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Chairman C. Robert Kidder called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

President McDavis introduced men’s basketball Head Coach John Groce and Athletics Director Jim Schaus. President McDavis acknowledged the significant achievements of the men’s basketball team who won the Mid-American Conference tournament and upset Georgetown in the first round of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) tournament. President McDavis gave special tribute to Coach Groce and the coaching staff. Chairman Kidder reiterated the President’s comments and, on behalf of the Board, expressed appreciation to the team as well.

Coach Groce began his remarks by stating what an honor and privilege it was for the team and his coaching staff to be recognized by the members of the Board of Trustees. He thanked Dr. and Mrs. McKinley, Asown Sayles, Tommy Freeman, Alex Kellogg, DeVauhn Washington and Kenneth van Kempen. Coach Groce also recognized team members who were unable to attend due to class commitments. He recognized the coaching staff including Assistant Coaches Ramon William, Dustin Ford and Chris Holtmann, Director of Basketball Operations Aaron Fuss and Graduate Assistant Chris Cobbin.

Coach Groce thanked the Trustees for their continued support of athletics and the recognition of the team.

Chairman Kidder requested Board Secretary Thomas E. Davis to call the roll.

ROLL CALL
Present– Chairman C. Robert Kidder, Vice Chairperson M. Marnette Perry, Trustees Sandra J. Anderson, David Brightbill, Norman E. “Ned” Dewire, Gene T. Harris, Yvette McGee Brown, Larry L. Schey and David Wolfort. Trustee Harris departed proceedings at 11:10 a.m. due to a commitment with Columbus Public Schools.

Also in attendance were President Roderick J. McDavis, National Trustees Frank P. Krasovec and Charles R. Stuckey, Student Trustees Chauncey Jackson and Kyle W. Triplett, Chair, National Alumni Board of Directors Dennis Minichello, and Board Secretary Thomas E. Davis.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
Chair Kidder asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting of January 15, 2010. Trustee Dewire moved, seconded by Trustee Perry, and all approved.

COMMUNICATIONS, PETITIONS, and MEMORIALS
There were no communications, petitions, and memorials.
Report from the Chair of the Board of Trustees
Chair Kidder expressed his thanks to Dean Greg Shepherd for the Trustees’ tour of the Scripps College of Communication. Trustees Dewire, Anderson and Schey offered words of appreciation to Dean Shepherd, the students, faculty and staff for the fine work being conducted within the College.

Chair Kidder reported that a constructive, frank, and open discussion occurred between the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board on Thursday morning. He indicated the need to maintain open lines of communication and encouraged such discussions continue into the future.

Report of the President
President McDavis shared the draft version statement for Ohio University which has been vetted through University constituent groups. It states, “Ohio University will be the nation’s best transformative learning community where students realize their promise, faculty advance knowledge, and alumni become global leaders.”

Dr. McDavis shared the top six strategic priorities and discussed the alignment of the Priorities with Vision OHIO goals. The priorities are:

- Establish Effective Short- and Long-Term Enrollment Planning
- Improve the Institution’s Financial Strength
- Enhance the Quality of the Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum
- Bolster Graduate Education and Associated Efforts of Faculty in Research and Creative Activity
- Institute Effective Compensation Policies and Practices to Ensure that Talented Faculty, Administrative Staff, and Classified Staff Are Rewarded and Retained
- Launch a $350M Capital Campaign Focused on Supporting Core Academic Initiatives

With endorsement from Board, President McDavis reported the University will move forward with these priorities. President McDavis thanked Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit and her staff for their work.

President McDavis provided an overview of the Promise Capital Campaign. He addressed the top five campaign priorities and the potential impact on non-endowed versus endowed funding. The priorities are:

- Cultivate Learning: Cultivate outstanding academic and student-life experiences
- Expand Opportunity: Increase access and opportunity
- Inspire Discovery: Invest in research, discovery, and creative activity
• Nurture Place: Enrich the campus environment
• Encourage Community: Expand outreach and partnerships

President McDavis introduced National Trustee Charles Stuckey as the Chair of the Capital Campaign Steering Committee and Trustee David Wolfort as the Campaign Steering Committee’s Vice Chair. President McDavis invited National Trustee Stuckey to offer a few words on the state of the campaign planning.

Mr. Stuckey provided an update on the work of the Capital Campaign Steering Committee. He acknowledged the efforts of Trustee Krasovec and other members of the Committee. The President reported a working goal for campaign of $350 million. President McDavis commended the work of Vice President for University Advancement Howard Lipman and thanked members of the Campaign Steering Committee for their work to date including Laura Brege, Dan DeLawder, Chuck Emrick, Shelia McHale, Alan Riedel, Steven Schoonover, Jeffery Stanley, Barbara Strom Thompson and Robert Walter.

President McDavis highlighted the University’s commitment to sustainability as a focused point of pride. He expressed appreciation for the achievements of the staff and students of the Ohio University Office of Sustainability which assisted in the creation of one of our institutional centers of excellence, the Center of Excellence for Energy and the Environment. President McDavis introduced and thanked the Director of the Office of Sustainability, Sonia Marcus. Ms. Marcus expressed her gratitude for the opportunity to speak to the members of the Board of Trustees. She discussed how sustainability, a core value for Ohio University, aids in the transformation of both students’ and community members’ lives. Ms. Marcus addressed three programs currently at the center of their efforts: the compost project, residence hall-based programs and the OHIO Ecohouse.

Chuck Hart, an adjunct professor in Environmental Health, shared his experiences with the compost project. He reported that it is a privilege to work with sustainability aids such as the compost project that enhance the educational experience and curriculum for students. Mr. Hart said he is encouraged by sustainability projects and hopes these programs not only enhance the academic curriculum but also enhance the understanding of sustainability on campus and in the community.

Ms. Marcus shared the mission statement and objectives of the OHIO Ecohouse. She introduced Alana Dakin, a junior in the Honors Tutorial College, a current student resident of the Ecohouse. Ms. Dakin discussed her intensive educational experience on sustainability through her residence at the Ecohouse and stated that living there was an extremely educational and rewarding experience. She cited her OHIO Ecohouse experiences as transformational.
Ms. Marcus ended her presentation by reporting on the success of the Residence Challenge and RecycleMania projects. She introduced Scott Eardly, a junior majoring in Chemical Engineering, who leads the Eco-reps in the residence hall-based programs. He shared his personal experiences and discussed challenges and barriers of living a lifestyle of sustainability. Chair Kidder queried Ms. Dakin and Mr. Eardly on the challenges of practicing sustainability both individually and with others throughout the university community.

President McDavis thanked Ms. Marcus and the participating students and faculty for their presentation and reported that the university has started its journey of sustainability and will continue with initiatives that focus on sustainability goals.

A copy of President McDavis’ presentation may be found in Appendix A.

University Academics and University Resources Joint Committee Report
Chair Kidder reported on the University Academics and University Resources joint committee meeting held on Thursday prior to the standing committee meetings. The discussion focused primarily on the FY 2011 budget. Chair Kidder indicated that Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit, and Interim Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration Michael T. Angelini led that discussion. Chair Kidder summarized discussions on reductions in state support, aligning the budget with strategic priorities, and the process of a multi-year budget perspective. He indicated that discussions focused on cost reduction and revenue generation ideas, including increased capacity.

A copy of the minutes of the University Academics and University Resources Joint Committee meeting may be found in Appendix B.

University Academics Committee Report
Committee Chair Harris began her report by commending the academic deans and faculty members for their diligent work on aligning strategic priorities across the University. She discussed Dr. Benoit’s presentation on the strategic priorities update which outlined the work being conducted by the various work groups. Trustee Harris indicated that the Committee received an update on enrollment management and indicated that more detail on enrollment and capacity will be presented at the June Board meeting. Additional discussions focused on academic restructuring and the quarters-to-semesters transition. Trustee Harris acknowledged the leadership of Dr. Benoit and the process of shared governance that was in effect during the process of aligning strategic priorities across the University. Trustee Schey commented on the opportunity for change to make things better during turbulent budget times. Trustees Schey and Krasovec each commended Dr. Benoit on collaborative efforts of faculty and staff.
A copy of the minutes and related materials for the University Academics Committee meeting may be found in Appendix C.

University Resources Committee Report
Committee Chair Perry began her report by summarizing Vice President for University Advancement Howard Lipman’s presentation on fundraising efforts and the upcoming capital campaign, in particular. Trustee Perry commended all involved in the planning of the capital campaign. She emphasized that everyone shares ownership in the capital campaign and along with that ownership comes responsibility.

Informational materials were presented on the FY 2010 and FY2011 budget. Trustee Perry reported that Board action on that budget will take place during the June 2010 meeting.

Trustee Perry asked the Board members to turn to tab 20 of the agenda which included four fee-related resolutions. They include:

- Fiscal Year 2010-2011 Athens Campus Instructional Fee, General Fee, and Non-Resident Surcharge, Resolution 2010-3145

FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011
ATHENS AND REGIONAL CAMPUSES
INSTRUCTIONAL FEE, GENERAL FEE AND NON-RESIDENT SURCHARGE

RESOLUTION 2010 – 3145

WHEREAS, the Ohio University 2010-2011 Current Funds Budget contains fixed and mandated cost increases, and

WHEREAS, the appropriate planning and consultations within the University have been accomplished, resulting in recommendations of fee increases, and

WHEREAS, the University will experience a significant loss in State revenue through the State Share of Instruction in FY 2011 and FY 2012, and

WHEREAS, the Amended Substitute House Bill 1 permits the combined instructional and general fees for undergraduate students to increase by up to 3.5%, and

WHEREAS, the planning within the Athens Campus results in a recommendation of a 3.5% increase to the instructional fee and general fee, and
WHEREAS, the University desires to maintain Athens Campus graduate tuition and fees and the Athens Campus non-resident surcharge fees for undergraduates and graduates at the Fiscal Year 2010 rates to maintain competitiveness.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees authorizes the attached schedule of fees, effective Fall Quarter 2010, except as noted above.

- Fiscal Year 2010-2011 College of Medicine and University Outreach & Regional Campuses Instructional Fee, General Fee and Non-Resident Surcharge, Resolution 2010-3146

FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE AND UNIVERSITY OUTREACH & REGIONAL CAMPUSES
INSTRUCTIONAL FEE, GENERAL FEE AND NON-RESIDENT SURCHARGE

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3146

WHEREAS, the Ohio University 2010-2011 Current Funds Budget contains fixed and mandated cost increases, and

WHEREAS, appropriate planning and consultations within the University have been accomplished, and

WHEREAS, the planning within the College of Osteopathic Medicine results in a recommendation of a 5% increase to the instructional fee and non-resident surcharge, and

WHEREAS, the planning within the University Outreach and Regional Campuses results in recommendations for an increase in tuitions for Independent Study Programs and the Masters in Financial Economics, and

WHEREAS, the planning within the University Outreach and Regional Campuses results in recommendations for the Masters in Athletic Administration and Masters in Coaching Education effective Summer Quarter 2010, and

WHEREAS, the proposed fee schedules are consistent with Amended Substitute House Bill 1.
NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees adopts the proposed fee schedules (Attachment B), effective Fall Quarter 2010, unless otherwise noted.

- Fiscal Year 2010-2011 Student Course, Technology and Miscellaneous Fees, Resolution 2010-3147

FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011
STUDENT COURSE, TECHNOLOGY AND MISCELLANEOUS FEES

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3147

WHEREAS, the Ohio University 2010-2011 Current Funds Budget will contain program enhancements as well as fixed and mandated cost increases, and

WHEREAS, the planning and consultation within the University regarding student course and miscellaneous fees have been accomplished, resulting in recommendations of fee increases, and

WHEREAS, the planning and consultation within the University regarding technology fees have been accomplished, resulting in recommendations to establish an undergraduate technology fee for the College of Health & Human Services and an increase to the College of Osteopathic Medicine medical resources technology fee, and

WHEREAS, the attached fee schedules (Attachments C and D) are consistent with House Bill 1, the state appropriations act as introduced in the Ohio General Assembly.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees adopts the attached fee schedules, effective Fall Quarter 2010.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees authorizes the President or his designee to make non-substantive adjustments to the fee schedules, including but not limited to changes in course and fee identification numbers.
WHEREAS, sustained effort has been made to achieve financial stability for Ohio University’s Residence and Dining Hall Auxiliary while providing necessary services for students, and

WHEREAS, the Residence and Dining Hall Auxiliary has planned for all operating expenses and debt service obligations by means of fees which are collected from students who use the residence and dining hall facilities, and

WHEREAS, the fee increases being requested for Fiscal Year 2010-2011 support progress on the Auxiliary 10 Year Plan.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees adopts the attached schedule of fees (Attachment E), effective Fall Quarter 2010.

Trustee Perry first asked President McDavis to offer a contextual summary of the rationale for the resolution addressing instructional fees and general fees.

President McDavis reconstructed the $1 million going toward top strategic priorities: $400,000 designated to the nursing program, $400,000 designated to general fund education, and $200,000 designated to enrollment management for recruiting efforts. He indicated that an additional $1.6 million will cover a 1 percent salary increase for all university employees, $800,000 is designated to scholarships for Ohio College Opportunity Grants, $1 million is designated for adding sections and courses not offered due to the shortfall of resources, $300,000 is designated to provide funds for faculty promotion, and the remaining $500,000 is designated for student scholarships. President McDavis stressed the importance of these funds that would maintain quality of academic programs. He also emphasized the importance of understanding instructional capacity needs which directly relate to student support. He indicated that future emphasis will continue to be placed upon increasing efficiencies, further reductions and costs and maximizing capacity through revenue generation. President McDavis emphasized that the increase in tuition will not impact regional campus students. He indicated that fiscal challenges will continue to face our state as we enter a new biennium budget cycle.
Trustee Brightbill indicated that he thought that a viable case had been made that would allow him to be supportive of the budget to be acted upon in June. He indicated that he would not be in attendance for the June meeting, but wanted his views to be recorded for the record.

Chair Kidder indicated that the issue of affordability remains a serious concern for the trustees and that continuing to make Ohio University affordable for students and parents should at the forefront of the Board’s efforts. President McDavis agreed and indicated that with the proposed tuition increase, Ohio University would retain its ranking of fourth in relation to other state university tuition costs. Vice Chair Perry thanked President McDavis for framing the case for the need for the instructional fee increase. She indicated that the Board and administration must continue to be cognizant of the impact of Board decisions on the lives of Ohio University students and their families.

Vice Chair Perry motioned approval of the four resolutions outlined above. The motion was seconded by Trustee Dewire.

Trustees Brightbill, Anderson, Schey and Student Trustee Triplett all acknowledged their struggle with the need to raise tuition, however all shared a common belief that it was a necessity to support the instructional fee increase based upon the case made by President McDavis and his administrative team.

Call for question: All voted in favor.

Vice Chair Perry reported on the report of opportunities for improvements to the South Green housing facilities. Trustees serving on the University Resource Committee asked for a comprehensive revitalization plan of residential housing at Ohio University prior to discussions related to the financing of such projects, including the South Green. Vice Chair Perry indicated that infrastructure issues at Ohio University are indicative of similar challenges facing other residential campuses within the University System of Ohio. For this reason she indicated that it may be important to engage the Chancellor to explore alternative ways to address residential issues on a state-wide basis. Chair Kidder indicated that there is a need for a master plan that is integrated into the University’s comprehensive financial plan for all residential buildings over the next 10 years.

Vice Chair Perry reported that in the near future, the Committee will hear more on the Board of Regents 6 Year Capital Plan, Energy Project Performance Contract Initiative Update, and the 5 Year Financial Ratio Analysis. She indicated that it will be important to navigate much of the institution’s future decision making on the 5 Year Financial Ratio Analysis which will be placed at the beginning of the agenda for the next Board meeting.
Chair Kidder encouraged trustees to re-read the 5 Year Financial Ratio Analysis carefully for the next meeting’s discussions.

A copy of the minutes and related materials for the University Resources Committee meeting may be found in Appendix D.

**Governance Committee Report**
Committee Chair Anderson reported that there are no action items before the Governance Committee. She briefly commented on the consent agenda items, adoption of by-laws revisions and appointments to the Kennedy Museum Board. She summarized Trustee Jackson’s update on the process of Student Trustee selection. The Governor’s office will announce the new Student Trustee prior to the June Board meeting. Trustee Anderson took the opportunity to thank Student Trustee Jackson for his fine work on the Board.

Trustee Anderson provided an update on the process of appointing two National Trustees and the corresponding policy and procedure. The recommendations of a new National Trustees will be made at the June meeting. Trustee Anderson reported the dates of September 2-3, 2010 for the annual retreat and meeting on the Athens campus. She expressed the need for a Governance Committee meeting before the June meeting to discuss the framework for the Board retreat.

Finally, Trustee Anderson took the opportunity to comment on the need to support the Third Frontier bond initiative that will be going before the voters of Ohio on May 4. She encouraged other Trustees to weigh the facts including the substantial benefits to Ohio University and its many research initiatives that benefit from the Third Frontier bond.

A copy of the minutes and related materials for the Governance Committee meeting may be found in Appendix E.

**Audit Committee Report**
Committee Chair Wolfort reported that Plante and Moran’s audit was received by the University and the Audit Committee in a timely fashion. In addition, Trustee Wolfort summarized Chief Audit Executive Kathy Gilmore’s Ethics Points trends presentation, including the whistleblower policy and hotline. He spoke to the success of the program and commended the University community for its obvious collaboration in making the process viable.

A copy of the minutes and related materials for the Audit Committee meeting may be found in Appendix F.
Executive Committee Report
Chair Kidder reported that the Board moved into Executive Session to discuss personnel matters. He indicated that the Board continues to focus on measuring institutional priorities and that the Trustees will continue to work closely with the President to accurately review data on progress towards achieving its stated goals.

Trustee Anderson Trustee Anderson moved approval of M. Marnette Perry to serve as Chair for the 2010-11 academic years. The motion was seconded by Trustee Kidder. All voted in favor.

- Election of Chair, Resolution 2010-3149

ELECTION OF CHAIR
RESOLUTION 2010 - 3149

RESOLVED that M. Marnette Perry be elected Chair of the Board of Trustees for the year beginning May 14, 2010, and ending May 13, 2011.

Upon the recommendation of the Governance Committee Trustee Anderson moved approval of C. Robert Kidder to serve as Vice Chair as the Vice Chair for the 2010-11 academic year. The motion was seconded by Trustee Anderson. Trustee Perry seconded. All voted in favor.

- Election of Vice Chair, Resolution 2010-3150

ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR
RESOLUTION 2010 - 3150

RESOLVED that C. Robert Kidder be elected as Vice Chair of the Board of Trustees for the year beginning May 14, 2010, and ending May 13, 2011.

A copy of the minutes and related materials for the Executive Committee meeting may be found in Appendix G.
APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Consent Agenda

Any trustee may request, in advance of action on the consent agenda, that any matter set out in this consent agenda be removed and placed on the regular agenda for discussion and action. All matters listed within the consent agenda have been distributed to each member of the Ohio University Board of Trustees for reading and study, are considered to be routine, and will be enacted by one motion of the Board with no separate discussion.

Chairman Kidder called for a motion to approve all items on the consent agenda. Trustee Anderson moved the motion, seconded by Trustee Brightbill. All voted approval.

- Appointment to Zanesville and Lancaster Regional Coordinating Councils, Resolution 2010-3151

Appointment to Regional Coordinating Councils

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3151

BE IT RESOLVED BY the Board of Trustees of Ohio University that the following persons be appointed to membership on the Coordinating Council at the Regional Campus of Ohio University - Lancaster and Zanesville.

Ohio University – Lancaster


Rob L. Walker For a three-year term beginning July 1, 2010, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2013, vice Denise Callihan, whose term expired.

Ohio University - Zanesville


James Paul AJ.P.@ Feldner Reappointment of a second three-year term beginning July 1, 2010, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2013.

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix C.
• Faculty Fellowship Awards for 2010-2011, Resolution 2010-3152

FACULTY FELLOWSHIP AWARDS

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3152

WHEREAS, the proposed University Faculty Fellowships on the attached list have been reviewed in accordance with University policy and found to be meritorious, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the attached University Faculty Fellowships for 2010-2011 be approved, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Provost can approve changes in the conditions of the fellowships but not the total number of fellowships granted for the 2010-2011 academic year.

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix C.
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:

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES**

Francis Bellezza  Professor Emeritus of Psychology  
Mary E. Chamberlain  Professor Emerita of Biological Sciences  
Kenneth Holroyd  Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Psychology  
Abelardo Moncayo  Associate Professor Emeritus of Spanish  
Charles Naccarato  Assistant Professor Emeritus of English

**COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE**

William S. Romoser  Professor Emeritus of Medical Entomology

**REGIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION**

Alta Sims  Assistant Professor Emerita of Humanities, Zanesville campus  
Thomas Stevenson  Associate Professor Emeritus of Anthropology, Zanesville campus

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix C.
RUSS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY
UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN BIOINFORMATICS

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3154

WHEREAS, the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science in conjunction with the Department of Environmental and Plant Biology have developed the Undergraduate Certificate program in Bioinformatics, and

WHEREAS, Bioinformatics, which combines biology with computer science, is one of the fastest growing disciplines in biological research and in computer science research today, and

WHEREAS, the National Institute of Health Bioinformatics and Computational Biology Roadmap states that “today computation is at the heart of all leading edge biomedical science,” and

WHEREAS, the program will allow Ohio University the ability to more effectively market and deliver to our students a high-quality curriculum built on the faculty and curricular strengths currently existing in various departments, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University hereby approves the Undergraduate Certificate Program in Bioinformatics.

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix C.
• New Non-Degree Program: Undergraduate Certificate in War and Peace, Resolution 2010-3155

THE CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN WAR AND PEACE

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3155

WHEREAS, the Center for International Studies is proposing the War and Peace Certificate to educate students in security studies from an interdisciplinary perspective, and

WHEREAS, there has been a recent and dramatic spike in demand for graduates with a focus in security studies, intelligence analysis and risk assessments, and

WHEREAS, no other school in Ohio has a program of this kind, and

WHEREAS, an interdisciplinary program in War and Peace Studies would be an excellent recruitment device, not only in Ohio but other neighboring regions, and

WHEREAS, graduates holding a certificate in War and Peace Studies will be ready to meet the increased demand in the securities and intelligence analysis field impacted by the events surrounding 9/11, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University hereby approves the Undergraduate Certificate in War and Peace.

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix C.
MINOR AND DEGREE PROGRAM REVIEWS

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3156

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

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

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

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University accepts the review for the following:

Deaf Studies and Interpreting
Department of Economics
Department of Geography

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix C.
• Name Change for the College of Health and Human Services, Resolution 2010-3157

College of Health Sciences and Professions
RESOLUTION 2010 –3157

WHEREAS, the College of Health and Human Services has been reorganized to focus its educational, research, and service mission on the growing fields of health sciences and professions, and

WHEREAS, the faculty and staff of the reorganized college have had an opportunity to discuss the renaming of the college, and

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the College of Health and Human Services be renamed the College of Health Sciences and Professions effective July 1, 2010.

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix C.

• Name Change for the College of Education, Resolution 2010-3158

Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education and Human Services
RESOLUTION 2010 - 3158

WHEREAS, Violet Patton, BSED ’38, is deeply appreciative of the education she received at Ohio University, and

WHEREAS, Miss Patton was an active and committed educator and holds Ohio University and the region of Southern Ohio in high regard, and

WHEREAS, Miss Patton desires to honor her parents, Gladys W. and David H. Patton, both of whom attended Ohio University and were selfless and dedicated educators, and

WHEREAS, Miss Patton’s generous support will greatly enhance the Ohio University College of Education and the ability of the college to provide quality instruction to students.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the College of Education shall be named the Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education and Human Services.
Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix C.

