations; and the university’s whistleblower reporting mechanism. The committee will take all actions it deems appropriate to set the university’s overall tone for sound financial and risk practices, and ethical behavior.

II. COMPOSITION

a. The Board of Trustees chairperson (chairperson) will annually appoint no fewer than three (3) audit committee members.
b. At least one member of the audit committee should have expertise in understanding financial statements, internal controls, and audit committee functions. These qualifications shall be determined by the chairperson through a review of the committee member’s resume or through an interview with the member.

III. RESPONSIBILITIES

With regards to each topic, the audit committee will:

a. External Audit
   - Recommend appointment of the external auditor to the board as authorized by the Ohio Auditor of State for the annual audit of the university. A five-year contract with the external auditor is expected and can be extended, based on the standards of and approval by the Auditor of State. The audit committee will review the university’s scoring of the external audit proposals, the results of which will be forwarded to the state for final approval.
   - Review the external audit engagement letter. Discuss with the external auditors at the last full board meeting each fiscal year, the proposed audit scope and approach, including coordination of audit effort with internal audit.
   - Evaluate annually, the external auditor’s qualifications and performance, including a review and evaluation of the lead partner, taking into account the opinions of management and the internal auditor, and report its conclusions to the board.
   - Following the completion of the annual audit, the audit committee shall review the university’s draft audited financial statements and the external auditor’s management letter, along with management’s response.
   - Review any disagreements between the external auditor and management concerning matters that could be significant to the university’s financial statement or the auditor’s report.
   - The audit committee shall also review work performed by the external auditors.
• At least annually, the committee shall meet with the external auditors to discuss any matters that the audit committee or the external auditors believe should be discussed privately.

b. Internal Audit
• Review and authorize any proposed changes to the internal audit charter, which has been established by board resolution.
• Review all decisions regarding the budget of the internal audit function and the evaluation, compensation, appointment, or removal of the internal auditor.
• Make appropriate inquiries of management and the internal auditor to determine whether scope or budgetary limitations impede the ability of the internal audit function to execute its responsibilities.
• Review the internal audit risk assessment and approve the related annual audit plan at the last full board meeting each fiscal year.
• Review annually at the first full board meeting of each fiscal year, the work plan performance, activity, budget, and staffing of the internal audit function.
• Regularly receive internal audit reports including management’s response as to corrective action taken for internal audit recommendations.
• As needed, receive presentations by management, related to corrective action taken for any follow-up internal audit report given an internal auditor opinion rating of “Needs Improvement” or “inadequate”.
• On a regular basis, meet with the internal auditor to discuss matters that the audit committee or the internal auditor deem appropriate.

c. Internal Controls
• Evaluate regularly, through review of external and internal audit reports and communications by management, whether management is establishing the appropriate "control culture”.
• Evaluate regularly, through consideration of internal and external audit recommendations, the overall effectiveness of the university’s internal control framework. Review, through internal and external audit reports, whether significant findings and recommendations made by the internal and external auditors have been implemented by management.

d. Compliance
• At least annually, obtain updates from management and university legal counsel regarding compliance matters that may have a material impact on the university’s financial statements or compliance polices.
• Annually review the process for communicating the code of conduct to university personnel, and for monitoring compliance with it.
• Ensure that there are effective procedures for anonymous receipt and treatment of complaints regarding the university’s accounting, internal controls and audit matters. Annually, review a summary of complaints that have been received.
Proposed Amendment (in Bold) to the Ohio University Board of Trustees By-Laws
Article VI. Standing and Special Committees
Section 1. (c) Audit

(c) Audit. Responsibilities will include the oversight of the internal audit functions, annual or other periodic audits of financial operations, the recommendation of the appointment of an external audit firm to the Board of Trustees, the receipts of the reports of the internal auditor and the external audit firm, and the university’s accountability and compliance procedures.
INTRODUCTION

The following presents Ohio University Internal Audit’s (IA) FY 08 Activity Report, including work plan performance, staffing, and financial activity.

WORK PLAN PERFORMANCE

Internal Control Environment
The Ohio University’s Board of Trustees’ Audit Committee has stressed the importance of improving the University’s internal control environment. While our efforts always center on this effort this was a primary focus for our office this year. There were several initiatives that we used.

First, the Chief Audit Executive co-chaired the Control Environment Improvement Committee. A deliverable of the committee was the Control Self Assessment Survey. The primary purpose of the survey was to educate our employees about the importance of internal controls. We experienced very strong participation in completion of the survey with 54% of “benefits eligible” employees submitting responses.

Second, we informed the University community about risks and controls through articles featured in the University’s communication vehicle, Outlook. Stories included such topics as appropriate disposal of sensitive paper waste; cash handling guidance; the importance of encryption for sending sensitive data; responsibilities related to FERPA, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act; and the importance of maintaining departmental inventories for certain non-capital equipment.