- Academic & Research Center Naming, Resolution 2010-3159

**Naming of the Osteopathic Heritage Foundations and Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey Academic & Research Center**

**RESOLUTION 2010 - 3159**

**WHEREAS**, The Academic & Research Center will welcome students, faculty, staff, alumni and visitors to learn and discover in the 21st Century, and

**WHEREAS**, The facility will allow for the exploration and advancement of medicine and clinical treatments, science, engineering and technology, and

**WHEREAS**, Partnerships between Ohio University’s Fritz J. and Dolores H. Russ College of Engineering and Technology and College of Osteopathic Medicine will allow researchers to meet and discuss projects, which, in turn, may inspire new projects, and

**WHEREAS**, The partnerships established by this facility will help advance the field of bioengineering and will create opportunities for Ohio University students, and

**WHEREAS**, The Osteopathic Heritage Foundations and Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey’s generous support for the creation of this facility will provide this integrated learning experience.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the facility shall be named the Osteopathic Heritage Foundations and Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey Academic & Research Center; Furthermore, the West Green Entrance and the Main Entrance freestanding name bearing wall shall bear the name Osteopathic Heritage Foundations and Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey Academic & Research Center; and the brick wall of the Main Entrance portico shall bear the name Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey and Osteopathic Heritage Foundations Academic & Research Center.

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix C.
• Academic & Research Center Named Spaces, Resolution 2010-3160

The Osteopathic Heritage Foundations and Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey’s Academic & Research Center Named Spaces

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3160

WHEREAS, The Osteopathic Heritage Foundations and Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey Academic & Research Center will welcome students, faculty, staff, alumni and visitors to learn and discover in the 21st Century, and

WHEREAS, The facility will allow for the exploration and advancement of medicine and clinical treatments, science, engineering and technology, and

WHEREAS, Partnerships between Ohio University’s Fritz J. and Dolores H. Russ College of Engineering and Technology and College of Osteopathic Medicine will allow researchers to meet and discuss projects, which, in turn, may inspire new projects, and

WHEREAS, The partnerships established by this facility will help advance the field of bioengineering and will create opportunities for Ohio University students, and

WHEREAS, The generous support of many donors for spaces and areas within the Osteopathic Heritage Foundations/Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey Academic & Research Center will provide this integrated learning experience,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that spaces within this facility shall be named accordingly:

Thomas and Barbara Anderson Medical Research Laboratory;
Brentwood Foundation Medical Research Suite;
Cleveland Clinic Medical Research Laboratory;
Dayton District Academy of Osteopathic Medicine Medical Research Laboratory;
Ohio Osteopathic Foundation Medical Research Laboratory;
Sybert Family Medical Research Laboratory;
Warren General Hospital Medical Research Laboratory;
John Koncelik, D.O., Collaborative Research Laboratory;
“A Warm Welcome” from the Stanley Family;
John Knable, D.O., Family Medical Conference Room;
Ohio University-College of Osteopathic Medicine Society of Alumni and Friends Café.
Summa Western Reserve Hospital/Cuyahoga Falls General Hospital Medical Study Alcove;
Osteopathic Heritage Foundations Medical Research Suites;
Leonard D. Kohn, M.D., Medical Research Suite, In honor of the James O. Watson, D.O. Diabetes Research Chair, Endowed by the Osteopathic Heritage Foundations;
Gutheil Family Medical Conference Room;
Robert Snow, D.O., Family Support Laboratory;
Karen T. Woo, D.O., Support Laboratory;
Foglietti Family Medical Instrumentation Laboratory;
John S. Urse, D.O., FACOS, Family Medical Conference Room;
Leonard and Marie Calabrese Family Medical Study Alcove;
Brent and Kathy Classen Family Medical Study Alcove;
The Emlich Family Medical Study Alcove;
Drs. George and Abigail Faerber Family Medical Study Alcove;
The Legend Group Medical Study Alcove;
Drs. Mehlman and Pina Family Medical Study Alcove;
The Ohio University-College of Osteopathic Medicine Alumni Society Medical Study Alcove;
Georgenna Riley, D.O., and Patriquin Family Medical Study Alcove;
Edwin J. Taylor Jr. Reading Room;
Fritz J. and Dolores H. Russ Learning Studio
Fritz J. and Dolores H. Russ College of Engineering and Technology Board of Visitors Learning Studio;
Paul and Barbara Batchelder Project Team Room;
Srinath and Kathryn Balakrishnan Project Team Room;
Bill and Janet Englefield Project Team Room;
Dickerson Family Project Team Room;
Warren K. Brown Study Alcove

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix C.
Robert D. Walter Center for Strategic Leadership, Resolution 2010-3161

ROBERT D. WALTER CENTER FOR STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3161

WHEREAS, Cardinal Health, Inc. wishes to further its charitable and educational vision for Ohio University’s College of Business, and

WHEREAS, Cardinal Health wishes to honor their founder Robert D. Walter, ’67, ’97, by establishing the Robert D. Walter Center for Strategic Leadership, and

WHEREAS, The mission of the Center will be to educate and provide leadership development opportunities designed to create leaders who can make an immediate difference to their organizations, and

WHEREAS, The center will initially focus on a select leadership program to develop strategic leadership capabilities of high-potential College of Business students, and

WHEREAS, A certificate program will be developed to enhance strategic leadership skills for College of Business students and students from around the University, and

WHEREAS, The Center will be established to advance understanding of strategic leadership, and

WHEREAS, Cardinal Health Inc.’s generous support will greatly enhance the College of Business and the ability of the College to provide quality instruction to students.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the College of Business shall house the Robert D. Walter Center for Strategic Leadership.

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix C.
WHEREAS, Violet Patton, BSED ’38 is deeply appreciative of the education she received at Ohio University, and

WHEREAS, Miss Patton was an active and committed educator and holds Ohio University and the region of Southern Ohio in high regard, and

WHEREAS, Miss Patton desires the creation of a community arts education center to provide arts experiences and education for young artists in the region and will create opportunities for Ohio University students to work with arts programs in local schools, and

WHEREAS, Miss Patton’s generous support will greatly enhance arts education and the ability of Ohio University to provide quality arts education instruction to students and young artists in the region.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Arts Education Center shall be named The Violet L. Patton Center for Arts Education.

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix C.
Russ College of Engineering and Technology Name Change for the Department of Industrial Technology, Resolution 2010-3163

RUSS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY
NAME CHANGE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3163

WHEREAS, the department chair and faculty of the Department of Industrial Technology have proposed a name change to the Department of Engineering Technology and Management, and

WHEREAS, changing the name of the department to Engineering Technology and Management more accurately describes the curriculum of the department’s academic program and better describes the skill set and employment opportunities of its graduates and alumni, and

WHEREAS, the name change has the support of the faculty, alumni, and accreditation body, and

WHEREAS, the name change will best represent the program and has excellent name recognition for recruiting, retention and graduate placement and advancement,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University hereby approves changing the name of the department from Industrial Technology to Engineering Technology and Management.

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix C.
Construction Projects, Resolution 2010-3164

APPROVAL OF PROJECTS AND AUTHORIZATION TO DEVELOP CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS, RECEIVE BIDS AND AWARD CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS FOR RESIDENCE HALL ROOF REPLACEMENT, JAMES HALL CASEWORK REFURBISHMENT, BROMLEY HALL RENOVATIONS, AND WEST GREEN LANDSCAPE AND INFRASTRUCTURE

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3164

WHEREAS, the following four capital projects with total project budgets of $500,000 or more have been planned and developed

A. Residence Hall Roof Replacements with a total project budget of $1,130,000,

B. James Hall Casework Refurbishment with a total project budget of $640,000,

C. Bromley Hall Renovations with a total project budget of $3,000,000,

D. West Green Landscaping and Infrastructure with a total project budget of $1,500,000, and

WHEREAS, the above mentioned projects have been planned, developed, and funded by the Housing Auxiliary as part of the 10 Year Capital Plan.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees authorizes the receipt of bids and the President or his designee to accept and award construction contracts within the total project budgets identified.

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix D.
• Third Frontier Bond Initiative, Resolution 2010-3165

SUPPORT OF STATE ISSUE 1

Resolution 2010 - 3165

WHEREAS The Third Frontier initiative was created to preserve and create jobs, enhance educational opportunities, and improve the quality of life and general well-being of people and businesses throughout Ohio by expanding Ohio’s research capabilities to promote product innovation, development and commercialization; and

WHEREAS The Third Frontier program has laid the foundation for the creation and growth of technology-based jobs and businesses, increased early stage capital investments, improved the environment for technology entrepreneurs, increased collaboration in research and development, and enhanced our economic competitiveness and diversity; and

WHEREAS More is expected of this program in the next few years as the research translates into market solutions, companies and lasting jobs; and

WHEREAS The State of Ohio’s Third Frontier initiative has delivered measurable results by investing $681 million since 2002 which has yielded $6.6 billion in economic activity, $2.4 billion in wages and benefits, and more than 48,000 jobs; and

WHEREAS Ohio University, as a result of its participation in the Third Frontier program, has teamed statewide with a number of Ohio universities and colleges to assist more than 250 companies and help launch 17 start-up companies; and

WHEREAS Ohio University has generated more than $26 million in additional federal and industry funding from the Third Frontier program, which has been a contributing factor in helping early stage technology companies accelerate commercialization; and

WHEREAS The proposed state constitutional amendment will authorize the State of Ohio to issue up to $700 million in bonds for the Third Frontier initiative in order to provide financial assistance for research, product innovation, and commercialization in support of Ohio industries and businesses in such areas as advanced materials, agbiosciences, alternative energy and fuel development, biomedical imaging, and improved diagnostics, treatments and cures for cancer, heart and other diseases; and
WHEREAS Issue 1 will continue to foster job creation through the advancement of new products and services based on science and technology research and development, thus ensuring Ohio’s ability to create and compete for jobs, today and in the future; and

WHEREAS Ohio University is an integral partner in the effort to advance scientific knowledge and to develop new products and applications that will enhance our state’s economy; and

WHEREAS The Ohio General Assembly deserves much appreciation for its strong bipartisan support of the Third Frontier program and its placement of the constitutional amendment on the ballot.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the said investment will improve the quality of life for all Ohioans and that Ohio University supports and endorses the passage of State Issue 1 and that a copy of this resolution be tendered to the Governor, the Ohio General Assembly and other interested constituencies.

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix D.
Adoption of By-Laws, Resolution 2010-3166

THE OHIO UNIVERSITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES BY-LAWS

AMENDMENT

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3166

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees recognized the benefit formalizing the appointment of two national trustees within the by-laws, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees deliberated and sought consultation with the Association of Governing Boards regarding the appropriate number of Regular Meetings per year, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees deliberated and sought consultation with the Association of Governing Boards regarding the appropriate process for the development of the Regular Meeting Agendas.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ohio University Board of Trustees approves the amendments to the by-laws Article I. Section 4 and 5; and Article V. Sections 1, 3, 4, and 6 as presented to them formally this day.

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix E.
Kennedy Museum Board, Resolution 2010-3167

Kennedy Museum of Art Advisory Board Members

Resolution 2010 - 3167

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 Art 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 additional appointments to the Advisory Board which will bring the number of members currently serving to eight members:

Three-Year Term

Jay Hostetler       Vice President of Product Development
                  Stewart-MacDonald, Athens, Ohio

Donald Roberts     Professor Emeritus of Art, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio
                  Master Printer

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix E.
• AFSCME Contract Ratification, Resolution 2010-3168

RATIFICATION OF LABOR AGREEMENT

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3168

WHEREAS, Ohio University and Local 1699 and Ohio Council 8 of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) have collectively bargained a new agreement effective 5:01 P.M. March 1, 2010 to 5:00 P.M. March 1, 2013, and

WHEREAS, the Ohio University Board of Trustees, in accordance with Section 4117.10(B) of the Ohio Revised Code, must ratify the agreement,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby ratify the Agreement between the University and Local 1699 and Ohio Council 8 of AFSCME; and authorizes the president of the University to arrange for execution in accordance with Ohio law.

Copies of background materials for this resolution may be found in Appendix G.

Announcements
President McDavis asked the Chair for a few moments to recognize Trustee Larry Schey for his nine years of service to the Board of Trustees. President McDavis reflected on the many ways the Schey family has contributed to Ohio University over the years. Trustee Schey’s father, Ralph Schey, served nine years on the Board of Trustees. He commended Trustee Schey’ work both on the Board of Trustees as well as his commitment to The Ohio University Foundation Board of Trustees. President McDavis presented Trustee Schey with a Certification of Appreciation.

Trustee Schey publically thanked Board members and others that he has served with over the years. Trustee Schey indicated that Trustees strive to do what is best for the university, students, faculties and employees through their due diligence. He thanked students, faculty, and staff and shared the privilege he felt in working with so many over the years. He expressed his love of Ohio University and promise it holds for the future. Trustee Schey ended his comments by indicating what a great honor this service has meant to him, and he rates it as one of his best life experiences.

President McDavis acknowledged the service of Student Trustee Jackson to the Board and presented a Certification of Appreciation to him. Student Trustee Jackson thanked the
Board members and University community for the opportunity that he has had over the past two years. He ended his comments by promising to stay connected as an alumnus to Ohio University.

Chair Kidder recognized and thanked Deborah McDavis for hosting the Board of Trustees dinner on Thursday evening.

Secretary Davis announced changes in the media avail location following the meeting.

**Announcement of Next Stated Meeting Date**
Secretary Davis indicated that the next meeting of the Board will be June 23-24, 2010 at Ohio University’s Athens campus.

**Adjournment**
Chair Kidder adjourned the meeting at 12:01 pm.

**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. Robert Kidder     Thomas E. Davis
Chairman        Secretary
President’s Report

presented to
Ohio University Board of Trustees
April 16, 2010
Overview

- Strategic Priorities
- Capital Campaign
- Program Spotlight—Sustainability
- Interlink Alliance
- Points of Pride
Ohio University will be the nation’s best transformative learning community where students realize their promise, faculty advance knowledge, and alumni become global leaders.
Top Strategic Priorities

- Establish Effective Short- and Long-Term Enrollment Planning
- Improve the Institution’s Financial Strength
- Enhance the Quality of the Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum
- Bolster Graduate Education and Associated Efforts of Faculty in Research and Creative Activity
- Institute Effective Compensation Policies and Practices to Ensure that Talented Faculty, Administrative Staff, and Classified Staff Are Rewarded and Retained
- Launch a $350M Capital Campaign Focused on Supporting Core Academic Initiatives
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision OHIO Goals</th>
<th>Enrollment Planning</th>
<th>Financial Strength</th>
<th>Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum</th>
<th>Graduate Education, Research/Creative Activity</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
<th>Capital Campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruit and retain talented and diverse students, faculty, and staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen undergraduate education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance graduate and professional education and research</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrich the environment for students, faculty, staff, and the region</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortify and align infrastructure to enhance the academic missions of instruction, research, and service</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance prominence within Ohio, the nation, and the world</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Promise Capital Campaign
Campaign Priorities

- **Cultivate Learning:** Cultivate outstanding academic and student-life experiences
- **Expand Opportunity:** Increase access and opportunity
- **Inspire Discovery:** Invest in research, discovery, and creative activity
- **Nurture Place:** Enrich the campus environment
- **Encourage Community:** Expand outreach and partnerships
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Promise Capital Campaign</th>
<th>CAMPAIGN PRIORITY</th>
<th>POTENTIAL NON-ENDOWED IMPACT</th>
<th>POTENTIAL ENDOWED IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTIVATE LEARNING:</strong> Cultivate outstanding academic and student-life experiences.</td>
<td>Academic Support Centers; Student Activities; Athletics Gender Equity; Centers of Excellence</td>
<td>Centers of Excellence; study abroad programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPAND OPPORTUNITY:</strong> Increase access and opportunity.</td>
<td>Non-endowed scholarships; student recruitment funds; learning communities</td>
<td>229 full-ride endowed scholarships; summer &quot;bridge&quot; programs; student mentoring funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSPIRE DISCOVERY:</strong> Invest in research, discovery and creative activity.</td>
<td>Technology &amp; research funds; faculty recruitment and mentoring funds; library collections</td>
<td>22 endowed chairs; 45 endowed professorships; lectureship and speakers endowments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUTURE PLACE:</strong> Enrich the campus environment.</td>
<td>New/renovated facilities for Arts and Sciences, Athletics, Business, Chillicothe, Scripps College, Education, Fine Arts and the Kennedy Museum</td>
<td>Endowments for facilities maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCOURAGE COMMUNITY:</strong> Expand outreach and partnerships.</td>
<td>Community Health programs; Kids On Campus</td>
<td>Center for Entrepreneurship Kennedy Museum programs; Arts Education programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Spotlight: Commitment to Sustainability

University Sustainability: Sonia Marcus
The Compost Project: Chuck Hart
Residence Hall-based Programs: Scott Eardley
OHIO Ecohouse: Alana Dakin
Inaugural Faculty Development Conference, “Teaching the Millennial Student: Best Practices in Teaching and Learning,” held March 19-20 at Spelman College

Conference a first step in achieving The Interlink Alliance’s goal of fostering and promoting faculty development

Conference focused on various methods of teaching the "millennial student" - a person born between 1977 and 1994

Dr. John Silvanus Wilson, Jr., executive director of the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities, delivered the keynote address
Points of Pride
Points of Pride

- The Speaking Bobcats won the Ohio Forensics Association State Champion Tournament for the third year in a row.
- Ohio University Professor of Teacher Education Guofang Wan received the 2010 Margaret B. Lindsey Award for Distinguished Research in Teacher Education from The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- The OHIO men’s basketball team won the Mid-American Conference Tournament Championship advancing to the NCAA Tournament where the team won its first round match up against Georgetown University.
- Ohio University named a Center of Excellence for Health and Wellness by Gov. Ted Strickland.
University Academics and University Resources Joint Committee Meeting
Margaret M. Walter Hall
Governance Room 104
1:00 p.m.

Present: Trustees Anderson, Brightbill, McGee Brown, Dewire, Harris, Jackson, Kidder, Krasovec, Minichello, Perry, Schey, Stuckey, Triplett, and Wolfort; President McDavis, Tom Davis, Joe McLaughlin, David Thomas

Presenting: Michael Angelini, Pam Benoit

Trustee Kidder brought the meeting to order. Dr. McDavis welcomed the Trustees and introduced the presentation as a follow-up to previous discussions on strategic, budget, and enrollment management. This presentation’s focus is on the alignments among these initiatives.

FY 2011 Budget, Key Elements

- **Approach:**
  - Activity Based Reductions were examined without regard to whether the unit was academic or support.
  - Activity reductions will take place in a multi-year framework
    - Reallocation of resources will develop academic strengths in line with the strategic plan

- **Alignment:**
  - Strategic Plan Objectives (priorities)
    - Curriculum
    - Graduate and Research
    - Enrollment
    - Compensation

- **Process**
  - Multi-year
    - Discussion will continue to increase understanding of unit organization and budget structure
    - Will continue to refine operational strategic priorities based on learning from this year’s process.
  - Consultative/Iterative
    - Rubric aligned with strategic plan objectives
    - University Website
Website created to receive suggestions from faculty, staff and students on cost savings and other ideas about efficiency
  o Received hundreds of submissions and responded to them. Ideas were divided into Phase I, ideas that could be implemented quickly, and Phase II, ideas that will need exploration and research.

- Units submit budget reduction scenarios
  - Meetings on scenarios with unit heads
- Budget Planning Council adjusts budget assumptions
- Dissemination of draft budget
  - Meetings with unit heads on draft budget recommendations
  - Four open forums held
    o Transparent
      - Draft budget recommendations provided to university community
      - President’s announcement on budget reallocations and investments sent to university community.

- Results
  o Transformational Change
    - Reconfiguration of academic programs and services
    - Realignment of academic programs
    - Reorganization of academic support services
    - Revenue generation, cost savings, and achievement of efficiencies as permanent institutional priorities.
      - Efficiencies: utility usage, consolidating copier contracts
      - Revenue Generation: real estate opportunities
      - Potential Cost Savings: phase out subsidies
  - Working on 2011-12 budget
    o Will base decisions on best data available and listen to community throughout process
    o Create greater understand of potential consequences of reductions

Discussion:

- What would we change in the next budget process?
  o Increase understanding of organizational and strategic plans within units to inform what can be changed or eliminated
  o Begin earlier to look at the 2011-12 budget preparation. Timing was difficult this year due to change in VPFA position.
  o Increase awareness of impact of reductions across units and the relationship between academic and service reductions.
What are we doing to increase capacity?

- Capacity issues are reviewed within context of enrollment.
  - We increased selectivity in the freshman class.
  - Targeted marketing for programs and out-of-state students; strengthened in person presence at feeder high schools, enhanced call and letter writing to prospects; trained faculty and staff to work on yield, responded to a Saudi initiative to diversify international recruitment; enhanced on-line recruitment through social networks (Facebook, Twitter); held first high school multicultural recruitment events; used RUFUS to assist with customized recruitment.
- We have a great deal of capacity on regional campuses; increasing on Athens campus will be discussed in Resources today.
  - How could an increase of 1000 beds be met within three years to meet educational demand?
    - More time needed to respond on Athens campus; transfer, international, out-of-state, and distance learning marketing may be growing.
- Have we identified an ideal enrollment for Athens campus?
  - We are working on an answer to that question in our enrollment management committees and will provide more specifics in the June meeting.
  - Finding ideal model in conjunction with strategic plan will help to know how to spend and in what sequence. Can we work on a 5-7 year plan?
    - Demographics are declining in Ohio; some growth is possible in traditional students but competition for those students is also rising.
- What does it cost to bring in 1000 new students, if the mix stays the same; what is the margin for instructional costs?
  - There are significant differences in costs depending on the type of instruction needed. Will look at pockets of opportunity, particularly programs not at full capacity, and then target marketing for where capacity exists.
  - These reviews will tell us what services, facilities, and instructional capacity will be needed. We are looking at facilities to meet the new millennial students’ expectations. We have a competitive advantage with academics, and we must move facilities forward as well.
- What is the process to align our capacity with capacity in the marketplace?
• We must advertise programs with capacity to prospective students to let them know what opportunities are available and what jobs are there for those programs of study. Students try majors out and most do not arrive knowing what they want to do. We need to help them make informed choices. Advertising creates demand and we need to create that where we have capacity.

  o Would a 5% increase in faculty spread across units stretch instructional capacity?

  ▪ General Education courses are required of all students requiring additional faculty to service them. Students make choices about those majors regardless of where our capacity exists.

  o How will the new capital campaign contribute to creating capacity?

    ▪ The challenge in capital giving is that the funding is often restricted. Increased support in scholarships will be helpful.

  o What is the standard teaching load?

    ▪ The number of people in a class is determined pedagogically. Courses with heavy writing, labs, and research, for example, must be smaller. The appropriate class size ought to be determined by design and nature of the course. The number of courses faculty teach along with research and service obligations determine workload. Colleges, schools and departments all have workload policies and we have ongoing discussions about those.

  o What percentage of new students are undeclared and when do they change majors?

    ▪ David Descutner, Dean of University College, requires undecided students to participate in Learning Communities to broaden their academic experience. They also hold majors fairs with all departments present to inform newcomers about the breadth and depth of their offerings.

• In addition to consolidating copier purchasing are their other opportunities for investment and savings through the USO?

  o The Interuniversity Councils (Presidents and Provosts) are in discussions with the Chancellor to find efficiencies at the state level.

Trustee Kidder adjourned with thanks to the able leadership’s presentation and the comprehensive understanding of complexities provided.

1:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Janice Roché
Assistant to the Exec. V.P. and Provost
University Academics
&
University Resources
Joint Committee Meeting

Ohio University Board of Trustees
April 15, 2010
FY 2011 Budget

Approach
Alignment
Process
Results
APPROACH

☐ Standard Issue Differential Reductions

☑ Activity Based Reductions
Approach

☐ Annual Framework

☑ Multi-year Framework

...offering decreased staff time, enhanced long-range planning, and improved program evaluation. Multi-year budgeting facilitates the integration of financial and strategic planning, replacing incrementalism with a more strategic approach to resource allocation.
APPROACH

• What activities are essential and what activities can be reduced or ended? [Activity-based reductions]

• How do we find ways to reallocate resources to develop the academic strengths of the institution? [Multi-year framework]
ALIGNMENT

Use of Strategic Budget Reallocation Rubric Based on Strategic Plan Objectives

Required an analysis of the degree in which activities within units are primary, secondary, or tertiary to the support of the strategic objectives

Strategic Budget Reallocation Guidance
Ohio University
November 20, 2009

Planning units’ 5% and 10% budget reduction scenarios should reflect a commitment to protecting the university’s academic quality and to ensuring an exemplary experience for our students. Planning units should take into account the following impact criteria as they construct their scenarios:

- Impact on meeting enrollment objectives
- Impact on graduation/retention rates
- Impact on generation of student credit hours
- Impact on the quality of the student experience
- Impact on research and creative activity

Planning units should group activities identified in proposed reductions into three categories:

| Primary to Supporting Enrollment Objectives, Graduation Rates, SCH, Quality of Student Experience, Research & Creative Activity | Secondary to Supporting Enrollment Objectives, Graduation Rates, SCH, Quality of Student Experience, Research & Creative Activity | Tertiary to Supporting Enrollment Objectives, Graduation Rates, SCH, Quality of Student Experience, Research & Creative Activity |

*Planning units must provide evidence of the quality, efficacy, and efficiency of those activities identified as primary.