Third, we increased the consideration of potential risks and facilitated standardization of internal controls by adding all deans and vice-presidents to the distribution list for our Internal Audit reports. The response to this change has been very positive. In the past, we provided the University community with a list of common audit findings. However, the observations and recommendations in the reports provide a more detailed explanation. Our audit clients have asked to be made aware of changes they could be making in advance of regularly scheduled audits. This is a vehicle to provide this information.

Fourth, at the request of the Chief Information Officer (CIO), IA, along with a consultant, assisted the Office of Information Technology (OIT) in conducting a risk assessment of OIT Operations. This assessment took place over several days and involved employees from each IT area.

Special Projects
IA continued to work closely with our prior external audit firm to coordinate our audit program. IA also conducts audit testing for the external auditor which helps control annual audit costs. This past year IA coordinated the external auditor selection process and prepared the RFP (request for proposal) as required by the Auditor of State.
OHIO UNIVERSITY INTERNAL AUDIT OFFICE
ACTIVITY REPORT

Our office continued to offer professional consultations on matters related to internal controls, compliance, ethics, and conflicts of interest. We conducted many related special projects throughout the year.

IA continued to administer the Ethics Hotline. Five reports were received during FY 08. The hotline was temporarily suspended in August 2007 after a legal review determined that unsubstantiated hotline reports were required to be released under Ohio's Public Records Act. The system was reinstated in September 2007 with modifications designed to protect the reputation of the subjects of the reports as well as the whistleblowers. The Ethics Hotline still serves as an important tool for reporting fraud, waste and abuse of University assets.

Audit Plan Completion
In FY 08, we completed eleven of sixteen regularly scheduled audits with five in process at year-end. One audit, Facilities Management, was moved to FY 09 and was replaced with the Cash Collection Points Inventory. In addition to our regularly scheduled audits, we conducted four investigations, which were completed during the year.

The following is the status of our FY 08 audit plan completion:

Audits
- College of Arts & Sciences – report issued 4/10/08
- College of Business – report issued 6/23/08
- College of Health & Human Services – in process
- Vice-President University Outreach – in process
- Eastern Campus – in process
- Facilities Management – replaced by Cash Collection Inventory

Follow-Up Audits
- Procurement Services – report issued 7/7/07
- Lancaster Campus – report issued 7/17/07
- Automated Payroll Systems – report issued 7/18/07
- Hiring & Termination Process – report issued 11/7/07
- Intercollegiate Athletics – report issued 1/8/08
- Chillicothe Campus - report issued 1/18/08
- CIO Business Operations report issued 6/19/08
- Dining Services report issued 9/2/08
- College of Fine Arts report issued 6/25/08
- Russ College of Engineering – in process

STAFFING ACTIVITY

Staffing Changes
We were very successful in filling our Senior Auditor position, which was vacant for less than two months. We hired Brian Ennis, MBA, CPA. Brian has had four to five years experience in retail and manufacturing internal auditing in Columbus. Brian was a graduate intern in our office, prior to moving to Columbus. His internal audit skills and his experience at Ohio University have resulted in his immediate contribution to our office.
Information Technology Audit Requirements
Due to budgetary constraints and the need for auditors with broad-based auditing skills, my office has not hired a specialized Information Technology (IT) auditor. IA staff continues to develop IT audit skills. Senior Auditor Susan Jago, CFE, CIA worked last year to develop the skills to receive her GIAC (Global Information Assurance Certification) System and Network Auditor certification. She completed this certification in July 2008. Senior Auditor Brian Ennis comes to our office with information systems auditing experience. IA continues to work with Office of Information Security (IS) to develop our IT audit testing. In addition, when necessary, IS has agreed to assist us in the review of systems in the University’s distributed IT areas.

Professional Development and Service
Our auditors continue to take their professional development and service seriously. Our audit staff averaged nearly 60 hours of continuing professional education each, which is identified by the Institute of Internal Auditors as a best practice. Much of the time required to complete this training took place outside of regular office hours.

Senior Auditor Susan Jago again served as chair of the Association of College and University Auditors Web Site Committee and presented at an Ohio Society of Certified Public Accountants on the topic of fraud investigations.

Our auditors are well respected and are frequently asked to serve on University search committees. Our Chief Audit Executive served on the search committee to fill the position of Director of Legal Affairs and on the committee to fill the Risk Manager position. Senior Auditor Susan Jago served on the Director of Information Security search committee. Audit Manager Jeff Davis, CPA, CIA served on the committee to fill an account position in the Office of General Accounting.

Student Intern Program
We continued our highly successful student intern program which was funded by the Program to Aid Career Exploration (PACE). We provide students with a broad spectrum of audit and accounting experience and the students quickly become a source of audit support, contributing to our departmental success. We have successfully recruited very qualified students for next year.

FINANCES

Expenditures and Budget
Internal Audit FY 08 expenditures were $384,912. Our FY 09 operating budget is $392,610. Personnel costs comprise 95% of our budget, compared to 91% of prior year actual expenditures. Professional development expenses make up 3% of the budget, which is the same percentage as that of prior year actual expenditures. The Ethics Hotline is 1% of our budgeted dollars. The remaining expenses for equipment, supplies, and information/communication make up the remaining 1% of total budget dollars. Our anticipated carryover from FY 08 is $11,074.

A presentation of historical expenditures for prior years and current budget follows. The comparison includes only years with the current staff level of four:
FY 06 - FY 08 Expenditures to FY 09 Budget Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 06 Actual</th>
<th>FY 07 Actual</th>
<th>FY 08 Actual</th>
<th>FY 09 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous &amp; Transfers</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental, Maintenance &amp; Repair</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Communication</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Training</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EthicsPoint</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSION

We thank you for the opportunity to report our work plan performance, staff achievements, and budget and expenditure results.
Ohio University Internal Audit Office FY 08 Activity Report

Internal Control Environment Improvement

- Articles featured in the Ohio University Outlook
  - Appropriate disposal of sensitive paper waste
  - Cash handling guidance
  - Using encryption when sending sensitive data
  - Responsibilities related to FERPA, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act
  - Maintaining departmental inventories for certain non-capital equipment, such as computers

- Chief Audit Executive co-chaired the Control Environment Improvement Committee which delivered the Control Self Assessment Survey (CSA)
  - CSA's primary focus was educating employees about internal controls
  - Experienced strong participation in the survey
  - 54% of "benefits eligible" employees submitted results

- Added deans and vice-presidents to distribution list for all Internal Audit reports
  - Increased consideration of potential risks and facilitated standardization of internal controls
  - Informed our audit clients of potential audit findings in advance of regularly scheduled audits

Special Projects

- Conducted external audit Chapter 7 compliance testing for Deloitte, resulting in annual cost savings for the University
- Coordinated external auditor selection process and prepared the required RFP (request for proposal)
- Offered professional consultations on internal control, compliance, ethics, and conflict of interest matters

- At the request of Chief Information Officer Internal Audit assisted the Office of Information Technology (OIT) in conducting a risk assessment
- Assessment took place over several days and involved employees from each OIT area
Special Projects
• Administered the Ethics Hotline
  - Five reports received during FY 08
  - Hotline was temporarily suspended in August 2007
  - Legal review found unsubstantiated hotline reports were required to be released under Public Records Act
  - Hotline was reinstated in September 2007 with modifications designed to protect reputation of whistleblowers and subjects of reports
  - Hotline serves as an important tool for reporting fraud, waste and abuse of University assets

FY 08 Work Plan Performance
• Planned Audits
  - Completed 11 of 16 regularly scheduled audits
  - 5 remaining in process at year-end
  - Facilities Management moved to FY 09 and replaced with the Cash Collection Points Inventory
• Investigations
  - Completed 4 investigations

Staffing
• Filled vacant Senior Auditor position
• Filled IT Audit Requirements through coordination with Information Security (IS)
  - Assistance in developing our IT audit testing
  - When necessary, IS will assist in the review of IT systems in distributed IT areas
• IA staff continues to develop IT audit skills
  - Senior Auditor developed skills for GIAC (Global Information Assurance Certification) System and Network Auditor certification, completed in July 2008
  - Hired Senior Auditor with systems auditing experience

Expenditures and Budget

Internal Audit

Conclusion
Internal Control Environment

Chief Audit Executive Kathryn Gilmore and Senior Associate Vice-President Christopher Clifford

Agenda

- Introduction of the Control Environment through the CSA Survey
- Control Environment Described
- Control Environment Evaluation
- Control Environment Action
- Current State of Control Environment
- Control Environment Strengths
- Control Environment Weaknesses
- Next Steps
  - Internal Audit
  - Finance

CSA Survey Control Environment Assessment

- In FY 08 Finance initiated a university-wide discussion of the control environment by conducting the Control Self Assessment (CSA) survey
- Based on the COSO best practices internal control framework
- Primary purpose was to educate the University community about controls that exist in a disciplined control environment and identify opportunities to strengthen controls
- Administered to 3,687 employees, 54% of whom responded

Control Environment Described

- The CSA survey description stated that the control environment
  - Sets the tone of the institution
  - Is the foundation for all other components of internal control
  - Instills a university-wide attitude of integrity and control consciousness through setting a positive “tone at the top”

Action

Internal Control Environment Improvement Committee

- Formed by SVP Decatur in 2006
- Multidisciplinary team which delivered the CSA survey
- Committee served as “ambassadors” to the University community during execution of survey
- Deliverables included two draft policies which are critical to a strong internal control environment; the Code of Conduct and the Financial Code of Ethics
- Committee’s work completed in May 2008