The university must perform activities that are essential to its operation but are not directly related to the five key activities listed above (e.g. legal services or payroll). Planning units responsible for those functions must demonstrate that they are delivering the service effectively and at the lowest feasible cost.
ALIGNMENT

FY 2010 BASE INVESTMENTS IN STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

FY 2011 BUDGET ACTIONS TO PROTECT/ENHANCE STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

Curriculum
- Learning Community Expansion ($130,000)
- Allen Student Help Center ($40,000)
- Supplemental Instruction for Math ($30,000)
- Educational Assessment Projects ($200,000)
- Stage One BSN ($904,640)
- Instructional Capacity Fund ($1M) & General Education Improvement Project ($400,000)
- Stage Two B.S.N. ($400,000)

Graduate & Research
- Graduate Tuition Scholarships ($1.5 M)
- Voinovich School ($500,000)
- Prioritizing Group I Faculty
- Prioritizing Research Investment Funds
Alignment

FY 2010 Base Investments in Strategic Priorities

FY 2011 Budget Actions to Protect/Enhance Strategic Priorities

Enrollment

- Increased Investment in Need-Based Scholarships ($2M)
- Support of Endowed Scholarships ($1M)
- Support of Recruiting Activities ($409,007)
- Increased Support of International Recruitment & Advising ($195,000)
- Increased Investment in Need-Based Scholarships ($1.4 M)
- Support of Recruiting Activities ($200,000) & Prioritization in FY 2011 Budget
ALIGNMENT

FY 2010 BASE INVESTMENTS IN STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

FY 2011 BUDGET ACTIONS TO PROTECT/ENHANCE STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

Compensation

- $1.6M in Faculty and Staff Increased Compensation
- $750,000 Merit Compensation for Faculty if Enrollment Targets are Exceeded
- Absorbed Increased Health Care Costs to Avoid Employee Premium Percentage Rate Increases
ALIGNMENT
FY 2010 BASE INVESTMENTS IN STRATEGIC PRIORITIES
FY 2011 BUDGET ACTIONS TO PROTECT/ENHANCE STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

Capital Campaign
• Provision of $1.9M to cover Investment Income Shortfalls
• Received Smallest Budget Reduction of the Academic Support Units in order to Protect Capital Campaign Staffing

Financial Strength
• Maintenance of $1M Reserve to Improve Financial Strength
• Maintenance of $700,000 Enrollment Reserve
• Continuation of Multi-Year Strategy to Resolve Structural Financial Issues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIGNMENT FY 11 Investments &amp; Reallocation</th>
<th>OCOG &amp; Other Financial Aid</th>
<th>1% Raise</th>
<th>Additional Faculty Raise Pool</th>
<th>Instructional Capacity</th>
<th>Vision Ohio Investments</th>
<th>Other Funding Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAD &amp; Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Planning</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Strength</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Campaign</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROCESS

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY INVOLVED IN MULTIPLE WAYS AND AT MULTIPLE LEVELS

PROCESS DESIGNED TO BE:

MULTI-YEAR
CONSULTATIVE
TRANSPARENT
ITERATIVE
MULTI-YEAR

- Broader discussions about unit organization and the structure of unit budgets will continue.

- Further work on the operational strategic priorities and the refinement of the strategic plan will continue.
CONSULTATIVE, TRANSPARENT, ITERATIVE
[November 2009 – January 2010]

- Establishment of rubric aligned with strategic plan objectives (November 2009)

- Activation of university website for posting of suggestions on cost-savings, efficiencies, and revenue generation (December 1, 2009 - January 29, 2010)
CONSULTATIVE, TRANSPARENT, ITERATIVE

[February 2010]

- Planning units’ submissions of 5% & 10% budget reduction scenarios (February 1)
- Meetings with planning unit heads on scenarios (February 3 – February 11)
- Budget Planning Council adjusts budget assumptions; gap reduced to $13.75 M (February 12)
- Dissemination of draft budget recommendations (February 15)
CONSULTATIVE, TRANSPARENT, ITERATIVE
[February 2010, Continued]

- Budget suggestion website reopened for comments on draft budget recommendations (February 15)
- Meetings begin with planning unit heads on draft budget recommendation (February 16)
- Four open forums held (February 23 – February 25)
CONSULTATIVE, TRANSPARENT, ITERATIVE
[March - June 2010]

- Meetings continue with planning unit heads (March)
- Responses provided to the university community on the 200+ suggestions posted on the budget website (March 10)
- Final budget reduction recommendations & other budget information provided to the university community (March 29)
- Budget update provided to the university community (April)
- FY 2011 proposed budget provided to the university community (June 1)
CONSULTATIVE, TRANSPARENT, ITERATIVE
Communications with the University Community November 2009 - March 2010

- EVPP announcement of budget process and budget suggestion website (November 20, 2009)
- President ongoing frequent email communications with University Community (November, 2009 through present)
- EVPP announcement that budget suggestion website is available for use (December 1, 2009)
- EVPP & Interim SVPFA update on budget and announcement of the budget forums (February 9, 2010)
• EVPP & Interim SVPFA update on budget and provision of responses to suggestions posted to the budget suggestion website in December & January (March 10, 2010)

• President’s announcement on budget reallocations and investments (March 29, 2010)
RESULTS

Examples of Transformational Change

- Reconfiguration of academic programs & services
  - College of Business Minor & Cluster
  - Center for Teaching and Learning
  - Center for Writing Excellence
  - Ohio University Press

- Realignment of academic programs
  - Center for Global Leadership
  - Discussions about internal administrative structure in the College of Fine Arts
EXAMPLES OF TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGE

- Reorganization of essential support services
  - Shared Ownership of the University Plane
  - Facilities Planning/Space Management
  - Management of Blackboard

- Aligning activities with other sources of funding (e.g. grants, RDP, etc.)
RESULTS

Examples of Transformational Change

• Office of Information Technology $405,000 Budget Reduction; IT Residence Hall Services Reconfigured Due to New Technologies

• Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) Budget Gap Closed; reduction of General Fund support of ICA

• Revenue Generation, Cost Savings, and Achievement of Efficiencies as Permanent Institutional Priorities
RESULTS

Examples of Efficiency Initiatives

• Phase I Website Suggestions

• Rethinking the delivery of College of Business minor using fewer instructional resources ($150,000).

• Consolidating of copier contracts across the university (estimated $400,000 when fully implemented).

• Reorganizing backroom library operations ($300,000)

• Reducing payroll runs ($100,000)
RESULTS

Examples of Revenue Generation Possibilities

• Creating two new online graduate cohorts in athletic training and sports administration (estimated $220,000)

• Leveraging capital assets at HDL & Kennedy Museum (estimated $65,000)

• Expanding social work degrees on the regional campuses (estimated $500,000)
RESULTS

Examples of Potential Cost Savings

• Move Global Leadership Center to the Center for International Studies. It is estimated that 1/3 of the current costs associated with this program (staffing, travel, and programming) will be saved by this move ($66,000)

• Phase out General Fund subsidy for the Ohio University Press ($361,686)

• Merge RHE and University Outreach to make it possible to eliminate one senior administrative position after the current incumbent retires at the end of the academic year ($200,000)
RESULTS

Examples of Potential Cost Savings

• Eliminate printing of calendars, mailings, and brochures distributed internally (TBD)

• Establish a Library policy of not purchasing print copies of journals that are available digitally ($20,000)

• Reduce non-peak hours in Baker Center ($16,000)

• Reorganization of Finance, UHR, and Safety/Risk Management ($411,618)
University Academics Committee
Ohio University Board of Trustees Meeting
April 15, 2010
Margaret M. Walter Hall Rotunda

Present: Trustees Brightbill, Chair Harris, Krasovec, Minichello, McGee Brown, Schey, Triplett

Chair Harris convened the meeting. Review of all the material requiring Committee consent was reviewed prior to hearing the Provost’s report. All resolutions below will be recommended for approval to the full Board of Trustees on April 16.

Regional Coordinating Councils Resolution:
• Ohio University-Lancaster
  o Three year terms for Suellen Goldsberry and Rob L. Walker
• Ohio University-Zanesville
  o Three-year terms for Stoey J. Stout and James Paul Feldner.

Faculty Fellowship Awards Resolution 2010

Faculty Emeritus/Emerita Awards Resolution 2010

Russ College of Engineering and Technology Undergraduate Certificate in BioInformatics Resolution 2010

The Center for International Studies Undergraduate Certificate in War and Peace
Discussion:
  o Benoit noted that these interdisciplinary certificates require no new resources to offer.
    ▪ Schey commended the collaboration among colleges to take advantage of resources, target coursework to increase student competitiveness in the job market.
  o Question arose on how these programs come about.
    ▪ New programs arise from faculty finding shared interests with others. They find they already have coursework under separate tracks that can be combined to create a new course of study. Students benefit from the new certificate noted on their transcripts. Sometimes students request coursework and then find faculty interested in developing the
offering. Vetted through CCC and UCC, they move to final board approval.

Major Degree Program Reviews
- Deaf Studies and Interpreting
- Department of Economics
- Department of Geography

Renaming the College of Health and Human Services
- New name: College of Health Sciences and Professions
  - Will accurately reflect mission focus and inclusion in the University System of Ohio Center of Excellence in Biomedicine and Health Care.

Renaming the College of Education
- New name: Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education and Human Services
  - New programs: Early Childhood Program and Child Development Center; the Department of Sports Pedagogy; and Restaurant, Hotel, and Tourism, Retail Merchandising, and Family and Consumer Science.

Naming of the Academic & Research Center facility
- The Osteopathic Heritage Foundations and Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey Academic & Research Center
  - The Irvine entrance will be named The Osteopathic Heritage Foundations Academic & Research Center
  - The Stocker entrance will be named the Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey Academic & Research Center

Resolution to house the Robert D. Walter Center for Strategic Leadership within the College of Business
- Mention was made that any new programs, certificates, majors or courses of study arising within the context of this new center will be subject to the normal cycle of program review by college and university curriculum councils.

Naming of the Arts Education Center in honor of Violet L. Patton Center for Arts Education
- Likewise, any new programs, certificates, majors or courses of study arising within the context of this new center will be subject to the normal cycle of program review by college and university curriculum councils.
Name Change for Department of Industrial Technology

Executive Vice President and Provost’s Report:

- Strategic Priorities Update
  - Vision Ohio goals reviewed demonstrating the benefit each priority would receive when specific activities are implemented.
    - Next step is to revise metrics.
- Enrollment Management Plan
  - Enrollment Management work groups do a variety of planning and create targets for particular markets in international, online, transfer, and summer programs.
  - Where are our markets and how do we increase capacity there?
    - There is a dwindling pool for traditional students and competition for them is significantly higher as a consequence.
    - Increases in enrollment affect classroom and instructional capacity, housing, and parking. The new SSI taxonomy, scholarships, differential tuition, and scholarship leveraging are being discussed.
  - On reference to differential tuition, Benoit stated that programs that might be candidates for this need high, sustainable demand. We must know program competitors and their price points. If we raise our price, will we lose students? How does differential tuition affect accessibility? We need to look at outcomes at other schools. Differential tuition works well in graduate programs and some undergraduate premium programs with high demand. Suggestion is to learn from successes and failures at other institutions.
  - Discussion:
    - Assessment of General Education Program Review
    - A current project by Institutional Research will provide an interim report on status of general education review.
      - An 1804 proposal to study of a variety of other institutional approaches is in the works. If awarded, the grant will allow visits to the institutions with the best processes to see if they are actually good on site.
      - Hope to create three or four models that would best fit OHIO and then discuss these on a university-wide basis. By the second year of this study, we may have specific information to provide to the
Board.

- **Academic Restructuring Update**
  - Progress: HHS, CoFA, CoE, CoB
    - Major aspects nearing completion
      - Approval program relocations by UCC’s Thomas and Kramer were instrumental in assisting with this process.
      - Benoit thanked Deans Middleton and Leite for managing the restructuring. Leite took on the largest challenges in this restructuring, extraordinary work has been accomplished.
  - Progress: Academic Health Sciences Center
    - Will share this restructure at June meeting.

- **Unification of Regional Higher Education and University Outreach**
  - University Outreach, led by Charlie Bird, has given the university new opportunities for revenue generation. Charlie is retiring in June. At that time, Regional Higher Education will be combined with University Outreach with an additional mission to extend e-learning and other efforts to continue growth.

- **Quarters to Semesters**
  - Thanks to leadership of Jeff Giesey; we are on track to complete transition by 2010. Our process is serving as a model; we are ahead of other institutions.
    - Great attention to detail will strengthen curriculum
      - A number of program codes have been eliminated; other programs combined to increase efficient delivery
  - Focus on 2011 will be on advising students during transition.

**Discussion:**

- Harris commended group on progress.
- RUFUS initiative impacts Q2S; faculty are working to find those policies that do not work with PeopleSoft. Decisions being made to either change policy or rewrite PeopleSoft.
- Is the USO providing technical assistance?
  - There is nice coordination among the institutions that are moving to semesters and discussions at IUCs are helping with transitions.
- David Descuter noted that every Friday for two years, a large group of faculty, led by David Thomas, took charge of this Q2S process. This has been the best example of shared governance within the university to date. Thomas has exemplified a cooperative ethic in moving issues forward, gathering information, and getting decisions made.
Thomas added that wonderful things are being said about Q2S. Extraordinary work has been provided by IT through the OCEAN program. This online system moves new courses and modifications through the approval process. OSU is interested in the OCEAN program; we will talk about license agreement.

- Tripplett asked if Academic Restructuring has realized any savings from shared services. It is too early to tell yet if they are there.
- Schey noted progress made in last year is significant. As we move forward with capacity analysis, it is encouraging to see all the right parties working together to find efficiencies, opportunities for new revenue, and collaborations to benefit students.

- Harris adjourned meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janice Roché  
Assistant to the Exec. V.P. and Provost
Executive Vice President and Provost’s Report
University Academics Committee
Ohio University Board of Trustees
April 15, 2010
Strategic Priorities

Update
Draft Strategic Priorities
Input from Campus Community & Vision Ohio Steering Committee

- Need a preamble to the strategic priorities that will link them clearly to FYVOIP and demonstrate how the priorities are interconnected. [Preamble Written] ✔

- Need to clarify how priorities fit within the Five Year Vision Ohio Implementation Plan (FYVOIP) [Table] ✔

- Need to communicate clearly that academics are front and center in our strategic planning [Ordering] ✔

- Need to flesh out the priorities and connect them to other substantive matters in the FYVOIP. [Revised] ✔
Prompted in part by Faculty Senate Executive Committee’s concerns about the clarity and concision of the Five Year Vision Ohio Implementation Plan (FYVOIP), the Board of Trustees requested that University leadership identify the core elements of the plan and distill them into a simple, lucid document. The deans and executive staff reviewed the plan during the summer and reached consensus on a document containing six strategic priorities that they then shared with the Board of Trustees before their August retreat. The Board used the retreat to produce a strategic priorities document on which they reached a consensus during the October Board of Trustees meeting.

Executive Vice President and Provost Benoît charged the Vision Ohio Steering Committee (VOSC), a university-wide committee with representatives from each constituent group, with reviewing the two documents, seeking input from their constituents on them, and ultimately producing a single set of strategic priorities that correspond to the six FYVOIP goals. After creating an unranked set of strategic priorities for each FYVOIP goal, VOSC then engaged in a prioritization exercise through which they selected priorities within goals and then selected priorities across all goals. The deans and executive staff, heads of the constituent senates, and all chairs and directors of academic units then completed the same prioritization exercise using the VOSC set of priorities. The results of the exercises were compiled and served as the basis for the Board of Trustees’ discussion at its January meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision Ohio Goals</th>
<th>Strategic Priorities</th>
<th>Enrollment Planning</th>
<th>Financial Strength</th>
<th>UG &amp; GRAD Curriculum</th>
<th>GRAD Education &amp; Research/Creative Activity</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
<th>Capital Campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruit and retain talented and diverse students,</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty, and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen undergraduate education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance graduate education and professional education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrich the environment for students, faculty, staff,</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortify and align infrastructure to enhance the</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic missions of instruction, research, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance prominence within Ohio, the nation, and the</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revised Strategic Priorities

(1) Enhance the quality of the undergraduate curriculum and the graduate curriculum through continuing assessment and the Q2S transition.

(2) Bolster graduate education and associated efforts of faculty in research and creative activity.

(3) Establish effective strategic short-term and long-term enrollment planning to ensure recruitment goals (quality and mix of students) and revenue projections are met.

(4) Institute effective compensation policies and practices to ensure that talented faculty, administrative staff, and classified staff are rewarded and retained.

(5) Launch a $350 million dollar capital campaign focused on supporting core academic initiatives.

(6) Improve the institution’s financial strength so that fiscal and capital resources are stable and permit ongoing strategic investment.
Enrollment Management Plan

Update
Workgroup #1 Charge

Smart Enrollment Planning

Recommend actions necessary to enhance efficacy of institutional and admissions marketing materials, student academic services, and academic support services, and to ensure that both sets of services are sufficient to meet demand associated with sustainable enrollment. Recommendations will be based on (a) an assessment of the quality of current institutional and admissions marketing materials across various populations and priority markets, specifically with respect to whether they are effectively aligned in anticipation of the upcoming branding campaign, and (b) an assessment of the adequacy of both student academic services (advising, tutoring, retention initiatives) and academic support services (instructional technology, student life programs, etc.) in light of institutional goals for student success, retention, and timely graduation.
Workgroup #2 Charge

Strategic Enrollment Planning

Recommend actions necessary (a) to achieve distinctive five-year maximum enrollment targets for traditional recruitment populations, including priority markets (transfer students, nonresident students, multicultural and international students, graduate students, online students, regional campuses), and (b) to expand online education and summer programs in ways that protect academic quality and ensure sustainable revenue generation. Making decisions that protect academic quality will require consultation with and annual reports to colleges, departments/schools, and standing enrollment committees. Making decisions that ensure steady revenue generation will require annual assessment of yield and retention among the specific target populations and determining whether online education programs and summer programs are academically sound and effectively meeting enrollment goals.
Workgroup #3 Charge

Sustainable Enrollment Planning
Recommend actions necessary to achieve realistic, durable five-year sustainable enrollment in ways that protect academic quality and are financially sound. Making decisions that protect academic quality will require specifying the instructional capacity necessary to accommodate annual sustainable enrollment targets, determining how instructional and related facilities can be optimally used, and studying extant policies and procedures to discover if they constrain enrollment expansion. Making financially sound decisions will require conducting a price elasticity study and taking into account the consequences of the new SSI taxonomy for the estimated sustainable enrollment targets, the possible strategic opportunities of differential tuition, and the relative advantages of different approaches to scholarship leveraging.
Academic Restructuring

Update
Progress on HHS, COFA, COE, & COB Restructuring

- Academic Program relocations approved by UCC
- Internal restructuring of HHS
- Resolutions for college name changes to be considered by Board of Trustees
Progress on Academic Health Center

- Revised draft of recommended structure and function of Academic Health Center submitted for review
Unification of Regional Higher Education and University Outreach

- Decision made to unify the two units
- New unit to be led by Dr. Dan Evans beginning in July 2010. His title will be Executive Dean of Regional Higher Education and Vice Provost of E-Learning and Strategic Initiatives
- Initial goals of new unit: create greater administrative efficiencies; establish ways in which University Outreach can promote academic quality, expand access to a wide variety of student populations, create services needed by all colleges and campuses, and increase revenue.
Quarters to Semesters

Update
Executive Vice President and Provost’s Report

University Academics Committee
Ohio University Board of Trustees
April 15, 2010
BE IT RESOLVED BY the Board of Trustees of Ohio University that the following persons be appointed to membership on the Coordinating Council at the Regional Campus of Ohio University - Lancaster and Zanesville.

Ohio University - Lancaster


Rob L. Walker For a three-year term beginning July 1, 2010, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2013, vice Denise Callihan, whose term expired.

Ohio University - Zanesville


Outstanding, experienced public library manager with twenty plus years experience in utilizing strong communication skills to motivate and train public service employees as well as plan, develop and coordinate programs for the community and employees.

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**
Twenty plus years (1985-2010) of public library experience, including fifteen years serving as Children’s Librarian, two years as Circulation Manager (concurrent with Children’s Librarian responsibilities), five years as Assistant Director, two Interim Director assignments and 4 years as Library Director. All twenty years have been as an employee of the Pickerington Public Library, 201 Opportunity Way, Pickerington, Ohio 43147-1296.

**SKILLS**

**Planning, Budgeting and Organization**
- Develop and manage library budget of $1.1 million dollars
- Assisted in planning, preparing records and training employees for automation of library circulation and catalog systems
- Served on committee of staff and board to plan construction of 23,000 sq. ft. library building
- Assisted in planning and directing addition and renovation of library building
- Participated in development and implementation of Pickerington Public Library Strategic Plan
- Organized upgrade of computer equipment and training of staff for migration to new operating system
- Conducted staff meetings and development activities
- Planned major library events such as One Book One Community, Santa Saturday and Holiday Open House
- Completed successful Ohio Humanities Council and Fairfield County Foundation Grant applications
- Responsible for drafting personnel and operating policies and presenting to Board of Trustees
- Organized volunteer program and recognition events

**Management**
- Manage library staff of 18 employees
- Interview, hire and train employees
- Complete employee review and development conferences
• Supervise custodial staff in addition to building and grounds maintenance
• Facilitate partnership with Unique Collection Services to recover lost library materials and require payment of fines
• Administrate employee health insurance plan
• Created and implemented employee recognition program, “A Pat on the Back”
• Handle customer complaints
• Assisted in salary study and market analysis for employee compensation comparison
• Created job descriptions
• Created circulation department training manual

Public Relations
• Responsible for content and editing of newsletter
• Media contact for publicity promoting library programming
• Speaker at community organizations to promote library and library programs
• Co-coordinated successful political campaign for library operating levy
• Communicated with state legislators and county officials concerning funding and other issues impacting public libraries

Education
• Library Media Technology Program – Ohio University – 1982-1985 – completed 30 credit hours
• Bachelor of Science in Communication Studies with a concentration in Organizational Communication - December 2003
• Student in Ohio University’s Executive Master of Public Administration Program

Professional Affiliations
• Lambda Pi Eta – honor society for students of communication - 2003
• Ohio Library Council – 1999 - present
• American Library Association – 1999-present
• Pickerington Area Chamber of Commerce
• Canal Winchester Chamber of Commerce

Activities
• Publicity Coordinator for Relay For Life of Pickerington – 2002 & 2004
• Chairperson Relay For Life of Pickerington – 2003
• Library Committee - Peace United Methodist Church – 1996-2002
• Member of Pickerington - Violet Township Historical Society - 1989-1996
• Former Violet Township Trustee – 1992-1993
Rob L. Walker, Superintendent
Lancaster City Schools

➢ Born and Raised in Troy, Ohio

➢ Bachelor's Degree in Education from University of Toledo

➢ Master's Degree from Miami University and Wright State University

➢ 32 years in Education with 13 years as a teacher and 19 years in administration including the last 8 years in the Lancaster City Schools as Director of Human Resources and Assistant Superintendent

➢ Married to Connie with two children:

  • Daughter, Erin of Denver, Colorado
  • Son, Ross married to Melanie and Grandson Wilson (6 months) of Pickerington, Ohio

➢ Hobbies include Fly Fishing, Photography and the Outdoors
STOYE J. STOUT

phone 740-455-3920 cell 740-607-4114

7283 Cattle Drive
Nashport, OH 43701

c-mail storyjstout@yahoo.com

Healthcare executive with experience in advertising/sales and in facilities maintenance and construction who increased average census in regional long-term care facilities by 7% in two years resulting in an additional $4 million in annual revenues.