Control Environment Evaluated

- The survey evaluated the control environment on the following factors
  - Integrity and Ethical Values
  - Commitment to Competence
  - Management Philosophy and Operating Style
  - Organizational Structure
  - Assignment of Authority and Responsibility
- These are factors we will discuss as strengths and weaknesses of the University’s control environment
Internal Control Environment Committee (ICE)

- Team of financial control professionals formed by SVP Decatur in August 2008
- Committee is charged with providing guidance and stewarding to completion all necessary improvement projects aimed at creating and sustaining an effective internal control environment
- Led by Senior Associate VP Chris Clifford

ICE Objectives

- Improve internal control environment by identifying and stewarding key internal control improvement projects to effective completion
- Desired outcomes include:
  - Supporting the University's academic mission
  - Optimal use of resources
  - System reliability
  - Compliance with existing laws and regulations
  - Enhanced public image
  - Properly alignment of resources and roles...“the right people doing the right things”

ICE Committee Members

- Julie Allison, Director of Business Operations Shared Service
- Michael Angelini, Associate VP Finance Treasury Management
- Chris Clifford, Senior Associate VP Finance
- Frank Corris, Chief Procurement Officer
- John Day, Associate Provost for Academic Budget and Planning
- John Demmer, Senior Budget Analyst for Budget Planning and Analysis
- Sherry Downs, Bursar
- Gina Fetty, Controller
- Kathy Gilmore, Chief Audit Executive
- Mark Hopton, Assistant VP Shared Services
- Linda Lonsinger, Interim Director Human Resources
- Kris Sano, Associate Controller
- Linda Shapiro, Associate Controller
- Rebecca Skillings, Assistant VP Budget Planning and Analysis
- Dawn Weiser, Assistant to the Senior VP Finance and Administration

Current State of Control Environment

- Identified by ICE
  - Ohio University has traditionally operated in a decentralized manner, characterized by individualized application of procedures within units
  - Decentralized culture has led to an internal control environment with significant opportunities for enhancement to ensure appropriate, efficient use of university resources

Control Environment Strengths

- Establishment of Audit Committee and its commitment to internal control improvement
- Management’s awareness of the need for improvement
- Management’s collaborative approach to internal audits
**Next Steps**  
Finance (cont’d)
- Lead effort to identify and steward the effective completion of key internal control improvement projects
- Engage in a program of compliance and enterprise risk management based on the COSO Enterprise Risk Management - Integrated Framework model and best practices in higher education

**Control Environment**  
**Strengths Identified by ICE**
- Credibility of the Internal Audit Office
- Audits and reviews
- Employees’ motivation to succeed

**Control Environment**  
**Weaknesses**
- Effects of decentralization
  - Organizational structure may impair effective communication
  - Employees may lack clear authority to carry out responsibilities
  - Unclear accountabilities may result in uneven enforcement of responsibilities
- Policies are not always communicated effectively
- Timely information not always available for decision making
- Insufficient training in the characteristics of a sound system of internal controls
- Assigned responsibilities are not always well matched to knowledge and skills

**Control Environment**  
**Weaknesses**
- CSA survey results indicated some unfamiliarity with internal control concepts
- Insufficient education and training opportunities about internal controls

**Next Steps**  
Internal Audit
- Continue to conduct independent effective audits of University operations
- Maintain commitment to and participation in ICE and other University internal control initiatives
- Communicate the importance of strong internal controls through
  - Outlook articles
  - Internal Audit webpage guidance
  - Professional consultations
  - Broadening audit report distribution as a learning opportunity
Next Steps
Finance

• Standardize position descriptions for financial managers
• Add dotted-line reporting of budget unit managers to the Senior VP for Finance and Administration
• Develop a process for management's "certification" that financial control policies are in place and control processes are being followed

Next Steps
Finance (cont'd)

• Achieve final approval of Code of Conduct and Financial Code of Ethics and circulate widely to campus community
• Implement increased budgetary controls, including position management and meaningful line item budgets
• Develop "How to do business at Ohio University" for all employees, including certification
• Significantly improve online training resources

Next Steps
Finance (cont'd)

• Eliminate cash collection points and implement training for those who, by necessity, must handle cash
• Improve policy development, communication, and relevance to campus community
• Annually require all employees to submit an ethics/conflict of interest representation
• Upgrade Oracle e-business system to include implementation of electronic workflow and re-engineering of underlying processes to increase efficiency and control

Next Steps
Finance (cont'd)

• Implement an e-procurement system to significantly reduce the number of purchasing cards
• Mandate purchasing from negotiated contracts
• Leverage Shared Services to standardize and increase the level of interim management reporting to ensure planning level results are monitored/managed on a timely basis

Conclusion