- Acted as a principal participating in decisions in all aspects of $50 million regional health care company.
- Managed construction and renovation projects at 7 long-term care and 2 assisted living residences.

Multilingual executive experienced in financial market forecasting, marketing, and financial operations management who in 6 months increased assets under management from $2 mil to $10 at one firm and doubled revenues from $2 mil to $4 mil at another.

- Managed 2 commodity funds listed 26 months as top-10 performers worldwide in recognized trade journals.
- Provided risk management advice which stabilized returns and reduced risk in 2 funds and 20 managed accounts.

Skilled communicator able to negotiate difficult and high-stress situations with tact and diplomacy.

- Acted as liaison between 82nd Airborne Division and Saudi officials during Persian Gulf conflict, received Bronze Star
- Contacted fund investors to communicate losses exceeding 50%, most stayed invested.

Open to relocation in US and abroad.
Lived and worked in Germany and Saudi Arabia.
Working knowledge of English, French, German and Arabic.

EDUCATION

MBA, Marriott School of Management, Provo, UT 1993, Full Tuition Scholarship, Graduated with Honors
BA, German, French, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 1990
Arabic, Defense Language Institute, Monterey, CA 1988, Valedictorian

EXPERIENCE

Vice President, Zandex, Inc, Zanesville, OH
1999 - present
- Responsible for all advertising/sales that grew census by 7% over two years and maintained that growth.
- Supervised $5 million in new construction and renovation projects.
- Increased staff development through new employee seminars and ongoing management training in communication.

Chief Financial Officer, Florida Pacific Express, Inc., Zanesville, OH
1998 - 1999
- Secured $400,000 in financing for failing transportation company in need of financial CPR.
- Stabilized cash flow and now on track to grow annual revenues from $2 million to $4 million.

Principal/Trader/Researcher, Murray Investment Company, Zanesville, OH
1993 - 1998
- Grew assets under management from $2 million to $10 million in 6 months through international media promotion.
- Traded funds listed 26 months as top-ten performers worldwide.

Intern, Zandex Health Care Corporation, Zanesville, OH
1992
- Provided financial analysis and market research for start-up insurance company.

Teaching Assistant, Marriott School of Management/Dept of Germanic Languages, BYU, Provo, UT
1989 - 1993
- Instructed MBA students in interviewing and presentation skills.
- Designed and implemented graduate and undergraduate coursework for daily language classes.

Interpreter/Liaison, Desert Storm, United States Army, XVIII Airborne Corps, Saudi Arabia
1990
- Assisted doctors/military police in maintaining sanitary conditions & order in camp of 50,000 refugees.
- Interrogated Iraqi POW's and acted as liaison between 82nd Airborne Division and Saudi Officials.
J.P. (James Paul) Feldner
1310 Westchester Drive, Cambridge, OH 43725
(740) 432-3603 – Home (740) 584-3558 - Cell
jpfeldner@roadrunner.com

EDUCATION

Franciscan University of Steubenville, Steubenville, OH
M.S. in Educational Administration 1997-1999

Ohio University, Athens, OH
B.S. in Elementary Education 1990-1993
Areas of Concentration: English
Honors: Cum laude

The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 1988-1990

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Cambridge City School District, Cambridge, OH
Teacher – 4th Grade at Central Elementary School 2006 - present

Director of Technology 2003 - 2006
Developed Technology Plan for the entire district, authored and administered numerous state and federal grants, led the Cambridge City School District’s Technology Council.

Elementary School


RELATED EXPERIENCE

Guernsey County JTPA, Cambridge, OH
Director of Summer Youth Program 1993-1997
Ran a summer work program for at-risk youth in Guernsey County.

Guernsey County Chamber of Commerce, Cambridge, OH
Graduate of the Guernsey Leadership Program 2000
This program is targeted for leaders within Guernsey County and meets monthly to discuss the inter-workings of Guernsey County as well as learn about teamwork and communication.
WHEREAS, the proposed University Faculty Fellowships on the attached list have been reviewed in accordance with University policy and found to be meritorious, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the attached University Faculty Fellowships for 2010-2011 be approved, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Provost can approve changes in the conditions of the fellowships but not the total number of fellowships granted for the 2010-2011 academic year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year Awarded</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Awarded</th>
<th>Academic Year to be Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2001-2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2003-2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Dept/School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa</td>
<td>Bernstein</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariaster</td>
<td>Chimeli</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Connor</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Ehrlich</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janis</td>
<td>Holm</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Ingram</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamila</td>
<td>Jayasuriya</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene</td>
<td>Kalenkoski</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>LeBar</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dina</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Loucks</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaclyn</td>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>History and Classics / World Religions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Neiman</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Petrik</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>English / Women's and Gender Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Ryu</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>Shen</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Springer</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takaaki</td>
<td>Suzuki</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Tees</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Thorne</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Sociology / Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Uhalde</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinh</td>
<td>Van Huynh</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Dept/School</th>
<th>Quarters in Academic Year 2010-2011</th>
<th>Short Description of Leave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Weitsman</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Finish a chapter for a book, revise, edit, and update the manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Axinn</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Various work at Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Kreiser</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Management Systems</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Develop and learn specialized knowledge that can be utilized by the new Entrepreneurship Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Prevost</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Teach a graduate level course and develop research at Massey University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>Debatin</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Work on a media production project and a research project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Harter</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Author a book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Riggs</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Information and</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Visit ITERA universities, present research, advance book sales, learn best practices, and serve as a temporary employee with the FCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Snow</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Telecommunication Systems</td>
<td>Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Learn the basic principles to fabrication of microelectrochemical cells at the University of California Berkeley, work in collaboration with the Center for Entrepreneurship at OHIO and TechGROWTH Ohio, and develop an instructiona unit on entrepreneurship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Educational Studies</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Complete a book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerardine</td>
<td>Botte</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Learn the basic principles to fabrication of microelectrochemical cells at the University of California Berkeley, work in collaboration with the Center for Entrepreneurship at OHIO and TechGROWTH Ohio, and develop an instructiona unit on entrepreneurship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang</td>
<td>Liu</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Serve as a visiting association professor at United International University in Zhuhai, China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Gain critical experience in the managemetn of a large, Federally-funded research project with multiple contributing entities from both the public and private sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maarten</td>
<td>Uijt de Haag</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Research, teach, and establish relationships in Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Weckman</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Industrial and Systems Engineering</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Collaborate with colleagues at the University of South Florida to strengthen research ties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Adleta</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Interpret, translate and help catalog Wolfgang Weingart's designs, his visual research, and his complex lesson plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley</td>
<td>Delaney</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Participate in a month-long performance and establish professional relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla</td>
<td>Hackenmiller</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Work on a project made up of prints and collaged prints, participate in residencies, and also present a solo exhibition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Hibbitt</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Complete a group of sculptural and installation works for an exhibition, research, writing publications, and/or presenting at a conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vladimir</td>
<td>Marchenko</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Arts</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Complete the manuscript for a second book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Sabraw</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Develop a new direction in creative and scholarly activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene</td>
<td>Berryman</td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>Human and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Research and develop expertise in adipose tissue physiology and its relationship to aging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Manoogian</td>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>Human and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Serve as a visiting scholar at Oregon State University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Dept/School</td>
<td>Quarters in Academic Year 2010-2011</td>
<td>Short Description of Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veena</td>
<td>Kasbekar</td>
<td>Regional Higher Education</td>
<td>Chillicothe campus</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Study primary and secondary texts to prepare for a course to be taught on Shakespeare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Reiger</td>
<td>Regional Higher Education</td>
<td>Chillicothe campus</td>
<td>Fall, Winter, Spring</td>
<td>Finish memoirs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Nissen</td>
<td>Regional Higher Education</td>
<td>Zanesville campus</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Design a project focused on classroom practices that support young children's socioemotional development and competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahrokh</td>
<td>Ghaffari</td>
<td>Regional Higher Education</td>
<td>Zanesville campus</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Perform a study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES**

Francis Bellezza  Professor Emeritus of Psychology  
Mary E. Chamberlain  Professor Emerita of Biological Sciences  
Kenneth Holroyd  Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Psychology  
Abelardo Moncayo  Associate Professor Emeritus of Spanish  
Charles Naccarato  Assistant Professor Emeritus of English

**COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE**

William S. Romoser  Professor Emeritus of Medical Entomology

**REGIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION**

Alta Sims  Assistant Professor Emerita of Humanities, Zanesville campus  
Thomas Stevenson  Associate Professor Emeritus of Anthropology, Zanesville campus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST 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>Francis</td>
<td>Bellezza</td>
<td>Professor Emeritus of Psychology</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary E.</td>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td>Professor Emerita of Biological Sciences</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>Holroyd</td>
<td>Professor Emeritus of Psychology</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abelardo</td>
<td>Moncayo</td>
<td>Associate Professor Emeritus of Spanish</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Naccarato</td>
<td>Assistant Professor Emeritus of English</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William S.</td>
<td>Romoser</td>
<td>Professor Emeritus of Medical Entomology</td>
<td>College of Osteopathic Medicine</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alta</td>
<td>Sims</td>
<td>Assistant Professor Emerita of Humanities, Zanesville campus</td>
<td>Regional Campuses</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>Associate Professor Emeritus of Anthropology, Zanesville campus</td>
<td>Regional Campuses</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Years of Service 269
RUSS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY
UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATE IN BIOINFORMATICS

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3154

WHEREAS, the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science in conjunction with the Department of Environmental and Plant Biology have developed the Undergraduate Certificate program in Bioinformatics, and

WHEREAS, Bioinformatics, which combines biology with computer science, is one of the fastest growing disciplines in biological research and in computer science research today, and

WHEREAS, the National Institute of Health Bioinformatics and Computational Biology Roadmap states that “today computation is at the heart of all leading edge biomedical science,” and

WHEREAS, the program will allow Ohio University the ability to more effectively market and deliver to our students a high-quality curriculum built on the faculty and curricular strengths currently existing in various departments, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University hereby approves the Undergraduate Certificate Program in Bioinformatics.
Date:     March 11, 2010  
To:        Roderick McDavis, President  
From:    Pam Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost  
Subject:  Undergraduate Certificate in Bioinformatics

This memorandum is written to express my support for the creation of an undergraduate certificate program in Bioinformatics. This interdisciplinary degree program will be offered through collaboration between the College of Arts and Sciences and the Russ College of Engineering and Technology. The certificate program will involve existing course offerings from several departments within each college.

The field of Bioinformatics is one of the fastest growing disciplines in the biological sciences and aids in the analysis of large amounts of data generated in many areas of biological research. The field is interdisciplinary in nature and involves an interface between biology, mathematics and computer science. Knowledge in Bioinformatics will be valuable to Ohio University undergraduate students interested in the biological sciences. Experiences in this discipline will open doors for our students to pursue biological research in a number of different directions. The experience our graduates gain from earning this certificate also will assist our students in gaining entry to graduate school and will provide a greater degree of marketability for those who want to pursue careers in biological research.

In addition, it is important to note that this certificate is being offered with existing courses and resources. No additional resources or courses will be required to offer this certificate degree program.

I am therefore pleased to provide my full support for the creation of the undergraduate certificate in Bioinformatics.
NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL

Undergraduate  Masters  Ph.D.  Certificate

Program Title: Bioinformatics
Degree to be Conferred: Undergraduate Certificate
Administrative Unit Proposing Program: EECS and PBIO
Date of Submission: 4/8/08
Brief Summary of Proposed Program:

The School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science and the Department of Environmental and Plant Biology are proposing a certificate program in bioinformatics. The certificate program has been developed based on the reality that bioinformatics is an interdisciplinary undertaking. Students will be given the opportunity to put together a set of courses reflecting the cross-disciplinary nature of the field, and the program will allow Ohio University the ability to more effectively market and deliver a high-quality program built on the faculty and curricular strengths currently existing in various departments.

Signatures:

Department/School Curriculum Chair*

Department/School Chair*

College Curriculum Chair

College Dean

Approved by:

University Curriculum Council Program Chair

University Curriculum Council Chair

PASSED BY CURRICULUM COUNCIL

PROVOST

INITIAL
I. Need for the Certificate Program

In March of 2008, the state of Ohio selected Ohio University’s proposal to develop a statewide bioinformatics consortium. As a result, Ohio University will receive funds for 30 scholarships per year for the recruitment of students to study bioinformatics. The proposed certificate program is being developed to allow the students to have a specific plan of study and to provide them with recognition for acquiring the knowledge necessary to be a bioinformatics specialist.

The state of Ohio is providing funding for bioinformatics training to address critical issues. The National Institute of Health Bioinformatics and Computational Biology Roadmap states that “today computation is at the heart of all leading edge biomedical science.”

Bioinformatics, which combines biology with computer science, is one of the fastest growing disciplines in biological research and in computer science research today. This discipline arose out of a need to rapidly expand and critique large volumes of biological data, especially in the area of genomics. Modern biological and biomedical research involves a significant informatics component. Traditionally, computer programmers have been educated in Computer Science, and biologists have been educated in Biological Sciences or Environmental and Plant Biology. But, it is becoming increasingly evident that to meet the growing need for people working in biological research and industry, a plan of study that focuses on the interdisciplinary aspects of bioinformatics is crucial. No single department can handle this demand. Thus, a certificate program in bioinformatics would make a natural advance in our educational programs.

For those in biology related majors, the program provides enough background in computer science for students to explore the extent of bioinformatics and gain employment or graduate opportunities in related fields. The converse is true of computer science majors. They would have a sound enough background in biology to be able to productively work in the bioinformatics arena.
II. Proposed Curriculum

The certificate program is designed to address a need for students to understand how computer programs can be used/developed to analyze the massive amounts of data currently being generated in almost all areas of biological study. Students will be required to take a total of \(~32\) credit hours for the certificate. To accomplish this, the certificate curriculum will use a combination of existing courses. No new courses are required for the certificate program. Courses are categorized in one of the four subject areas: biology, statistics, computation, and bioinformatics.

Required Courses

I. Biology Requirements (choose one from each group)
   A. Genetics
      PBIO 330 Plant Genetics (5) or
      BIOS 325 Genetics (5)
   B. Cell Biology
      PBIO 431 Plant Cell Biology (3) or
      BIOS 320 Cell Biology (4)
   C. Laboratory practicum
      PBIO 301 Lab CaMPP (3) or
      BIOS 322 Animal Cell Biology Lab (2) or
      BIOS 326 Laboratory Genetics (3)

II. Statistics (choose one course)
   PSY 221 Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (5) or
   MATH 250 Intro to Probability and Statistics (4) or
   EE 371 Applied Probability and Statistics for Electrical Engineers (4) or
   PBIO 415 Quantitative Methods in Plant Biology (4)
   ChE 408 – Engineering Experimental Design (3)

III. Computation Requirements (take two courses)
   CS 300 Introduction to Discrete Structures (5) and
   either
   CS 361 Data Structures (5) or
   MATH 387 Quantitative Foundations of Bioinformatics (4)

IV. Bioinformatics Capstone Courses
   PBIO/CS 416 Problem Solving using Bioinformatics Tools (4) and
   CS 417 Programming in Bioinformatics (4)
The number of credit hours will vary slightly depending on the courses chosen by the student. Although ~32 hours of courses are needed to complete the certificate, many of the courses will satisfy major requirements, and the extra courses should amount to the equivalent of a minor. For any biology major, roughly 16-20 hours of the core courses and 5 of the prerequisites would apply to the major. The converse is true of the computer science majors with roughly 18-22 hours of core courses and 8 of the prerequisites satisfying major requirements. Some of the courses would also satisfy Tier I and Tier II requirements.

III. Entrance Requirements and Expectations

1. Students will be accepted into the certificate program in bioinformatics if they have successfully completed (with a grade of 'C' or better) an introductory series in biology (PBIO 114 OR BIOS 170), in computer science (CS 240A and CS 240B) and in mathematics (MATH 263A OR MATH 266A). The prerequisites are seen as necessary to identify students with a true interest and potential ability in bioinformatics: those who have a reasonable expectation of successfully completing the certificate.

2. Students are expected to earn a 2.0 GPA overall and a 2.5 GPA in the required courses in order to receive the certificate.

3. Students will earn the Certificate in Bioinformatics upon completion of all of the required courses.

IV. Faculty expertise

The existing faculty at OU, in particular those affiliated with Computer Science, Biological Sciences, Biomedical Engineering, Environmental and Plant Biology and Mathematics are well qualified to participate in this certificate endeavor.

V. New resources needed - None
No additional faculty or infrastructure resources will be required to initiate the certificate. However, if the certificate becomes a popular option, it may be necessary to identify a part-time coordinator of the program.

VI. Relation to Other Programs
The certificate is to be an "umbrella" program: it is not designed to replace any major or program currently in existence. It fact, it should provide an excellent supplement to those students currently studying biology, biochemistry or computer science to broaden their educational and career prospects.
Date: Wed, 22 Jul 2009 11:05:48 -0400  
From: Todd Young <young@math.ohiou.edu>  
To: Thomas Scanlan <scanlan@ohio.edu>  
CC: Jeff Connor <connor@math.ohiou.edu>, Vicki Butcher <butcherv@ohio.edu>  
Subject: Re: Undergraduate Bioinformatics Certificate

Dear Tom,

I took part in the discussions concerning the proposal for the Undergraduate Certificate in Bioinformatics and the letter sent by Jeff has my endorsement.

Cheers,  
Todd

Thomas Scanlan wrote:
Dear Todd,

Would you be able to send me (and copy to Vicki) a brief one-line email that says that you (in your capacity as curriculum-chair) sign on to Jeff's letter below? UCC usually insists that it be the curriculum chair who signs off on these sorts of things.

Best,  
Tom

On Jul 15, 2009, at 3:15 PM, Jeff Connor wrote:
Dear Professor Wyatt,

The Department of Mathematics has reviewed the revised proposal for the Undergraduate Certificate in Bioinformatics, dated A/O 6/11/09.

We believe that an Undergraduate Certificate in Bioinformatics will be an extremely valuable addition to our curriculum and will open a number of promising career paths to some of our alumni. We recognize the difficulties inherent in designing a set of requirements that make the certificate feasible for qualified students and at the same time ensure adequate preparation for a career in this highly interdisciplinary field. We consider the current revision of the certificate a reasonable compromise between these objectives and support adoption of the current proposal for the time until the quarter to semester transition.

We do, however, still have reservations about making MATH 387 a course that is not mandatory, but only serves as a requirement that can be satisfied by taking CS 361 Data Structures instead. Bioinformatics is the science of extracting biologically relevant information from large sets of biomolecular data. MATH 387 will introduce students to the mathematical models, statistical techniques and algorithms on which this process is based, and will enable students to meaningfully connect the mathematical/statistical aspects of bioinformatics with the biological questions the field is trying to address. A course like MATH 387 that gives students this key knowledge will need to become a mandatory requirement of the certificate once we make the transition to semesters.

Best regards,

Jeff Connor  
Chair, Department of Mathematics
May 2, 2008

To Whom It May Concern:

The Department of Psychology has received a request to accommodate approximately 10 students per year as part of the bioinformatics certificate program. The department will be able to accommodate this request beginning fall of 2008. If you require additional information, please feel free to contact me (740-597-2718).

Sincerely,

Susan A. Tice-Alicke
Susan A. Tice-Alicke, PhD
Assistant Chair for
Undergraduate Studies
April 16, 2008

Dear Sarah Wyatt,

As the Curriculum Committee Chair for Environmental and Plant Biology I would like to offer my full support for the proposal to offer a certificate in Bioinformatics. Our curriculum committee has reviewed the proposal and feels this program will address a clear need within our undergrad curriculum. Furthermore, the selection of courses is both rigorous and flexible enough to allow students from different departments to accomplish their goals.

Arthur Trese
Environmental and Plant Biology
Chair, Curriculum Committee
May 5, 2008

Professor Lonnie Welch,

As the Curriculum Committee Chair for the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, I support the proposals to offer two certificates in Bioinformatics; one at the undergraduate and the other at the graduate level. The curriculum committee has reviewed the proposals and believes that they will become an important asset to our curriculum. The committee also supports the efforts of the designers of the proposals to offer a real multidisciplinary experience to our students.

Professor Constantine Vassiliadis, Ph.D.

School of Electrical Engineering & Computer Science
Associate Undergraduate Chair - Russ College of Engineering and Technology
357 Stocker Engineering Center
Ohio University Main Campus, Athens, Ohio 45701-2979
(740)593-1582 (voice) - (740)593-0007 (fax) - (740)593-4672 (adm. assistant)
vassilia@ohio.edu
To: University Curriculum Council
From: Laura DiCaprio
Chair, Curriculum Committee
Biological Sciences
Date: May 12, 2008
Re: Accommodating Bioinformatics students

Unless there have been substantive changes in the bioinformatics graduate and undergraduate certificate proposals that we reviewed for Dr. Wyatt in January, we do not expect there to be changes in enrollment in BIOS courses. However, there would be no problem accommodating additional students if necessary.
May 15, 2008

To Lonnie Welch and Sarah Wyatt:

I am excited about the undergraduate and graduate bioinformatics certificate proposals that you have developed. These certificates will allow students to receive formal recognition for their interdisciplinary bioinformatics coursework. Additionally, the existence of a formal program will also be helping in enhancing student awareness of this important area.

The proposed certificate programs have my strongest endorsement. Additionally, the School of EECS is committed to serving in an administrative role for the certificate programs.

Sincerely,

Shawn Ostermann, Chair of EECS
WHEREAS, the Center for International Studies is proposing the War and Peace Certificate to educate students in security studies from an interdisciplinary perspective, and

WHEREAS, there has been a recent and dramatic spike in demand for graduates with a focus in security studies, intelligence analysis and risk assessments, and

WHEREAS, no other school in Ohio has a program of this kind, and

WHEREAS, an interdisciplinary program in War and Peace Studies would be an excellent recruitment device, not only in Ohio but other neighboring regions, and

WHEREAS, graduates holding a certificate in War and Peace Studies will be ready to meet the increased demand in the securities and intelligence analysis field impacted by the events surrounding 9/11, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University hereby approves the Undergraduate Certificate in War and Peace.
Date: March 11, 2010  
To: Roderick McDavis, President  
From: Pam Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost  
Subject: Undergraduate Certificate in War and Peace

This memorandum is written to express my support for the creation of an undergraduate certificate program in War and Peace. This interdisciplinary degree program will be offered through the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S) and will involve existing course offerings from several departments within A&S and the Center for International Studies.

The program is designed to train individuals to meet the increasing demand in the securities field as the result of events surrounding the 9/11 tragedy. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security and an increased emphasis on terrorism, intelligence analysis, immigration and border control has increased demand for students trained in War and Peace Studies. Employment opportunities for students trained in War and Peace Studies exist in government organizations, multinational corporations and think tanks.

In addition, it is important to note that this certificate is being offered with existing courses and resources. No additional resources or courses will be required to offer this certificate degree program.

I am therefore pleased to provide my full support for the creation of the undergraduate certificate in War and Peace.
NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL

_x_ Undergraduate  ___ Masters  ___ Ph.D.  _x_ Certificate**

Program Title: War and Peace Certificate
Degree to be Conferred: NA
Administrative Unit Proposing Program: International Studies
Date of Submission: revised 1/06/10

Brief Summary of Proposed Program: A broadly and coherently conceptualized program, graduates holding a certificate in War and Peace Studies will be ready to meet the increased demand in the securities studies field impacted by the events surrounding 9/11. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security, new emphases on improved intelligence analysis and risk assessments, border control, immigration, heightened proliferation threats in Iran, North Korea, and other countries around the globe, increased attention and hiring in the areas of counterterrorism and counterinsurgency, as well as reconstruction and development in countries such as Iraq and Afghanistan, culminate in demand for students well trained in war and peace studies. In addition, our students would be well equipped for careers at NGOs, IGOs, multinational corporations, and think tanks.

Signatures:

Daniel Weiner
Department/School Curriculum Chair*
Daniel Weiner weinerdj.zhio.edu

Printed Name and contact information

Daniel Weiner
Department/School Chair*
Daniel Weiner weinerdj.zhio.edu

Printed Name and contact information

Thomas Scanlan scanlant@zhio.edu
College Curriculum Chair

Printed Name and contact information

Gregg J. Meny
Approved by:
University Curriculum Council Program Chair

Date

University Curriculum Council Chair

Date

Where the proposal originates within a department or school
Mandatory: Preliminary Certificate Programs should append memos of approval

April 2006
Title of Program: War and Peace Studies Certificate

Administrative Unit: International Studies

Revised 3/3/10
Introductory Descriptive Statement

The purpose of the War and Peace Studies Certificate is to educate students in security studies from an interdisciplinary perspective. The program will address the increased need for graduates in this field. Students have shown interest in the development of a thematic certificate, a break from the tradition of our area studies focus. The curriculum involves a rich diversity of courses and faculty across the university, which will be refreshed each year (much like the other certificates). No financial requirements are needed for this program since all courses are currently on the books. We would like to implement the program in Fall '10. The course list is long enough so that we are confident the certificate will successfully transition from quarters to semesters.

Program Need

There has been a recent and dramatic spike in demand for graduates with a focus in security studies. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security, new emphases on improved intelligence analysis and risk assessments, border control, immigration, heightened proliferation threats in Iran, North Korea, and other countries, increased attention and hiring in the areas of counterterrorism and counterinsurgency, as well as reconstruction and development in countries such as Iraq and Afghanistan, culminate in demand for students well trained in war and peace studies. In addition, our students would be well-equipped for careers at NGOs, IGOs, multinational corporations, and think tanks, as well as to pursue a graduate degree in a related field.

No other school in Ohio has a program of this kind.

The closest to the proposed program is the Department of Political Science’s world politics track. However, this is not an interdisciplinary program and focuses exclusively on Political Science offerings, and second, once we move to semesters, the track system in Political Science will be eliminated.

Faculty from the following departments have reviewed proposal (in addition to the BAIS Faculty Advisory Board, an interdisciplinary group of 18, which helped to conceptualize the major):

AAS
ANTH
COMS
GEOG
HIST
ML
PHIL
POLS
PSY
SOC
An interdisciplinary program in War and Peace Studies would be an excellent recruitment device, not only in Ohio but from further afield geographically. We will have connections to a number of think tanks in DC, London, and Geneva, which will make it a very attractive program both in terms of scholarship, but also in terms of making connections and getting real world experience.

We expect 5 students per year to join the certificate much like the other International Studies certificates. This program will be very attractive to students already at Ohio University as well as new students thinking about applying to universities who are interested in war and peace.

Curriculum

Total Required Hours: 28 hours

Core War and Peace Courses (complete 12 hours):

ANTH 353 - Anthropology of Violence and Peace
COMS 110 – Communication between Cultures
HIST 321D - War, Violence, and Modernity
PHIL 446 – Justice and Liberty
POLS 458 - War and Its Causes
SOC 484 – Crimes against Humanity

War and Peace Thematic Options (16 required hours, only 12 of which may be from one discipline):

AAS 101 - African American History I
AAS 202 – African American History II
AAS 364 - Comparative Study of Injustice
HIST 265A - Nazi Germany
HIST 305 - The United States and the Vietnam War
HIST 300C - Rev Era 1763-1789
HIST 303 US in World War II
HIST 305 US & Vietnam War
HIST 308B Civil War and Reconstruction
HIST 321A – American Military to 1898
HIST 321B – American Military since 1898
HIST 333 Oil and World Power
HIST 341C Modern Africa
HIST 353C History of the Crusades
HIST 360C - Women Warriors: Women and War in Europe
HIST 361 French Revolution
HIST 364A - Europe Between World Wars
HIST 369A The Pacific War 1931-1945
HIST 374B - Origins of World War II, 1914-1941
HIST 374C – Cold War
HIST 369Y Roman Warfare
HIST 375 - World War I
HIST 377 - Jewish Holocaust
HIST 382B - Russia: Road to Revolution 1825-1917
HIST 382D - The USSR in World War II

POLS 340 - The Politics of Developing Areas

POLS 352 - International Peace

POLS 354 - America Foreign Policy

POLS 427 - Formulation of American Foreign Policy

POLS 449 - Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict

POLS 455 - International Law

POLS 456 - International Organizations

POLS 457 - National Security in the Post-Cold War World

POLS 460 - International Political Economy

POLS 490N - Terrorism

POLS 490P - Intn'L Human Rights Org

PSY 337 Social Psychology of Justice

SOC 230 - Sociology of Poverty

Transfer of credit from other institutions and programs at Ohio University will be accepted.

We have initiated conversations with the departments teaching core courses in order to avoid conflicts.

There is no accreditation agency that accredits such a program.

Faculty and Instruction
Existing courses for the new certificate will continue to be taught by current faculty members. All courses being taught as part of the curriculum of this certificate will be taught by faculty members or other instructors having at least an MA, Ph.D. preferred. Participation in this major will not impact current teaching loads of faculty. Courses currently being used for the program are already being taught as part of each faculty member’s regular load.

Admission Requirements

Any OU will be admitted into this program. No new monies will be necessary to run this program.

Administration

The Bachelor of Arts in International Studies Faculty Advisory Board, chaired by the Executive Director of the Center for International Studies, will govern the curriculum.

Timing and Evaluation

No external publicity about this program has been generated.

We would like the program to start in Fall ’10.

Budget and Financial
We do not anticipate any new expenses for this program.
Hi Laura,

I am writing to lend my enthusiasm for the War and Peace Studies Major being proposed by International Studies. I am an instructor and coordinator for COMS 110 (Communication between Cultures) which is a core class for COMS majors at Ohio University. I believe that International Studies is considering placing this class as a part of the core for the proposed major on War and Peace Studies. I am excited about the possibilities that this might open up for interdisciplinary work. I endorse the proposed major and wish you all the best with the process.

Devika Chawla
Assistant Professor
School of Communication Studies
Lasher Hall
Athens, OH 45701
Laura, Prof. Weitsman asked me to comment on my enthusiasm for a proposed major and certificate in War & Peace Studies. A course I teach frequently, Justice & Liberty, may be part of this program, and what enthuses me about the program overall is the interdisciplinary approach to thinking about the norms, institutions, principles, and so on that shape human practices and lives on the scale that war and peace do. I think Ohio University would do very well to have such a program available, and I'm certain that students in an array of majors could benefit from thinking about these issues from the perspective of the different disciplines to be represented in the major and certificate. I wish you the best of luck with the proposal.

Sincerely,

Mark LeBar

Associate Professor of Philosophy

Ohio University
Dear Laura,

I am writing to introduce myself as a new faculty member in the history department and to voice my support for the proposed War and Peace Studies major and the certificate program in War and Peace Studies. Patricia Weitsman explained the proposal to me and suggested that my HIST 321D - War, Violence, and Modernity - be included as a core elective. I am much in favor of the idea. I am broadly trained as a military, diplomatic, and international historian and I would like to see this proposal come to fruition. In addition, I have previously served as an undergraduate adviser for a Studies in War and Peace major and as co-associate director for Norwich University’s Center for the Study of War and Peace. That experience has led me to conclude that the consideration of war and peace as related issues, rather than separate pursuits, offers students tremendous opportunities to engage one of the fundamental questions of our time. Moreover, they could do so from an interdisciplinary perspective, which should strengthen their appreciation for the complexity of war and the difficulty of maintaining or creating peace. Given the strengths of faculty in so many departments on campus, this would seem to be an excellent opportunity for Ohio University to retain and recruit excellent undergraduate students.

Best regards, Ingo

Ingo Trauschweizer
Department of History
Dear Professor Weiner and Ms. Schaeffer,

I am writing to give my whole hearted endorsement of the major and certificate in War and Peace Studies. This is a program that will be of the utmost academic caliber and a tremendous asset to the university. There are very few institutions worldwide that have the resources on hand to run a comprehensive war and peace studies program housed by an interdisciplinary unit. The major and certificate cohere as a program that addresses the most important arguments topics in the study of war and peace.

Most War and Peace Studies programs are housed in Departments of Political Science or International Relations and offer instruction to students principally on the nature of warfare, the causes and correlates of war, and strategy and tactics of war. War and Peace Studies are usually very narrowly understood as the causes and correlates of war, which, by default, are supposed to provide students and scholars with an understanding of the conditions for peace. The curriculum offered here, for both the major and the certificate, not only offer those areas of inquiry, but also provide students with a broader and deeper understanding of war and peace from anthropological, philosophical, sociological, historical, psychological perspectives, as well as offering students an opportunity to understand the dynamics of communication. This will give students an unparalleled opportunity to enjoy a well rounded perspective on war and peace, as well as connect their analytical understandings to a particular area of the world and also combine rigorous language study as well. This will be a phenomenal program that offers students the best of all possible worlds and will make them extremely attractive hires for international businesses, banks, intergovernmental organizations, nongovernmental organizations, government agencies, think tanks, non profit organizations, the defense industry, among others.

Students in the area of security studies at Ohio University are already excelling. Few universities nationwide have the number of NSEP/Boren recipients (a nationally competitive award, the National Security Education Program). This will give the university an opportunity to provide those students with even more opportunities to grow and learn, and will allow even more students to be provided with similar challenges. An interdisciplinary program in War and Peace Studies will put Ohio University at the cutting edge in security studies, an area of growth intellectually and in regard to employment opportunities. The only programs similar to the one proposed here are at elite -- and extremely expensive -- colleges and universities on the east coast, and at Kings College in London. With the internship opportunities we can provide for students, Ohio University may well very quickly make a reputation for itself in this area, making this a unique opportunity for exceptional student and faculty recruitment.
This curriculum also offers development opportunities and grant seeking. It will also bring together a cohort of faculty across the university which will foster collegiality and interdisciplinary cooperation beyond instruction. I think the prospect of such a program is exciting and support it without reservation. Please let me know if there is anything else I can do to facilitate the process of moving forward with this program.

Best,

Patricia Weitsman

Patricia Weitsman
Professor
Department of Political Science
249 Bentley Annex
Ohio University
Athens, OH 43130
USA

tel: (740) 593-1335
fax: (740) 593-0394
email: weitsman@ohio.edu

http://www.ohiou.edu/pols/faculty/weitsman.html
January 4, 2010

College Curriculum Council
Ohio University

Dear College Curriculum Council:

This is a letter of support for the proposed Bachelor of Arts in International Studies – War and Peace and War and Peace Studies Certificate. From the perspective of Political Science, both of these programs are well-designed and a useful extension of the existing offerings at Ohio University. These programs will leverage the strengths in Political Science in International Relations with the strengths in other departments that are related to War and Peace Studies. By providing a good complement to the International Relations courses offered in Political Science, these programs will strengthen International Relations. For example, War and Peace Studies' students will bring to Political Science classes an expertise on War and Peace Studies developed in departments other than Political Science. It will also bring faculty together from various departments and strengthen interdisciplinary interchange and research on War and Peace Studies.

Sincerely,

James Mosher
Curriculum Chair, Department of Political Science
WHEREAS, the continuous review of academic programs is essential to the maintenance of quality within an educational institution, and

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

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

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University accepts the review for the following:

Deaf Studies and Interpreting
Department of Economics
Department of Geography
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Name of Program: Deaf Studies and Interpreting

Approved by Review Chair: ______________________ (signature) 1/12/89

Approved by UCC chair: ______________________ (signature) 1/12/10

* the word “DRAFT” must appear on each page of the review until it has been formally approved by the University Curriculum Council.
Deaf Studies and Interpreting

The program is viable and plays a substantial role in the University's overall mission. As noted in the reviews, some aspects of the program are to be commended. The reviewers also express some concerns and make some recommendations; these should be addressed prior to the next regularly scheduled review. In particular, one more Group I or Group II faculty member be hired for the OU-C program and that the administration of the program resides at OU-C. The next review will take place in 2013-2014.
Deaf Studies and Interpreting
Internal Review – November 2009

Executive Summary

Program Description
The Deaf Studies and Interpreting (DSI) Technology program is a two-year degree program leading to an Associate in Applied Sciences (AAS) with a major in Applied Sciences. The program is offered at Ohio University – Chillicothe (OU-C) and related coursework is offered at other campuses. The program prepares students to work as interpreters for the deaf and hearing impaired by providing course work in American Sign Language.

Commendations

After substantial concerns were identified in 2007, the program has undergone significant revision. A Group I faculty member has been hired to direct the program, the curriculum has been revised to reflect current instructional practices in Deaf Studies and Interpreting and the OU-C campus has a well equipped DSI lab. Students feel that faculty are caring and committed and offer effective instruction. The program has begun to make connections with the broader community.

Recommendations

- That the program should be regarded as viable and be reopened and allowed to admit majors.
- That the administration of the DSI program reside at OU-C.
- That at least one more Group I or Group II faculty member be hired in fall, 2010 (or as soon as possible).
- That the next program review occur on the usual 7-year cycle, which would be in 2013-14.

---

1 This report was prepared by Jeff Connor, Marty Tuck and Tom Scanlon in December, 2009.
Deaf Studies and Interpreting – Internal Review, November 2009

Description

The Deaf Studies and Interpreting Technology program is a two-year degree program leading to an Associate in Applied Sciences with a major in Applied Sciences. The program is offered at Ohio University – Chillicothe (OU-C) and related coursework is currently offered at other campuses. The program prepares students to work as interpreters for the deaf and hearing impaired by providing course work in American Sign Language. Program coursework also addresses cultural and regional issues.

A total of 96 credit hours are required for the A.A.S. in Deaf Studies. This includes 57 hours of technical requirements, which include six courses in American Sign Language, a course providing an overview of Deaf Studies, four courses in interpreting, two practicums, and participation in a capstone professional development seminar. American Sign Language is also offered at other campuses, and can be used to fulfill the Foreign Language requirement in the College of Arts and Sciences.

History

General concerns about the quality of the program prompted RHE to stop admitting students into the program in January, 2007. Following this, the program underwent an academic program review during first half of 2007. The reviewers found that the faculty was committed to the program and students, that the faculty worked well together, and that the program’s learning laboratory was a substantial resource. Even so, there were significant concerns regarding the qualifications of the faculty, the method of pedagogy, the nature of the curriculum, and the general level of preparation of the students. These concerns were echoed by the students, who felt that the program was not offering an adequate preparation for the job market or future training. The reviewers suggested a number of steps that needed to be taken to get the program back on track. These included:

- Forming an advisory committee to oversee and offer advice on changes in the curriculum, program outcomes, long term and strategic planning, and represent the program in the community.
- Providing professional development for existing faculty.
- Making more effective use of laboratory space.
- Reviewing the program’s teaching resources in conjunction with curricular revisions designed to bring the program up to date.
Regional Higher Education made a commitment to improving the program and, as of January 2008, the program had hired a (Group IV) Program Coordinator with the experiential qualifications needed to guide the program revisions, and made a further commitment to hire a Group I faculty member. The Program Coordinator was also charged with revising the curriculum and pursuing additional faculty lines. Professional development opportunities were provided for existing faculty members. Steps were also taken to establish an Advisory Board, plans were made to establish new admission standards, and budget allocations were made to purchase new curriculum materials as well as for long term support of the program.

Based on progress towards revising the program and promises of future support, the UCC approved admitting a new cohort of students in fall, 2008. The program was to be re-reviewed in fall, 2009, prior to opening the program to students in general.

Since January 2008, the program has:

- Hired a Group I faculty member to serve as the Program Director. The Program Director holds a Masters degree in Deaf Education, a Bachelors degree in Speech and Hearing Sciences, and an Advanced Plus Rating on the Sign Language Proficiency Interview.

- Redesigned the curriculum.

- Provided professional development to current faculty. All instructors are now expected to hold at least an Advanced rating on the Sign Language Proficiency Interview and attend appropriate workshops.

- Recruited new faculty. The program now has four Deaf faculty members and four licensed interpreters. All hold at least a Bachelors degree and are fluent in American Sign Language.

The DSI Program Director met with the University Curriculum Council (UCC) Program Review Committee in October 2009 and internal reviewers Marty Tuck, Tom Scanlan and Jeff Connor made a site visit to the program in November, 2009. During the site visit the internal reviewers met with students, faculty members, and a representative from the Dean's office. The results of the site visit were discussed during a November meeting of the UCC Program Review Committee.

Faculty

The OU-C faculty currently consists of one Group I faculty member, one Group IV faculty member, and 3-5 Group III faculty members. Group III faculty are required to hold a Bachelors degree and evidence of proficiency: faculty teaching the interpretation classes need to be certified and/or hold State licensure and faculty teaching sign language are required to have passed the Sign Language Proficiency Interview exam at the Advanced Level or above (or have similar qualifications). Prospective Group III faculty members are interviewed by the Program Director either in person or via videophone and, if hired, are also required to attend a DSI program orientation session and a campus orientation for adjunct faculty.
Ohio University Lancaster (OU-L) has one Group II faculty member who teaches classes in the program and hires 3–4 group III faculty members, Ohio University Southern (OU-S) has two Group III faculty members, and Ohio University Zanesville (OU-Z) has one Group III faculty member. These faculty members teach approximately 12 sections at the Chillicothe campus, 10 sections at the Lancaster/Pickerington Center campus, 3 sections at the Southern campus, and one section at the Zanesville campus.

During the site visit, the reviewers met with five faculty members. They believe that the program has improved significantly and that, in general, the program is being adequately supported. It was noted that the fire alarm for the lab had been replaced by one that gave a visual, as well as auditory, alert. The class sizes are appropriate and within the norm for a DSI program. There were some concerns. It would be useful to have easy access to an interpreter for meetings with students, faculty and administrators. It would also be helpful to have more general faculty meetings; as is, the majority of the faculty members are adjuncts and it is difficult to arrange general faculty meetings; there are current plans to start having general faculty meetings starting winter or spring of 2010. There was also concern regarding past communication between the campus administration and program faculty; this situation seems to be improving.

Students

The program currently has 8–9 students in the fall 2008 cohort, and all are female. There are currently 25 students at OU-C and 18 students at OU-L interested in the program. There are active student organizations at OU-C and OU-L. All of the students in the fall 2008 cohort have been placed into practicum settings; these settings include working with agencies which provide interpretation services to individuals such as the Deaf Service Center in Columbus and Community Services for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing in Portsmouth, working in K-12 schools, and working at OU-C and OU-L.

The internal reviewers met with five students during the site visit (three in the 2008 cohort and two more recent students that had completed some coursework). The students were quite positive about the program. They reported that the classes and advising are good, faculty members are helpful and supportive, and they have had opportunities to participate in the broader Deaf community. The latter includes participating in the signed presentations (platform interpretations) of a church play and Tecumseh. They also felt that they were as prepared as students from Columbus State’s interpreting training program. There was some sentiment that the curriculum could be more challenging and they would like some courses added to the program, especially in transliteration. There was also some concern about the clarity of communication between the DSI faculty and the administration. Overall, though, they were quite happy with the program as a whole.
Concerns

The major concerns that surfaced were that:

- The program needs to grow in a manner that offers consistent, high-quality instruction across campuses.

- There be sufficient long-term staff (Group I or Group II) to handle the workload of administering the program, teaching the major courses, provide long-term stability to the program (should a faculty member leave), and allow the faculty members to grow professionally.

Recommendations

- That the program should be regarded as viable and be reopened and allowed to admit majors.

- That the administration of the DSI program reside at OU-C. While the DSI program is based at OU-C, other campuses offer ASL (as a foreign language) and there is the possibility of other campuses duplicating the program. In order to maintain a consistent quality, it is important to have a single director who is responsible for curricular decisions related to the DSI program and who is consulted in the hiring of adjunct faculty for the program(s) at OU-C and the other regional campus sites.

- That at least one more Group I or Group II faculty member be hired for the OU-C program. The program currently has a Group I and Group IV faculty member at OU-C, however the Group IV faculty member is in her third, and hence last possible, year. This would only leave one full-time faculty member at OU-C at the start of fall, 2010; the remainder of the faculty would be adjunct faculty members. (OU-L also has a HHS Group II faculty member that teaches in the program.) The Program Director is a Group I faculty member in her probationary period, and the review team is concerned that if another non-adjunct faculty member is not hired it will be difficult for the program director to accomplish the scholarship required in order for her to secure tenure/promotion. Therefore, the review team feels the program needs at least two non-adjunct faculty members in order to administer the program, teach classes, develop curriculum, supervise adjunct faculty and insure continuity in the program.

- That the next program review occur on the usual 7-year cycle, which would be in 2013-14.
January 4, 2010

Jeff Connor, Chair
UCC Program Review Committee
Ohio University
Athens, OH 45701

Dear Dr. Connor,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Deaf Studies and Interpreting Internal Review report dated November 2009. I appreciate the efforts of all involved in this review and I have reviewed the synopsis of the Deaf Studies and Interpreting (DSI) program you have provided as it has existed over the past several years.

In all, I agree with your recommendations that the DSI program is currently viable and should be reopened and allowed to admit majors; that at least one additional Group I or Group II faculty member be hired in DSI; and that the next program review occur on the usual 7-year cycle which would be in 2013-14. On one item, I am asking for slightly stronger wording. I agree that the administration should reside at OU-C, yet the curricular decisions and the hiring of adjunct faculty should require more than consulting as mentioned in your recommendations. I believe staffing approvals should emanate much like they do with Athens' departments, in that, Athens' departments provide approvals of staffing for their respective academic units.

Again, thank you for this opportunity and the review of our Deaf Studies and Interpreting program.

Sincerely,

Michael Lafreniere, Associate Dean
Ohio University-Chillicothe
January 4, 2010

University Curriculum Council
Baker Center Room 231
One Park Place
Athens, Ohio 45701

Deaf Studies and Interpreting Program Coordinator Response to Site Visit Report

The report written by the Program Review Committee following a site visit on November 4th, 2009 to Ohio University Chillicothe for the Deaf Studies and Interpreting (DSI) program is an accurate summary of the progress accomplished since the seven year review conducted in 2007. Reviewers in 2007 stated four main recommendations including seeking a new Program Coordinator, redesigning the curriculum, providing professional development to faculty, and recruiting new faculty members. The program has met all four recommendations and continues to improve.

A Group I faculty member with the necessary education and experience for coordinating the program has been hired. Curriculum has been reviewed and textbooks have been updated. The program will begin the curriculum approval process to make further revisions in the near future. Professional development courses were offered to two previous faculty members. Several new instructors have been recruited. Five of the ten instructors are Deaf and four instructors are interpreters. All faculty have at least a Bachelors degree and an Advanced Rating on the Sign Language Proficiency Interview or equivalent proficiency documentation. Furthermore, an Advisory Board of five members has been established. Four members are Deaf and one is an interpreter.

The program will continue to improve and strive to accomplish the new recommendations stated in the site visit report. I agree that Ohio University Chillicothe should approve all faculty and
curricular revisions on any Ohio University campus. The sequential nature of the program demands consistency and quality in coursework and faculty. This can only be achieved by having administration reside at one campus.

I thank the reviewers for their time and accurate depiction of the current DSI program. We will strive to continue to make necessary improvements to meet the needs of students, the university, and the interpreting field.

Sincerely,

Abigail White
Assistant Professor and Program Coordinator
Deaf Studies and Interpreting

Ohio University Chillicothe
101 University Drive
Chillicothe, Ohio 45601
whitea2@ohio.edu
(740) 774-7248
curricular revisions on any Ohio University campus. The sequential nature of the program demands consistency and quality in coursework and faculty. This can only be achieved by having administration reside at one campus.

I thank the reviewers for their time and accurate depiction of the current DSI program. We will strive to continue to make necessary improvements to meet the needs of students, the university, and the interpreting field.

Sincerely,

Abigail White
Assistant Professor and Program Coordinator
Deaf Studies and Interpreting

Ohio University Chillicothe
101 University Drive
Chillicothe, Ohio 45601
whitea2@ohio.edu
(740) 774-7248
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

Name of Program: Department of Economics

Program Type (check all that apply):

___ undergraduate certificate
___ graduate certificate
___ associate degree

x bachelor's degree
x master's degree

Approved by UCC chair: ________________________________ 3/7/10

(signature)  

* the word "DRAFT" must appear on each page of the review until it has been formally approved by the University Curriculum Council.
University Curriculum Committee  
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS  
Seven Year Review
For the period 1999-2006

The Department of Economics has undergraduate programs in both Economics and Business Economics. The main difference between the two is that the BA in Economics is conferred by the College of Arts and Sciences and the Bachelor of Business Economics is a Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) degree conferred by the College of Business. The number of Economics majors has ranged from 70 to 90. The number of Business Economics majors has ranged from 10 to 15. The Department also has Masters programs in Applied Economics and Financial Economics (offered on two campuses, Athens and Pickerington). Since 2004 the Masters in Financial Economics (M.F.E.) has been offered at the Ohio University Pickerington Center. In November 2006, the Ohio Board of Regents approved a separate M.F.E. degree. Faculty are generally required to teach one introductory course per year and other courses in their area of specialization. The faculty are research active, producing scholarship at twice the level of peer-institutions and on par with median Ph.D.-granting institutions.

The external reviewer notes that the Department is excellent, with an active and collegial faculty, strong students, an involved chair, and program coordinators who are engaged.

Commendations

The program should be commended for its ability to engage in the instruction of students in its major and from across the university while maintaining a strong research profile, successfully maintaining its programs in the face of seven Group I faculty resignations/retirements during the period of review, expanding course offerings in both the graduate and undergraduate programs, its research output that is twice that of peer-institutions and on par with median Ph.D.-granting institutions, and the development of its M.F.E. program, especially the Saturday-only program offered to working professionals at Pickerington Center.

Concerns and Recommendations

The external reviewer cautions that cooperation between the College of Business should be increased to remedy an overlap between courses in the business school and the Department of Economics, and that the graduate program 1) should be sufficiently differentiated from the undergraduate program so that the graduate program is not too repetitive, and 2) should provide more research opportunities and student colloquia. The Department feels that upgrading the administrative, physical infrastructure, and technological needs of Pickerington Center is vital for the growth of the M.F.E. program. The external reviewer recommends that the Department should investigate how increased research opportunities can be made available to students (both graduate and undergraduate) and foster more cooperation between themselves and the College of Business.

1Prepared by Robert G. Brannan (brannan@ohio.edu) of the School of Human and Consumer Sciences, and Michael Prudich (prudich@ohio.edu) of the Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering Department. The outside reviewer was Dr. Elizabeth Hendry, Dean of Social Sciences and Professor of Economics, Queens College CUNY.
General Program Summary

The Department of Economics in the College of Arts and Sciences has undergraduate programs that lead to either a Bachelors of Arts in Economics or a Bachelor of Business Economics. The main difference between the two degrees is that the BA in Economics is conferred by the College of Arts and Sciences and the Bachelor of Business Economics students earn a Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) degree which is conferred by the College of Business. The number of Economics majors over the review period has ranged from 70 to 90 and is predominantly Caucasian and male. The number of Business Economics majors has ranged from 10 to 15. The Department also has graduate programs that lead to either a Masters of Arts in Applied Economics or a Masters of Financial Economics (MFE, offered on two campuses, Athens and Pickerington). Since 2004, the MFE has been offered at the Ohio University Pickerington Center on Saturdays and is designed for students to begin in winter quarter and complete the program in seven consecutive quarters. The Athens MFE degree program is a five quarter, summer to summer, program. The number of students pursuing the MA in Applied Economics has ranged from 7 to 15. The number of students in the MFE program in Athens has averaged approximately 20. The number of students in Pickerington has averaged approximately 23. In November 2006, the Ohio Board of Regents approved a separate M.F.E. degree. Seventeen Group I faculty have served the Department during the review period of 2000-2006. Two faculty who are early retirees also teach and a Group 3 faculty member is utilized as needed. A department administrative assistant and a secretary provided support. In the spring of 2007 one Group 1 faculty member retired, two Group 1 faculty members resigned and a fourth Group 1 faculty member was granted an unpaid leave of absence. Faculty are generally required to teach one introductory course per year and other courses in their area of specialization, as assigned by the Department Chair. The graduate faculty are research active. Independent measurements of graduate faculty productivity suggest that the faculty produce scholarship at twice the level of peer-institutions and on par with a median Ph.D.-granting institution.

Faculty Profile

Seventeen Group I faculty have worked in the Department of Economics during 2000-2006. Of these 5 were women, 1 was Hispanic and 4 were Asian. At the time of the review, the current faculty profile consisted of 14 continuing, non-retired faculty members (four Professors, three Associate Professors, seven Assistant Professors), and three continuing, early-retired members (one Distinguished Professor, one Professor, one Associate Professor). During the period of the review, the department saw the retirement of four Professors (one Distinguished) and two resignations (one Professor, one Associate Professor). During the period of the review, the Department used a limited number of Group 4 faculty, primarily for teaching lower-level classes as needed.

Programmatic Practices

Teaching assignments are made by the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty. All faculty have been expected to teach at least one introductory-level course per year, either Principles of Microeconomics (ECON103) or Principles of Macroeconomics (ECON104), both of which are large service courses that fulfill the University’s General Education requirement for
Tier II Social Studies. Faculty also teach 300-600 level classes in their area of specialization. In assigning graduate courses, preference is given to tenure-track professors building research programs and/or professors in programs with higher student demand. Teaching is assessed through student evaluations and peer observations. Mentoring of junior faculty is accomplished on an informal basis by senior faculty in similar or related fields of specialization. Advising assignments are made by the chair of the Undergraduate Committee. Assignments at the graduate level are made by the chair of the Graduate Committee. Graduate students do not teach on the Athens campus. Their work consists largely of grading homework and exams and assisting faculty in their research.

The evaluation of research is based on the level and quality of peer-reviewed publications and presentations at professional meetings. The submission of proposals and success in acquiring grant funding are also considered in the evaluation of research. The Department supports faculty with funding for travel to professional meetings and workshops. The University provides access to a Datastream database, which is a source of non-proprietary economic data. However, the Department is not able to provide faculty access to databases such as Compustat, Bloomberg or the Standard and Poor Emerging Markets database. According to the Guidelines and Policy for Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal of Probationary Appointments, “Typically, candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor should have six high-quality publications in refereed, scholarly journals.”

All faculty are expected to contribute to the operation of the Department, College, and University at a level consistent with their rank and experience. No major service assignments are given to first-year faculty. In their second year, a typical assignment might be the direction of the Department Seminar Series. Major department service assignments, as well as College and University service, are normally reserved for tenured faculty. These include Graduate Chair, Undergraduate Chair, Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, and Search Committee Chair.

Curriculum

Undergraduate

The Economics major requires a minimum of 40 quarter hours in economics plus a calculus requirement. The first two required economics courses survey essential topics in microeconomics (ECON 103 or 105) and macroeconomics (ECON 104 or 106). Other required courses for the Economics major are Intermediate Microeconomics (ECON 303), Intermediate Macroeconomics (ECON 304), Introduction to Statistics and Econometrics (ECON 381) and Economic Methodology and Research (ECON 485), which fulfills the University's General Education Tier III requirement. Economics majors may fulfill the University's General Education Tier I junior composition requirement by enrolling in ECON 310J or any J class. In addition, students complete the forty-hour economics requirement by enrolling in economics elective courses. Economics majors must complete all University General Education requirements and all College of Arts and Sciences requirements.

The Business Economics (BBA) major requirements are very similar to the Economics major requirements except that Business Economics students must fulfill the Tier I junior composition requirement with Business Communications (PRCM 325J) and complete all College of Business requirements, such as a “breadth cluster” that includes one approved course from each of the areas of ethics, diversity, 300 level economics, and political/legal/social.
Graduate

For the degree of M.A. in Applied Economics, students who have all the prerequisites for the program must complete a total of 60 graduate credit hours distributed among the four components of the program: core economics requirements (35 hours), other required classes in an area of concentration (10 hours), elective courses (10 hours), and a research paper (5 hours). Core requirements include Mathematical Economics (ECON 500), Statistical Foundations (ECON 501), Advanced Microeconomic Theory (ECON 603A and 603B), Advanced Macroeconomic Theory (ECON 604A), Econometrics I (ECON 635), and Applied Econometrics (Econ 638). Areas of concentration include Development Economics, Environmental and Resources, International Economics, Labor Economics, Public Finance & Policy, Money and Banking, and Economic History. Each candidate is required to complete a research paper (ECON 696) in the area of concentration and under the guidance of at least two faculty members, one of whom is designated as the Principal Advisor.

The Master of Financial Economics degree in Athens is structured so that all academic requirements can be completed in 5 quarters, beginning in the summer. The Athens MFE requires a minimum of 59 credit hours with 30 hours in Economics, 16 hours in Finance, 8 hours in accounting, and 5 hours for Internship or Research Project.

The Master of Financial Economics degree in Pickerington is designed for working professionals who desire to advance in financial services. The program meets on Saturdays at Ohio University-Pickerington Center. Classes are staffed by faculty members from the Athens campus. The program requires 59 credit hours with 35 hours in Economics, 16 hours in Finance, and 8 hours in Accounting. The program is structured so that all academic requirements can be completed in seven quarters, beginning in the winter and ending with the summer session of the following year. To finish the program, participants will complete an in-house research project.

Both MFE programs are built upon the Candidate Body of Knowledge, or CBOK™ of the CFA® Program, which is closely tied to up-to-date professional practices in investment management. The CFA Institute awards the Chartered Financial Analyst®, CFA®, designation to those who pass a series of three written examinations and meet other requirements set by CFA Institute.

Teaching

Teaching assignments are made by the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty. All faculty have been expected to teach at least one introductory-level course per year, either Principles of Microeconomics (ECON 103) or Principles of Macroeconomics (ECON 104). The Principles courses fulfill the University’s General Education requirement for Tier II Social Studies. Faculty also teach 300-600 level classes in their area of specialization. In assigning graduate courses, preference is given to tenure-track professors building research programs and/or professors in programs with higher student demand. Teaching is assessed through student evaluations and peer observations. Mentoring of junior faculty is accomplished on an informal basis by senior faculty in similar or related fields of specialization. Advising assignments are made by the chair of the Undergraduate Committee. Assignments at the graduate level are made
by the chair of the Graduate Committee. Graduate students do not teach on the Athens campus. Their work consists largely of grading homework and exams and assisting faculty in their research.

During the period under review, the Department revived and expanded its undergraduate elective course offerings to include Economics of Sports (ECON 318), Economics of Health Care (ECON 315), Economics of Crime (ECON 425), Public Finance (ECON 430), Economics of Human Resources (ECON 322), Antitrust (ECON 334), Labor Economics (ECON 320), Energy Economics (ECON 335), and Economic Data Analysis (ECON 382).

During the period under review, the Department began the approval process for two new courses, Foundations of Microeconomics and Foundations of Macroeconomics (proposed to University Curriculum Council as ECON 105 and ECON 106) which have a higher prerequisite set than the Principles courses (ECON 103 and ECON 104). The Department hopes that these classes, taught in a small-class format, will attract a higher performing student to the Economics majors.

Graduate were also added or revised during the period of this review, including Economic Development (ECON 550), Economics of Poverty (ECON 512), Economics of Latin America (ECON 574) and Economics of Korea, Japan and South East Asia (ECON 576) for the Applied Economics program and Macroeconomics and Business Fluctuations Theory (MFE 601), Statistics and Econometrics (MFE 639), International Trade (MFE 640) and Financial Derivatives (MFE 644) for the M.F.E. program.

Research
Research activity by the Economics faculty during the period of review has included publications in refereed journals, book chapters, scholarly books, conference presentations or other professional presentations, and consulting presentations and contracts. Both the total number of scholarly activities and the percentage of faculty participating in research has increased during the period of the review. From 2003-2007, the total number of scholarly activities has increased from 28 to 57 and the percentage of faculty with scholarly activities has increased from 75% to 93%.

The Department of Economics reports that journal publications per faculty member per year for the past five years was approximately one. The department suggests that this productivity is excellent for a non-PhD program, based on the fact that research in the Journal of Labor Research gives the number of publications per faculty member per year in PhD programs as 0.68. The department also suggests that they compare well with peer institutions using a metric based on publications in the prestigious JCR journals. The OU rate is 1.4 per faculty, while rates are 0.63, 0.60 and 0.65, for Kent State, Bowling Green University and Miami University, respectively.

Students
Undergraduate

The Department of Economics has seen total enrollments in its undergraduate programs range from a low of 71 in 2005 to a high of 95 in 2003. The undergraduate program under the period
of the review has been predominantly white (yearly enrollments ranging from 77-89%) and male (yearly enrollments ranging from 73-86%). The average GPA for incoming students ranged from 2.84 to 3.04.

As noted by the External Reviewer, the undergraduates were very positive about their experiences at Ohio University, described the faculty as accessible, and were pleased with the variety of courses available to them.

Graduate

The Department of Economics has seen total enrollments in its graduate programs range from a low of 27 in 2001 to a high of 58 in 2006. The graduate program has been majority foreign for all years of the review. Black enrollment has ranged from 0% to 9%. The graduate enrollment has been majority male (53-76%). The average GPA for incoming graduate students ranged from 3.39 to 3.64.

Students in the M.F.E. track in Pickerington are working professionals, typically employed at financial institutions such as Morgan Stanley, State Teachers’ Retirement, Chase Bank, Huntington Bank, Park Bank, Nationwide Insurance, Grange Insurance, and BISYS Systems.

The External Reviewer notes that most graduate students were pleased with the program and the accessibility of the faculty. However, those with an economics or finance undergraduate background felt that the curriculum was repetitive and complained about classes that were dual listed as both graduate-undergraduate.

Alumni Profile

Undergraduate

The Department of Economics self reports that “many recent Economics majors have been successful in obtaining employment in the business world or have gone to law school. Others have gone directly to Ph.D. in Economics programs, including those at Florida State University, Washington University of St. Louis and the University of Virginia.”

However, the internal reviewers caution that there is a lack of data on graduates because no program survey of graduates has been undertaken during the period of review.

Graduate

The Department of Economics self reports that “students who have graduated from our program have been successful in obtaining employment in government. For example, one our students received the prestigious Presidential Management Fellowship and is now employed at the African Development Foundation. Other Economics majors have found employment at financial institutions such as Wachovia Bank, Garlikov Companies, Nationwide Insurance or Ginnie Mae or government institutions such as the U.S. Department of Energy. Some students have gone directly to other graduate programs such as Financial Engineering at Carnegie Mellon or Ph.D. programs in Economics or Finance at institutions such as Purdue University, Georgia Tech,
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill or Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Many graduates of the Financial Economics track take the Level I or Level II exam of the Chartered Financial Analyst Institute. The Ohio University pass-rate for the Level I exam is more than twice that of the national average."

However, the internal reviewers caution that there is a lack of data on graduates because no program survey of graduates has been undertaken during the period of review.

**Adequacy of Resources**

At the end of the period of the review, the Department of Economics was anticipating losing one administrative FTE with all non-teaching duties in the Department becoming the responsibility of one individual (this has since occurred). A number of work-study positions have been unfilled in recent years. The Department has adequate funds for faculty computers and travel, but does not have funds for expensive databases and software licenses.

The department chair suggests that the department has a need for increased graduate student stipends in order to compete with other universities. Support for a small number of graduate students is a partial aid package, typically a stipend of $1400 per quarter and a scholarship to cover one half of their tuition.

There is agreement that the Department of Economics improved their physical space during the period under review the Department moved to a new building, Bentley Annex. Space concerns in Bentley Annex include the lack of a projector in the computer lab for teaching purposes.

The internal reviewers acknowledge that the department has specific administrative, space, and technology concerns related to the M.F.E. track in Pickerington. New administrative and secretarial responsibilities are now required. Small classroom space and inadequate facilities for breaks and meals has been an issue. The M.F.E. track also has problems in the area of technology for recording lectures and providing instruction in a computer lab, due to the lack of broadband, servers and computer lab capacity at Pickerington.

**Commendations**

The Department of Economics should be commended for:

1) its ability to engage in the instruction of students in its major and from across the university while maintaining a strong research profile.

2) successfully maintaining its programs in the face of seven Group I faculty resignations/retirements during the period of review.

3) expanding course offerings in both the graduate and undergraduate programs.

4) its research output that is twice that of peer-institutions and on par with median Ph.D.-granting institutions.
5) its Masters in Financial Economics program, especially the Saturday-only program offered to working professionals at Pickerington Center.

**Concerns**

The external reviewer cautions that cooperation between the College of Business should be increased to remedy an overlap between courses in the business school and the Department of Economics.

The external reviewer cautions that the graduate program 1) should be sufficiently differentiated from the undergraduate program so that the graduate program is not too repetitive, and 2) should provide more research opportunities and student colloquia.

The internal reviewers acknowledge that the Department feels that upgrading the administrative, physical, and technological needs of Pickerington Center is vital for growth of the M.F.E. program.

**Recommendations**

The external reviewer notes that the Ohio University has an excellent Department of Economics, but makes the following recommendations:

1) The Department should investigate how increased research opportunities can be made available for students.

2) The Department should foster more cooperation between themselves and the College of Business.
External Reviewer's Report  
Department of Economics  
Ohio University

Reviewer: Dr. Elizabeth Hendrey  
Dean of Social Sciences and Professor of Economics  
Queens College CUNY  
Date of Visit: January 9-11, 2008

During my visit to the Ohio University's economics department, I met with administrators, junior and senior faculty, and undergraduates and graduate students. My overall impression was of a strong department, with an active and collegial faculty, and strong students. I was particularly impressed by the commitment to teaching by full time faculty, rather than relying on part-time faculty, as so many colleges and universities do.

The department has undergraduate programs in economics and business economics, and an MA in economics as well as a masters’ in financial engineering, that is also offered at the Pickerington campus on weekends, staffed by the same faculty. The curricula seemed to be appropriate and with a good offering of both required courses and electives. About two thirds of the undergraduates I met with were business economics students. All of the undergraduates were very positive about their experiences at Ohio University, and described the economics faculty as very accessible, and the variety of electives offered as wide. The business economics students did raise some concerns, including insufficient cooperation between the College of Business and the economics department, and too much overlap between courses in the business school and the economics department. They wanted more advanced offerings in financial economics, such as futures and options. Finally, since the College of Business job fairs do not include economics, they asked for more support for internships and job placement. Many of the undergraduate students expressed interest in having more opportunities to do research with faculty members. Overall, however, they were very satisfied with the faculty and the education they were receiving.

The graduate students I met, a mixed group of MA and MFE students, were also pleased with the accessibility of the faculty. The students were a diverse group, who described themselves as being attracted by the curriculum, and scholarship of the faculty. They did raise some concerns. Those students with an economics/finance background as undergraduates felt that the curriculum was too repetitive of the undergraduate major. However, other students who did not have that background were positive about the curriculum. Also, because many electives are cross-listed with undergraduate classes, students who did their undergraduate degrees at Ohio University expressed a desire for more electives. They also expressed a desire for more research opportunities, and student-faculty colloquia. I did not visit the Pickerington campus or meet with those students, but the chair of the department,
Professor Rose Rossiter, described the program as quite successful, but the facilities there as inadequate. For example, faculty members do not have offices at Pickerington to meet with students. One concern that was raised about the Athens program, both by students and faculty, was the need to increase the number of graduate stipends, to improve recruitment.

Based on the faculty profiles provided to me, as well as my meetings with faculty, I got the impression of a faculty committed to both research and teaching. Junior faculty felt that the department was supportive of their success, and provided good mentorship. Many faculty in the department have co-authored research with colleagues. Concerns expressed included the need to teach very large introductory sections with little support beyond grading. Faculty also felt that there was a lack of access to electronic databases and statistical software, and expressed a desire for more cooperation with the business school, which does have access to many databases that are not accessible to economics faculty. There was some limited concern about the degree of support for faculty seeking grant funding. Finally, the department felt that a clerical support position that had been cut should be restored, particularly since changes in administrative systems had increased the responsibilities of departmental clerical staff.

Faculty described students as strong, and cited the undergraduates as having excellent quantitative skills, and stated that both undergraduates and MA students had gone on to excellent Ph.D. programs, while job placement for MFE students was good. Faculty cited the continuation of the masters’ programs as very important for continuing to attract excellent new faculty.

My overall assessment of the Ohio University economics department is an excellent one. I recommend that the faculty investigate the possibilities for facilitating more student research. I recommend that the University foster more cooperation between the College of Business and the economics department, both to provide more research support for faculty, and to improve the educational experience for students, by reducing overlap in course offerings, and improving coordination of advising. I would like to say a word about departmental leadership. The chair, and the graduate and undergraduate advisors, as well as all the faculty with whom I met, were involved, caring and doing an excellent job of running the department and deserve compliments for the strength of the program, especially given limited resources, as is the case with so many public institutions today.
MEMO

December 16, 2008

To: University Curriculum Council

Fr: Rosemary Rossiter, Chair, Department of Economics

Re: Comments on the Seven-Year Review

1. We are very pleased that the reviewers recognized our faculty's commitment to effective teaching and research productivity.

2. The Department of Economics provides all undergraduate instruction in microeconomics, macroeconomics, managerial economics and other economic fields. The College of Business does not provide coursework in economics. The College of Business does teach an introduction to statistics course. Some topics from this course are also included in our Economics 381 course, though the level of instruction differs. The study of statistics is a requirement for upper-level class work in econometrics (Economics 485). The change to semesters may affect the distribution of content between Economics 381 and Economics 485.

3. In the M.A. in Applied Economics curriculum, several field courses are dual-level. In dual-level classes graduate students may be provided additional instruction and assessment of graduate students differs from that of undergraduates. In recent years we have been able to offer separate classes for undergraduate and graduate study in economic development and the economics of the environment. We would like to reduce the number of dual-level classes but can only do so with an increased level of staffing.

4. The M.F.E. program is structured so that students are prepared for employment as financial analysts. Analysts must be trained in economics, accounting and finance. Thus by design the M.F.E. program is cross-disciplinary and depends on staffing in accounting and finance from the College of Business. Some students enter the M.F.E. program with more background in one area such as economics but this is not the case for all students. The reviewers make a similar observation.

5. The Department of Economics seeks to provide students with assistance with internships and job placement. However, as a department and not a College, our resources are limited in this regard. We are currently exploring if alumni support is available for internships and looking into the University's Mentor program.

6. Funding for graduate students is inadequate. We lose many qualified applicants because other departments at Ohio University and other universities are able to offer much more generous stipends and tuition support.
7. For most M.A. students, the M.A. degree is a stepping stone to enter a Ph.D. program in economics at another university. Most MFE students enter the job market immediately after finishing the program, as their skills are highly appealing to financial institutions.
Date: August 11, 2009

To: Unit Review Committee

From: Benjamin Ogles, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
      Thomas Scanlan, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Re: College Response to 7-Year Review of Economics

The College of Arts and Sciences would like to thank the Program Review Committee for its thoughtful review of the Department of Economics. We agree with your finding that the Department of Economics is viable.

The reports of both the internal and external reviewers indicate that the Department of Economics has emerged from this most recent review period in very good shape. As Dr. Hendry, the external reviewer, notes, this fact is due in no small measure to the efforts of those faculty members who have served in leadership roles in the Department over the past several years. The Department has clearly benefited from their dedication, wisdom, and hard work. And as Dr. Hendry also notes, the tone set by the departmental leadership is echoed by the faculty as a whole, who are an impressive group of scholars and teachers. Among the notable accomplishments of the Department during the review period is its record of scholarly research output that exceeds that of Economics departments in peer-institutions; the development and implementation of a self-supporting M.F.E. degree-program that provides needed professional development to financial professionals; and the re-invigorating of both its graduate and undergraduate curricula. Moreover, the Department has played a vital role in the College’s Liberal Arts curriculum and the University’s General Education curriculum by offering consistently high-quality instruction in two of the ten most taken courses on campus – ECON 103 and ECON 104. It is noteworthy that the Department was able to accomplish all of this during a period of shrinking resources.

In their report, the UCC reviewers express three concerns, and we will address them in the order in which they are laid out in that report. The first matter involves the level of cooperation and coordination between the Department of Economics and the College of Business. In her report, Dr. Hendry relays the criticisms of the Business Economics students with whom she met during her visit. These students complained not only of a
lack of cooperation between the two units but also of "too much overlap between courses in the business school and the economics department." Dr. Rossiter, in her Chair's response, suggests that the overlap is probably limited to the two courses that involve statistics. In any event, the College would be happy to facilitate communication between Economics and the College of Business in order to address the perceptions of these students. While these perceptions may not correspond to reality, they can work to undermine the quality of the academic experience of these and other students in this program.

The second concern relayed by Dr. Hendry and echoed by the U.C.C. reviewers is twofold. First, they suggest that there may be too much similarity between the material covered in the graduate and undergraduate programs. Secondly, they urge the Department to provide more research opportunities and student colloquia. In her response, Dr. Rossiter suggests that the culprit in the first area of concern may well be the dual-listed graduate/undergraduate courses. In some areas, the Department has been able to avoid this practice, but it will not be able to eliminate it altogether without additional resources. Since the College is not able to provide those resources at this time, we will encourage the Department to explore pedagogical innovations that could improve the academic experience of the graduate students without jeopardizing that of the undergraduates. While having graduate and undergraduate students in the same classroom is not optimal, the College has a number of programs that manage to deliver a quality education to both populations. We will work with Economics to see if there are ways to improve the situation within the current resource picture. As for the expansion of research opportunities and student colloquia, we will encourage the Economics faculty to facilitate these opportunities for their students.

Finally, the reviewers express concern about the adequacy of the Pickerington Center for the delivery of the M.F.E. program. Since this center is not within the control of the College of Arts and Sciences, we may not be able to effect the types of changes the reviewers have in mind. Nonetheless, the Dean's office is always willing to serve as an advocate for its programs, and we would be happy to initiate a conversation with the leadership of Regional Higher Education to see what sorts of improvements are possible in the near and long term.

In closing, let us say that we largely agree with the findings and recommendations of the report. Unfortunately, many of the recommendations of the review team, while valid and helpful, cannot be fully implemented without additional resources, and we are not optimistic that the College's resource picture will improve in the near future. The
College nonetheless remains committed to a thriving Department of Economics, and we applaud them for their impressive ability to make the improvements they have made within the current budgetary climate.

Thank you again for your thoughtful and thorough review. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us.
Seven-year review of the Department of Economics: Report by the curriculum committee of Graduate Council

The Department of Economics offers an MA in economics and a Master’s in Financial Economics. Concerning the seven-year review of the Department of Economics, the outside evaluator noted that the department was excellent, possessed an active and collegial faculty, and had strong students. Concerning the department’s graduate component specifically, the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences was particularly impressed by the fact that the department had developed and implemented a self-supporting M.F.E degree-program.

The various evaluators of the department did raise some concerns, however, which need to be addressed. These include:

1) Greater cooperation between the department and the College of Business needs to be fostered to avoid overlap in offerings and improve coordination in advising. This, in turn, would provide more research support for faculty.

2) The faculty are encouraged to facilitate the expansion of research opportunities and colloquia for its students.

3) The adequacy of the Pickerington Center to deliver the M.F.E. program is a concern. If, and when, further funding is available, the committee recommends that this become a reality.

4) The graduate curriculum should be revised to better serve the needs of the students, depending upon the training which they have already received. Repetition could thus be avoided, and the potential to take additional electives enhanced.

5) Funding for graduate students is presently inadequate, causing many outstanding students to decide to pursue their graduate studies elsewhere. The committee recommends that this issue needs to be resolved, so that the department’s excellent reputation can be further enhanced.

Despite these concerns, Graduate Council accepts the seven-year review.
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Department of Geography
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2000-2006

The Department of Geography resides in the College of Arts and Sciences and offers the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, and the Master of Art degrees. Undergraduates can pursue six different specializations and graduate students can choose from two specialties or develop an individualized study plan. These programs help prepare students for careers in industry or government, or to pursue further academic studies. The Department supports general education through its course offerings and participates in a variety of interdisciplinary programs. The faculty engages in research and scholarship and has either attained or is gaining national and international prominence in their specialties. On the whole, the Department is fundamentally sound and both the graduate and undergraduate programs are viable.

Commendations

The Department is to be commended for:

- A well thought-out and coherent curriculum that supports both the program’s majors and general education. This includes the creation of a regular two-year rotation of courses.
- Collaborations with other programs, especially the Environmental Studies and International Studies programs.
- An increase in scholarly output and increased grant funding.
- Responding to the increasing role of computer and information technology in Geography by combining the Cartography and Geographic Information Science tracks into a single Geographic Information Science track in 2004 and adding an undergraduate certificate program in GIS for non-majors.
- Maintaining a set of up-to-date computer and information technology labs through the use of external grants and one-time funding opportunities.
- An increase in faculty diversity.
- Obtaining a reduction in the number of courses taught, without decreasing the total number of WSCH taught, through thoughtful planning.

\(^1\) Prepared by Jeff Connor, Department of Mathematics (connor@math.ohiou.edu) and James D. Matthews, Health and Human Services (matthej3@ohio.edu) The outside reviewer was W. Renwick, Professor and Chair, Department of Geography, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio
Concerns and Recommendations

- Group I faculty. There is a serious need to recruit faculty to support the Department's Meteorology program. This unique program normally attracts about 40 majors and is the only such program in the state of Ohio. Currently the program is run by an early retiree, one Group IV faculty member, and the lab is maintained by a Teaching Assistant. It is critical to recruit at least one Group I faculty member in the near future and another in the next two to three years.

- Space issues. The Department is short of space and the current layout makes it difficult to use its existing space effectively. There should be a comprehensive review of the Department's space needs.

- Regular computer equipment and software replacements and upgrades. Given the growing importance of computer and information technology in Geography, it would be appropriate for the Department to be able to replace and upgrade equipment on a regular basis without having to rely on external funding and one-time monies.
Program Review

The Department of Geography resides in the College of Arts and Sciences and offers the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, and the Master of Art degrees. Undergraduates can pursue six different specializations and graduate students can choose from two specialties or develop an individualized study plan. These programs help prepare students for careers in industry or government, or to pursue further academic studies. The Department supports general education through its course offerings and participates in a variety of interdisciplinary programs. The faculty engages in research and scholarship and has either attained or is gaining national and international prominence in their specialties.

Faculty Profile

The faculty of the Department of Geography consists of 13 Group I faculty members (3 full professors, 5 Associate Professors, 5 Assistant Professors), five Early Retirees, 2 Group IV faculty, 1 Group II faculty member, 1 Group III member and, at the time of the site visit, was searching for a new Group I faculty member. The current range of faculty specializations allows the Department of Geography to offer courses necessary for its programs of study. Since 2000, three faculty members have taken early retirement, one member has fully retired, and two have resigned to take positions elsewhere. The Group I faculty consists of seven male and six female faculty members; three of the female faculty members are from historically under-represented groups.

Programmatic Practices

The normal teaching load is currently five courses per year and a standardized two-year rotation of course offerings was established in 2006. Faculty members teach at least one general education course per year with a typical enrollment of 120 – 220 students and one graduate seminar every other year. All Group I faculty members teach graduate courses and serve on thesis committees; Group IV faculty members also teach upper-division undergraduate and graduate courses, however they may not chair thesis committees. Graduate Assistants are assigned grading and laboratory duties. Outstanding teachers are nominated for College and University awards and the Department also gives a “Best Teaching Assistant” award.

The faculty advises 130 – 140 undergraduate geography majors and a faculty member typically advises 15 students per year. The Department is committed to offering high-quality advising; undergraduates are interviewed by the undergraduate coordinator before being assigned advisors and advisees must meet with their advisors at least once a quarter.

The Department created a formal mentoring plan for junior faculty in 2006. Mentoring includes teaching, research and publishing, and probationary faculty members meet formally at least once per quarter. Each probationary faculty member’s teaching is
observed by their mentor and another faculty member twice a year, and the observations result in a formal evaluation letter.

Research and scholarly activity is supported through start-up funds, reduced teaching loads, scheduling accommodations, and the mentoring of junior faculty. The Department also supports junior faculty by limiting the number of new course preparations and offering reduced teaching loads.

The Department encourages service, which includes serving on departmental, college and university committees; participating in local, regional, national, and discipline-specific organizations; consulting; and community service.

The Department participates in a number of interdisciplinary activities. Faculty members have served as program directors for the Environmental Studies program and teach required courses for the program; during the review period, they directed one-third of the Master’s of Science Environmental Studies theses. They have been active in Education Abroad programs; taught courses and directed Master’s theses in the International Studies Program; and served as members of thesis and dissertation committees in other departments. The Department is also active in community and educational organizations such as Rural Action, local watershed groups and the Ohio Geographic Alliance.

When possible, the Department has worked, and continues to work, on building a diverse faculty. In fall, 2000, the faculty consisted of 8 men and 3 women. The faculty now consists of 7 men and 6 women, three of whom are from historically under-represented groups.

The evaluation of teaching, service and research is done by a three member evaluation committee with a rotating membership; each faculty member serves on this committee at one time or another. Typically, teaching and research are each given a 40% weight and service is given a 20% weight. Teaching is evaluated primarily through student evaluations, but also includes student advising, the development of course material and instructional tools, curriculum development, membership on graduate committees and supervision of theses, and peer evaluations for probationary faculty.

Research

The Department of Geography faculty is active in its discipline and has gained or is progressing towards international and national prominence. The faculty’s areas of specialization are Geospatial Techniques, Environmental Geography, Nature-Society Studies, Regional/Developmental Studies, and Physical Geography. During the review period the faculty produced 4 books, 56 peer-reviewed articles, 17 book chapters, 9 maps, and 35 book reviews, encyclopedia entries, and reports. They also presented 131 papers and 43 invited lectures, and received 59 grants for a total of $4.19 million. The external reviewer reports that “the quality of the faculty is consistently high” and the level of scholarship matches that of peer institutions.
Undergraduate Review

The Department’s undergraduate mission is to prepare students to be able to pursue “fulfilling and rewarding careers” and to be successful in the global economy. They also seek to install a passion for the discipline, prepare students to be global citizens, and develop critical thinking skills. The department strives towards excellent teaching, mentoring, and offering students current methods, theories and technology. The long-term goals for the program are to continually improve the quality of the program, maintain and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the undergraduates curriculum, maintain and enhance computer and information technology capabilities, to engage their most gifted students in faculty research, improve relations and communication with their alumni, and to take the distinctive meteorology track to new heights.

The Department offers six different degree tracks: Geography (B.A. or B.S.), Environmental Geography; Environmental Pre-Law; Geographic Information Science (B.S.), Urban Planning (B.S.); and Meteorology. The degree tracks have a common core of five courses and require at least 30 hours of courses at the 300-level or above. The Department also offers minors in Geography and Meteorology as well as an Undergraduate Certificate in Geographic Information Science. The curriculum serves a variety of programs. Eighty-two percent of the teaching load comes from outside the Department; much of this is from the Department’s general education offerings.

There is a significant overlap in the courses required for the different specializations. The external reviewer writes that “The core tracks of geography and environmental geography are well-designed and well-staffed” and that the meteorology program “is an especially unique and important asset to the University.” He also writes that the programs in Geographic Information Science are “important and vital” and that the Department has depth and expertise in this area. The external reviewer does note some points of concern: the course offerings in Urban Planning are limited and, as discussed elsewhere, the meteorology program is understaffed. The reviewers also met with a few undergraduate students. The students were pleased with the quality of instruction and the variety of course offerings. The students did, however, express concern regarding the staffing of the meteorology program and the layout of the classrooms.

Faculty

The current composition of faculty allows the Department to fulfill its program and mission with respect to the tracks in Geography, Environmental Geography, and the programs in Geographic Information Science.

The Department has identified faculty needs in Meteorology, Urban Geography, and Water Resources. As the only undergraduate Meteorology program in Ohio, it is an attractive and distinctive program and the external reviewer asserts that this program should be strongly supported. However, it is currently being staffed by one Early Retiree, a Group IV faculty member, and the lab is being maintained by a Teaching Assistant. The Department seeks to hire two faculty members to support this area. The
impending retirement of the Department’s Urban Geographer is a potential threat to the Urban Geography track. The external reviewer notes that the course offerings in Urban Geography are limited and that “maintaining this track in the future would require hiring at least one urban geographer, and/or making this track more “interdisciplinary.” The self-report states that a hire in Water Resources would fit into the Department’s existing specializations and “would fill an existing gap in the Department’s curriculum.”

The number of majors varied between 121 and 152 during the review period, and the Department had 143 majors in fall 2006; this is an unusually large number of majors for a Geography department of this size. Most of the majors are recruited after they come to campus; on average, 9 freshman enroll into and 42 students graduate from the program each year. The program has a high first-year retention rate and the average time to graduation is approximately 4.5 years. During the review period the proportion of female majors has ranged from 28% to 41%, and the proportion of historically under-represented from 1.6% to 4.2%. In order to increase the number of students from historically under-represented groups, faculty members have initiated recruiting efforts in Washington, D.C., and Baltimore. There is no official tracking of graduates; the internal review reports that graduates find employment in government or private industry, or go on to graduate school.

The student teaching evaluations indicate that students are pleased with the quality of instruction, and the relatively large number of majors speaks to the overall success of the undergraduate program. The undergraduate students that met with the reviewers felt the faculty was outstanding, although they also expressed concerns regarding the Meteorology program and support for computer services.

Graduate Program Review

The Department of Geography offers the Master’s of Arts degree. The mission of the Department is to prepare students for professional careers and, for students seeking academic careers, to prepare students for entry into a doctoral program. The Department’s long-term goals are to improve the quality of the program; maintain and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the graduate curriculum; maintain and enhance the Department’s computer and information technology capabilities; and maintain and enhance the emphasis on research in the graduate program.

The Department offers a thesis and non-thesis option. Thesis students must defend a thesis proposal after their first year, and non-thesis students must develop a study program that covers three areas that include systemic and technical topic areas and pass a written comprehensive exam. All students are required to take three core courses (Research and Writing, Quantitative Methods, and Geographic Thought) and complete two graduate seminars. Students may design their own course of study or follow the Department’s study programs in Environmental Geographical Information Science or Natural Resources and Planning (thesis only). About 47% of graduate hours are taught to geography students and about 28% to International Studies students. (This does not include credit for teaching the required courses and directing theses for Masters of Environmental Studies students.)
The range of faculty specialties and overall level of scholarly activity are more than sufficient for the existing Master's program.

The Department enrolls and graduates approximately the same number of students per year and typically has a total enrollment of 23 graduate students in a given year. Approximately half the students were female, and there have been a small number of students from historically under-represented groups. The Department has good retention and graduation rates. The external reviewer reports that the applicant pool's GRE scores are "typical of Master's-only programs, and perhaps stronger than most." He also reports that the Department "is doing an excellent job of recruiting students." In order to increase the size of the applicant pool, the Department is establishing connections with undergraduate programs. In order to recruit more graduates from historically under-represented groups, the Department has entered into Memorandums of Understanding with Kenyatta University and Coppin State University. There is some desire to increase the ratio of non-OU to OU graduates in the program. While there is no official tracking of students after they graduate, the self-study reports that students appear to be successful in moving into government or industry positions, or in pursuing further academic work.

The Department offers Teaching Assistantships, Research Assistantships, a 12-month Scalia Lab 'super stipend' and Departmental Scholarships. The external reviewer notes that Ph.D. programs typically offer higher stipends; however, the TAs that spoke with the reviewers felt that the stipends were 'livable'. Outside of the University's TA orientation program there is no Departmental preparation for assuming TA duties, and graduates students felt that the TA loads were unequal; lab duties could take over 25 hours per week while classroom duties could take 12-15 hours per week, and the duties do not rotate. The TAs play an important role in supporting the undergraduate program, and faculty members felt that it would be desirable to recruit more teaching assistants to work in labs or to do grading.

Adequacy of Resources

There were some recurrent concerns regarding resources.

Space: There appears to be inadequate space and the current layout of existing space may not be appropriate for the Department's overall needs. The faculty, undergraduates, and graduates all made comments regarding the existing space. These included that the physical dimensions of some classrooms are not conducive to learning, upper-division classes are limited by classroom space, the Scalia lab is cramped, and computer lab courses are limited by space. Faculty offices are relatively small, and only five faculty members have dedicated laboratory space. Another difficulty is that space is spread across four buildings (Clippinger, Morton, the Ridges, and Porter) making it difficult to utilize space efficiently. For instance, in order to control access, the Morton labs are locked when unattended.

At the same time, it appears that some space could be better utilized, and the Department has given considerable thought as to how to remodel its existing space. As it stands, laboratory and classroom modifications have often been upgraded on a piecemeal basis as funds became available. This piecemeal approach has not contributed
to effective general use of space. The external review provides a good description of current space use and recommends that the Department perform a comprehensive review of the Department’s space needs and to develop a plan for creating flexible spaces that can meet a wide range of needs.

Computer equipment and information technology: Geography is a technology-intensive discipline and it is important for its research and classroom facilities to be up to date. This includes a number of specialized, and often expensive, software programs. While the current status of the Department’s software and hardware is good, the labs tend to be built using one-time money. Funding sources include grants, funding from the technology fee, House Bill money and other opportunities. There needs to be a funded regular schedule for upgrading hardware and software. Faculty felt that the Department needs a full time IT person.

Meteorology program: This is an attractive and distinctive program, and the only undergraduate Meteorology program in the state of Ohio, but it has serious staffing needs. It is currently being staffed by one Early Retiree, a Group IV faculty member, and the lab is being maintained by a Teaching Assistant. The lab space is cramped and limits the number of students that can make use of the facilities.

Budget needs: The Department could make effective use of further funding, especially for summer research for graduate students, field trips for undergraduate classes, travel money, and reduced loads for research. The Department could also use further administrative support for grants and budgets.

Workload: There were a variety of concerns related to work load. First, graduate and undergraduate advising — which is done online — requires a substantial amount of effort. Also, faculty members play an important role in other graduate programs, and more TAs are needed to run the GIS labs and help with grading.

Commendations

The Department is to be commended for:

- A well thought-out and coherent curriculum that supports both the program’s majors and general education. This includes the creation of a regular two-year rotation of courses.
- Collaborations with other programs, especially the Environmental Studies and International Studies programs.
- An increase in scholarly output and increased grant funding.
- Responding to the increasing role of computer and information technology in Geography by combining the Cartography and Geographic Information Science tracks into a single Geographic Information Science track in 2004 and adding an undergraduate certificate program in GIS for non-majors.
- Maintaining a set of up-to-date computer and information technology labs through the use of external grants and one-time funding opportunities.
- An increase in faculty diversity.
- Obtaining a reduction in the number of courses taught, without decreasing the total number of WSCH taught, through thoughtful planning.

Concerns and Recommendations

- Group I faculty. There is a serious need to recruit faculty to support the Department's Meteorology program. This unique program normally attracts about 40 majors and is the only such program in the state of Ohio. Currently the program is run by an Early Retiree, one Group IV faculty member, and the lab is maintained by a Teaching Assistant. It is critical to recruit at least one Group I faculty member in the near future and another in the next two to three years.

- Space issues. The Department is short of space and the current layout makes it difficult to use existing space effectively. There should be a comprehensive review of the Department's space needs.

- Regular computer equipment and software replacements and upgrades. Given the importance of computer and information technology in Geography, it would be appropriate for the Department to be able to replace and upgrade equipment on a regular basis without having to rely on external funding and one-time monies.
7-year evaluation of the Geography Department: 
External reviewer’s report

W. Renwick 
Professor and Chair 
Geography Dept. 
Miami University

Overview and summary of recommendations

The Ohio University Geography Department is effective and efficient in its work. It delivers focused, high-quality programs to a large number of majors, it provides service courses to an even larger number of undergraduates in many areas, operates an excellent Master’s-level graduate program, and plays central roles in the Environmental Science master's program as well as several other graduate degree programs. Levels of scholarly output and external grant funding are high given teaching loads, and service contributions are also substantial. The department and its faculty are to be commended for these achievements.

The greatest near-term opportunities to improve the work of the department are as follows:

1) The Meteorology program needs a full-time tenure-track faculty member immediately, and a second full-time tenure-track position should be added within the next 2-3 years.

2) The efficiency of resource use in its computer-based teaching classrooms should be improved, as part of a comprehensive review of departmental space needs.

3) The university should make a commitment of hard-budgeted, continuing support of vital computer-based teaching resources, to allow regular replacement and upgrades of hardware and software.

Faculty

Demographics

With only two full professors, five associate professors, and four assistant professors this is a young department. Assuming that 2-3 additional junior faculty will be added in the next few years that relative youth will continue for several years. The ranks are a bit thin at the senior level, owing to recent retirements, but faculty currently at the Associate Professor level are productive and making good progress toward promotion. The overall youth of the department is an important asset. However, it should be noted that the two
senior faculty are highly productive scholars and carrying a disproportionate burden of internal service to the department. Salary compression problems are an inevitable consequence this age distribution. This problem appears to be significant in the geography department, and should be addressed. The faculty are quite diverse. Recent searches have been very successful in hiring female and minority faculty members; the department should be commended for this success.

**Overall quality**

The quality of the faculty is consistently high. Everyone is research-active, and publishing in high-quality venues. Faculty in the natural science tradition have been active in seeking external grant funding, with considerable success. The social scientists among the faculty, for whom external funding opportunities are fewer and needs are lower, have nonetheless been active also. The overall rate of publication is equivalent to that in peer institutions, although across the profession expectations for scholarly output continue to rise. The tenured faculty make major service contributions within the university as well as outside.

**Recent hires**

The quality of recent hires appears to be high. They have come from top doctoral programs, and as a group have been productive scholars. The department's policies regarding release time for junior faculty are appropriate and beneficial for retention. The chair is to be commended for his flexibility in accommodating the needs of young families.

**Undergraduate program**

**Strong, focused programs**

Geography is a very broad discipline, including both natural and social sciences and some may argue the humanities as well. Historically geographers were expected to be fluent in the entire breadth of the discipline, and the discipline still maintains a strong tradition of familiarity with a wide range of subjects. However, in an increasingly specialized world there is thus an inevitable tension between breadth and focus in any geography department. The OU department has done an excellent job of building focused strength in a few areas, while maintaining representation in a good portion of the geographic spectrum.

The department offers undergraduate major tracks in Geography, Environmental Geography, Meteorology, Geographic Information Science, Urban Planning and Environmental Pre-law. There is considerable overlap in the courses needed for these tracks, making possible what appears to be a relatively long list of specializations but which in reality is relatively concentrated. One track, Urban Planning, is significantly limited in its offerings. The core faculty member in this track is on early retirement. Maintaining this track in the future would require hiring at least one urban geographer,
and/or making this track more interdisciplinary and thus include courses in other departments.

Overall, the number of majors is very high for a department of this size. Typically, geography programs in the United States are enrollment rich and major poor. The OU department is exceptional, with large numbers of majors for a geography program. They accomplish this by focusing in areas that are in high demand, with clear professional employment outcomes.

The department's two core tracks: geography and environmental geography are well-designed and well-staffed. They cover the discipline well but allow for in-depth training; they include a significant amount of basic methodological material such as statistics and GIS to ensure that students are well-grounded in these areas. Clearly, with ~40 majors in each, the department is doing a good job in these core areas.

The meteorology program is an especially unique and important asset to the University. Meteorology is "sexy": the subject matter is real, interesting, and exciting, and many students are naturally drawn to it. But the OU program is also very rigorous, with significant requirements in mathematics and physics. The meteorology program is the sort of thing that the Admissions office can feature prominently on its web page and other advertising to attract high-ability students to OU. As pointed out in the self study it is the only undergraduate meteorology program in the state. It should be strongly supported.

The department's programs in GIScience, including the certificate program, are similarly important and vital. GIScience has been an area of tremendous job growth for the last two decades, and there is no sign that that growth will let up any time soon. It is thus a very attractive area for undergraduates, regardless of whether they expect to do graduate work before entering the job market. With five faculty members teaching key courses in this program the department has considerable depth of expertise. Enrollments in these courses are large, and demand is growing from outside of geography as well as from within. The department has rightly devoted much of its energy and resources in this area, and should continue to do so.

I am also impressed to see the Environmental Pre-Law program. It offers an area of focus for pre-law students with environmental interests, and even though it has relatively few students enrolled it can be maintained at low cost given the department's strengths in environmental geography.

Finally, based on mean scores from the standard evaluation form, the quality of teaching in the department is excellent. Although I did not see data on averages across the College of Arts & Sciences, departmental mean scores of 4.2 to 4.4 in undergraduate classes would seem to be very impressive.

**Contributions to other programs**
As is typical for geography departments, there are close ties to other programs in the University. The department has large enrollments in introductory-level general education classes, and also strong links to other programs at the upper division level including such programs as Women’s Studies and African Studies. These links strengthen both Geography and the interdisciplinary programs, and should be encouraged.

Course scheduling and advising

I am impressed with the department’s course scheduling plan, in which the timing of offerings of courses are clearly and (apparently) efficiently laid out. The plan appears to work very well, providing students and advisors clear guidance for planning curricula while still allowing needed flexibility. I am especially impressed with the work of the Chair of the Undergraduate Committee, who devotes a substantial amount of time to coordinating the advising process as well as taking on a significant advising load. It is common for someone bearing an added service load such as this to have some compensatory reduction in teaching assignments.

Graduate program

Curriculum

The department is mindful of the need to identify a few foci within which it can establish strength, and of the particular importance of such foci in a graduate program. The concentrations in Environmental GISci and Natural Resources & Planning are appropriate and valuable; it may be useful to define curricula for concentrations in selected other areas of strength defined by departmental areas of research strength. Graduation rates are good.

Quality of students

The department is doing an excellent job of recruiting students. Geography is a relatively small discipline without large numbers of undergraduate majors in the United States, and so the potential pool of applicants is relatively small. An additional challenge faced by OU and other Masters-only programs is that in competing for students they must compete with PhD-granting institutions that typically offer higher stipends and have greater resources. The OU department has found an effective strategy for dealing with this situation, and they are attracting a strong if small applicant pool. Based on data on GRE scores the OU program is attracting an applicant pool that is typical of Masters-only programs, and perhaps stronger than most. One would always like to see a larger applicant pool and they are working in this direction, but what they have done so far is important and they are to be commended. Given the strength in African Studies at OU it may be possible to increase diversity by establishing recruiting links with African undergraduate universities.

Contributions to other graduate programs
Geography has natural ties to environmental studies, and the OU programs draw much of their strength from these links. The addition of a population of Environmental Studies students to 3/5 classes and graduate classes makes a greater range of offerings at this level than would otherwise be possible. In addition to offering courses to graduate students in Geography, Environmental Studies, and other programs, OU Geographers are highly active in these programs as advisors and committee members.

Facilities and funding

Space

Computer labs

The department has several rooms of varying sized devoted to computer-based instruction and research. These include one large (~30-seat) classroom on the 1st floor of Clippinger, one smaller room in the Center for Cartography, also on the 1st floor of Clippinger, the Scalia Laboratory on the 4th floor of Clippinger, and two classrooms in Morton Hall: one on the round floor devoted to remote sensing and one on the 4th floor focused on cartography. In addition, there is a small room available for student use for word processing and similar uses.

The department offers two sections of GEO 268 each quarter. This 4-credit class requires both classroom instruction and substantial individual student work time in the lab each week, as class exercises require use of specialized software installed in the lab and cannot be completed on individually-owned computers. At these levels of use a single 30-seat classroom (Clippinger 105) is stretched beyond its limits. In addition to this class, occasional lab sections of Geo 101 and other classes may also use this lab. The department clearly has need for added computer classroom space in Clippinger. In addition to GEO268, Geo 271, Geo 4/578, various meteorology classes, laboratory sections of introductory classes that need computer labs both for classroom instruction and independent work using specialized software that students would not normally have installed on their own computers.

In contrast to Clippinger 105, the two computer classrooms in Morton Hall appear to be used much less intensively. Morton 114, the Remote Sensing teaching laboratory, is used for GEOG 4/566 which is taught (according to Table 1 of the self study) twice every other year, or an average of once every three quarters. Morton 419, the cartography teaching lab, would presumably be used for GEO 3/560 and 3/561, which together constitute 2.5 offerings per year. Because these rooms are in a building removed from core departmental activities they are locked when not in use, and perhaps less likely to be used for independent student work when classes are not in session. The various classes that use these rooms are taught with different arrangement of workstations, chairs, and tables and this provides some justification for multiple classrooms, but otherwise it appears that there is an opportunity to improve the efficiency of computer classroom use in Morton Hall.
Other classrooms

The 30-50-seat classrooms currently available in Clippinger Hall are woefully inadequate. They are crowded, inflexible, awkwardly proportioned (especially 119) and not configured for discussion-oriented classes. Remodeling these rooms should be considered as part of any major reconfiguration of space in Clippinger.

A comprehensive approach to space problems

It appears that many of the space needs of the department have been addressed on a piecemeal basis. A new facility is needed, money is found to pay for it (often from external sources), and a room is equipped. The result is a variety of specialized spaces that meet important needs, but not always with the greatest efficiency. At the same time some rooms continue to be used for the same purposes to which they were put years ago, without adequate accommodation for changing class sizes or teaching styles. The department should consider taking a more comprehensive look at its space needs, and develop a plan for creating flexible spaces that can meet a wide range of needs. Once such a plan is created, funds and perhaps rooms should be allocated to bring it to fruition.

Computer equipment

Equipment inventory

The department has an excellent inventory of computer hardware. With three dedicated teaching labs (Clippinger 105; Morton 114 and 419) each equipped with 10-30 computers, plus smaller lab/classrooms (Clippinger 104, Clippinger 402, Clippinger 116) with 5-10+ machines each and additional computer-based research labs (Morton 118 and 426), the department is exceptionally well-endowed with computer resources. Some of these labs have significant specialized hardware, including dedicated servers and large, high-resolution monitors appropriate to the particular needs of geographic databases, analyses and visualization.

To continue to offer training in state-of-the-art methods, the department must keep this equipment inventory up to date. In an era of rapid technological change, this means replacing equipment well before it ceases to be fully functional. Rapid evolution of software, databases, and hardware require frequent replacement of hardware as well as regular software updates. For computers this means replacement as frequent as once every two years, or every three years at most. Typically monitors can be replaced less often.

It is common to expect a desktop computer to last ~5 years, so replacement after 2 or 3 years may seem excessive. However, in an institution such as Ohio University there are many users that have less intensive computer needs and can work very easily with 3-6-year-old computers. Thus when new computers are purchased the 2- or 3-year-old machines can be redistributed to other users, many of which will be outside of the
Geography Department. This is a system that has been in place for several years at Miami University and could be very effective and efficient at Ohio University as well. Given the substantial number of computers in the department, replacing one third to half of the inventory each year would be very expensive.

The complement of a recommendation for frequent replacement of essential equipment is a recognition that that equipment must be intensively used before it depreciates. To that end, the department should seek to find ways to increase the efficiency of its use of teaching computer labs. I recognize that different instructors and different courses demand different pedagogical styles and related classroom resources. However, the department should seek to find new and creative ways to accommodate these diverse needs in more efficient ways. The best example of an opportunity to improve efficiency of computer/classroom use is in the two classrooms in Morton Hall: 114 and 419. Neither of these is particularly intensively used; at the same time the department seeks to add a GIS teaching facility in Clippinger. If they are able to find ways to increase the efficiency of use of computer classrooms this could both make space available for other purposes. In addition, by reducing the inventory of computers it would reduce the continuing costs of replacing computers on a regular basis.

Software resources

Specialized GIS and remote sensing software is absolutely essential to an effective educational program in these important fields. The ArcGIS suite of programs, plus remote sensing/GIS software such as Erdas Imagine, E-Cognition, and IDRISI, are industry-standards without which instruction in GIS and remote sensing is of little value to students. Some of these packages are available at very large educational discounts while others, unfortunately, remain quite costly even to universities. The geography department has done an excellent job of acquiring this software, largely through one-time using soft money, with upgrades and/or annual license fees either not included in original grants or paid for only a short time period.

Hardware and software maintenance

Given the high quality, large enrollments, and vitality of the department's Geographic Information Science programs I am surprised to find that there is no regular, continuing commitment from the University to support and maintain departmental computer hardware and software. The department's computer labs are no less central to its offerings than are laboratory facilities in biology or chemistry. Yet, perhaps because of their relative novelty in the discipline, there is no established means for funding hardware replacement and software licenses. These costs are being covered from soft-money sources such as House Bill allocations and external grants. Indeed, at least one faculty member has used a substantial amount of research challenge money for purchase and maintenance of instructional software! This is an unacceptable situation that should be remedied with a substantial, continuing, hard-budgeted allocation for regular computer replacement and software upgrades/license fees.
December 29, 2008

University Curriculum Committee
Ohio University

The Department of Geography has received the final version of the internal and outside reviewers’ report of the 2000-2006 Seven-Year Departmental Review. This letter shall serve as the Department’s official response to that report.

The Department agrees with and accepts the report’s commendations of the program, including a coherent curriculum, strong interdisciplinary collaboration, a strong and diverse faculty, a significant increase in scholarly and creative activities and grand funding, and a strong and vibrant Geographic Information Science curriculum.

Similarly, the Department agrees with the primary concerns and recommendations expressed by the reviewers: 1) the need to recruit Group I faculty to support and improve the Department’s meteorology program; 2) the need for a comprehensive review of the Department’s space needs. It should be noted, however, that since the reviewers’ visit the Department has indeed conducted such a comprehensive review, which has resulted in a plan to significantly reconfigure our existing space in Clippinger Laboratories. We are currently in the process of securing funding for this reconfiguration; 3) the need to secure budgetary funding for regular computer hardware and software replacements and upgrades instead of having to rely solely on external funding and one-time monies.

Overall, then, the Department accepts and agrees with the findings of the internal and external reviewers and we thank the reviewers for their fair assessment and consideration.

With very best regards,

[Signature]

Timothy G. Anderson
Associate Professor and Chair
Date: August 11, 2009

To: Unit Review Committee

From: Benjamin Ogles, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
      Thomas Scanlan, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Re: College Response to 7-Year Review of Geography

The College of Arts and Sciences would like to thank the Program Review Committee for its thoughtful review of the Department of Geography. We agree with your finding that the “Department is fundamentally sound and both the graduate and undergraduate programs are viable.”

We are extremely pleased with the work that Geography faculty have undertaken during the review period. In addition to providing a high-quality undergraduate experience to a large number of majors, the department also has offered a host of extremely successful general education courses that have given thousands of students a working acquaintance with a discipline that plays an important role in the College’s ongoing effort to deliver its Liberal Arts curriculum to as wide an audience as possible. At the graduate level, the Geography faculty have managed to find a niche in a difficult market. As Dr. Renwick, the external reviewer, notes, departments that offer Masters-only programs must compete with better-resourced PhD.-granting departments that are able to offer their students higher stipends and a broader range of academic experiences. Our Geography faculty are thus rightly commended for successfully competing within a relatively small pool of potential students.

Both the external reviewer and the internal review team note three concerns. We would like to address these concerns in the order in which they are listed in both of these reports. First, both reports remark on the critical lack of a Group I faculty member in the Meteorology program. We are happy to report that a new Group I faculty member in Meteorology, Dr. Ryan Fogt, will join the Geography Department in September of this year.

The next area of concern for the reviewers was the instructional space available to the department. As noted, the department needs additional computer-classroom space. Moreover, as Dr. Renwick puts it, “the 30-50-seat classrooms currently available in Clippinger Hall are woefully
Inadequate." In his response to the report, the Department Chair, Dr. Timothy Anderson, indicates that the Department has recently conducted the comprehensive review that the report suggested. It should also be noted that the Geography Department has emerged in recent University planning and space-allocation studies as in need of additional instructional space. Given the demands placed on Clippinger Hall by its other occupants, it is quite likely that a comprehensive solution to the Geography space shortage will involve relocating Geography to another building, such as the currently off-line President Street Academic Center. Our point in mentioning this potential solution is simply to point out that the implementation of a comprehensive review is likely to take a good deal of time and money. The College is committed to giving all of its departments and programs the best possible instructional space, but sometimes the ideal solutions take longer than we would like.

The third concern voiced by the reviewers was the reliance on one-time monies to fund computer and software replacements and upgrades. While we recognize that these technological investments are becoming more important to the discipline (and pedagogy) of Geography with each passing year, the College is simply not in a position to commit base budget for this purpose at this time. In the most recent round of cuts, no academic unit on the Operating Budget saw an increase in its base allocation, and we are not likely to see any increases in the foreseeable future. Moreover, we are concerned that our ability to pay for these types of upgrades with one-time money will be severely curtailed in the near future. For this fiscal year, the College absorbed more of the cuts centrally so as not to compromise the core academic mission of the academic departments. This move by our office was necessary but regrettable, as it will inevitably mean that we have even less one-time money to spend on important academic investments such as computer equipment and software.

In closing, let us say that we largely agree with the findings and recommendations of the report. We are thus happy to be able to report that one of the concerns has been addressed fully already. Unfortunately, given the current economic climate, it is unlikely that the College's resource picture will improve in the near future. And without increased resources, we are unlikely to make significant progress on the two other areas of concern identified by the reviewers. The College nonetheless remains committed to a vibrant and fully equipped Department of Geography within the context of a very tight budget.

Thank you again for your thoughtful and thorough review. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us.
Seven-year review of the Department of Geography:
Report by the curriculum committee of Graduate Council

The department of Geography, which offers an MA degree, is characterized by the outside evaluator as being excellent. The quality of its faculty is high and the amount of scholarship produced is in accordance with that of peer institutions. The reviewer notes the presence of two foci in the program: environmental BIScI and Natural Resources & Planning. The department has been active in interdisciplinary work, with its faculty members directing a substantial number of theses in departments like Environmental Studies and International Studies.

The various evaluators of the department did raise some concerns, however, which need to be addressed. These include:

1) a comprehensive review of departmental space is required to improve the efficiency of its computer-based teaching classrooms.

2) increased funding is required to allow regular replacement and upgrades of hardware and software in the computer-based teaching resources. Graduate Council acknowledges the argument by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences that considering the current budget climate at the university, the College is not in a position to commit base budget for this purpose at this time. Nevertheless, the outside evaluator made the following cogent arguments: “When new computers are purchased the 2- or 3-year-old machines can be redistributed to other users, many of which will be outside of the Geography Department. This is a system that has been in place for several years at Miami University and could be very effective and efficient at Ohio University.” He further states: “If the department is able to find ways to increase the efficiency of use of computer classrooms this could both make space available for other purposes. In addition, by reducing the inventory of computers it would reduce the continuing costs of replacing computers on a regular basis.”

3) alleviation of the “salary compression problem.”

4) curricula in selected areas besides the two foci mentioned above should be defined. These would be based upon current faculty members’ areas of research.

Despite these concerns, Graduate Council accepts the seven-year review.
Whereas, Violet Patton, BSED ’38, is deeply appreciative of the education she received at Ohio University, and

Whereas, Miss Patton was an active and committed educator and holds Ohio University and the region of Southern Ohio in high regard, and

Whereas, Miss Patton desires to honor her parents, Gladys W. and David H. Patton, both of whom attended Ohio University and were selfless and dedicated educators, and

Whereas, Miss Patton’s generous support will greatly enhance the Ohio University College of Education and the ability of the college to provide quality instruction to students.

Therefore, be it resolved that the College of Education shall be named the Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education and Human Services.
March 23, 2010

To: Roderick J. McDavis, President
From: Pam Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost
Re: Renaming of College of Education

I concur with the recommendation received from Dean Renée Middleton and the faculty and staff of the College of Education that the college be renamed the Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education and Human Services. If approved by the Board of Trustees, the change would become effective July 1, 2010.

The proposed name change reflects two important developments in the life of the college. The first acknowledges the tremendous generosity of Violet Patton, BSED ’38. Miss Patton has helped to ensure the continuing excellence of the college through a generous donation made in honor of her parents, Gladys W. and David H. Patton, both of whom attended Ohio University and were selfless and dedicated educators who made a difference in the lives of many students.

The second development is the decision to enlarge the academic scope of the college by bringing in new academic programs. The College of Education is known for its excellence and efficacy in training professionals who provide important human services through teaching, leadership development, and counseling. The programs becoming part of the college will allow for increased opportunities for students to study physical, social, and community development. The expansion of the college also will permit it to become even more entrepreneurial in its approach to serving the state of Ohio and meeting the needs of local communities.

The Early Childhood Program in Health and Human Services will be united with the Early Childhood Program in the Department of Teacher Education in the College of Education. The Child Development Center also will become part of the College of Education. Bringing these entities together will strengthen the work that they already do together and will allow for the development of greater opportunities for collaboration in the future.

Physical Education, Recreation Studies, and Coaching Education will join the College of Education as a separate department - the Department of Recreation and Sports Pedagogy. These units will bring to the college new opportunities to offer a broad range of education programs for children, adolescents, and adults of all ages.

Restaurant, Hotel, and Tourism; Retail Merchandising; and Family and Consumer Sciences Education will also become part of the College of Education. The faculty in these programs are known for developing innovative hands-on-learning experiences and for their exceptional commitment to their students. They will bring expertise and energy that will fuel the expanded mission of the college and allow it to encompass the education of consumers and their communities.

It is appropriate that the name of the college be changed to reflect its refocused mission and the generosity of its benefactress, Violet Patton.
WHEREAS, The Academic & Research Center will welcome students, faculty, staff, alumni and visitors to learn and discover in the 21st Century, and

WHEREAS, The facility will allow for the exploration and advancement of medicine and clinical treatments, science, engineering and technology, and

WHEREAS, Partnerships between Ohio University’s Fritz J. and Dolores H. Russ College of Engineering and Technology and College of Osteopathic Medicine will allow researchers to meet and discuss projects, which, in turn, may inspire new projects, and

WHEREAS, The partnerships established by this facility will help advance the field of bioengineering and will create opportunities for Ohio University students, and

WHEREAS, The Osteopathic Heritage Foundations and Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey's generous support for the creation of this facility will provide this integrated learning experience.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the facility shall be named the Osteopathic Heritage Foundations and Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey Academic & Research Center; Furthermore, the West Green Entrance and the Main Entrance freestanding name bearing wall shall bear the name Osteopathic Heritage Foundations and Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey Academic & Research Center; and the brick wall of the Main Entrance portico shall bear the name Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey and Osteopathic Heritage Foundations Academic & Research Center.
TO: President Roderick McDavis  
   Executive Vice President and Provost Pamela Benoit

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

SUBJECT: Academic & Research Center

DATE: March 24, 2010

The new Academic & Research Center (ARC) is a research and teaching facility shared by the Russ College of Engineering and Technology and the College of Osteopathic Medicine. It does not meet the definition of a Board of Trustees-approved center as defined by university policy 01-015, “Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes,” and therefore is exempt from the review process outlined in that policy. I fully support the resolution that the ARC facility shall be named The Osteopathic Heritage Foundations and Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey Academic & Research Center; the Irvine entrance shall be named The Osteopathic Heritage Foundations Academic & Research Center and the Stocker entrance shall be named the Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey Academic & Research Center.

cc: Tom Davis, Secretary, Board of Trustees  
   Dennis Irwin, Dean, Russ College of Engineering and Technology  
   John Brose, Dean, College of Osteopathic Medicine
WHEREAS, The Osteopathic Heritage Foundations and Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey Academic & Research Center will welcome students, faculty, staff, alumni and visitors to learn and discover in the 21st Century, and

WHEREAS, The facility will allow for the exploration and advancement of medicine and clinical treatments, science, engineering and technology, and

WHEREAS, Partnerships between Ohio University’s Fritz J. and Dolores H. Russ College of Engineering and Technology and College of Osteopathic Medicine will allow researchers to meet and discuss projects, which, in turn, may inspire new projects, and

WHEREAS, The partnerships established by this facility will help advance the field of bioengineering and will create opportunities for Ohio University students, and

WHEREAS, The generous support of many donors for spaces and areas within the Osteopathic Heritage Foundations/Charles R. and Marilyn Y. Stuckey Academic & Research Center will provide this integrated learning experience,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that spaces within this facility shall be named accordingly:
Thomas and Barbara Anderson Medical Research Laboratory;
Brentwood Foundation Medical Research Suite;
Cleveland Clinic Medical Research Laboratory;
Dayton District Academy of Osteopathic Medicine Medical Research Laboratory;
Ohio Osteopathic Foundation Medical Research Laboratory;
Sybert Family Medical Research Laboratory;
Warren General Hospital Medical Research Laboratory;
John Koncelik, D.O., Collaborative Research Laboratory;
“A Warm Welcome” from the Stanley Family;
John Knable, D.O., Family Medical Conference Room;
Ohio University-College of Osteopathic Medicine Society of Alumni and Friends Café
Summa Western Reserve Hospital/Cuyahoga Falls General Hospital Medical Study Alcove;
Osteopathic Heritage Foundations Medical Research Suites;
Leonard D. Kohn, M.D., Medical Research Suite, In honor of the James O. Watson, D.O.
Diabetes Research Chair, Endowed by the Osteopathic Heritage Foundations;
Gutheil Family Medical Conference Room;
Robert Snow, D.O., Family Support Laboratory;
Karen T. Woo, D.O., Support Laboratory;
Foglietti Family Medical Instrumentation Laboratory;
John S. Urse, D.O., FACOS, Family Medical Conference Room;
Leonard and Marie Calabrese Family Medical Study Alcove;
Brent and Kathy Classen Family Medical Study Alcove;
The Emlich Family Medical Study Alcove;
Drs. George and Abigail Faerber Family Medical Study Alcove;
The Legend Group Medical Study Alcove;
Drs. Mehlman and Pina Family Medical Study Alcove;
The Ohio University-College of Osteopathic Medicine Alumni Society Medical Study
Alcove;
Georgenna Riley, D.O., and Patriquin Family Medical Study Alcove;
Edwin J. Taylor Jr. Reading Room;
Fritz J. and Dolores H. Russ Learning Studio
Fritz J. and Dolores H. Russ College of Engineering and Technology Board of Visitors
Learning Studio;
Paul and Barbara Batchelder Project Team Room;
Srinath and Kathryn Balakrishnan Project Team Room;
Bill and Janet Englefield Project Team Room;
Dickerson Family Project Team Room;
Warren K. Brown Study Alcove
WHEREAS, Cardinal Health, Inc. wishes to further its charitable and educational vision for Ohio University’s College of Business, and

WHEREAS, Cardinal Health wishes to honor their founder Robert D. Walter, ’67, ’97, by establishing the Robert D. Walter Center for Strategic Leadership, and

WHEREAS, The mission of the Center will be to educate and provide leadership development opportunities designed to create leaders who can make an immediate difference to their organizations, and

WHEREAS, The center will initially focus on a select leadership program to develop strategic leadership capabilities of high-potential College of Business students, and

WHEREAS, A certificate program will be developed to enhance strategic leadership skills for College of Business students and students from around the University, and

WHEREAS, The Center will be established to advance understanding of strategic leadership, and

WHEREAS, Cardinal Health Inc.’s generous support will greatly enhance the College of Business and the ability of the College to provide quality instruction to students.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the College of Business shall house the Robert D. Walter Center for Strategic Leadership.
TO: President Roderick McDavis  
   Executive Vice President and Provost Pamela Benoit

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

SUBJECT: Robert D. Walter Center for Strategic Leadership

DATE: March 24, 2010

The Robert D. Walter Center for Strategic Leadership does not meet the definition of a Board of Trustees-approved center as defined by university policy 01-015, "Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes," and therefore is exempt from the review process outlined in that policy. I fully support the resolution that the College of Business shall house the Robert D. Walter Center for Strategic Leadership to develop the leadership capabilities of high-potential business students.

cc: Tom Davis, Secretary, Board of Trustees  
   Hugh Sherman, Dean, College of Business
The Violet L. Patton Center for Arts Education

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3158

WHEREAS, Violet Patton, BSED ’38 is deeply appreciative of the education she received at Ohio University, and

WHEREAS, Miss Patton was an active and committed educator and holds Ohio University and the region of Southern Ohio in high regard, and

WHEREAS, Miss Patton desires the creation of a community arts education center to provide arts experiences and education for young artists in the region and will create opportunities for Ohio University students to work with arts programs in local schools, and

WHEREAS, Miss Patton’s generous support will greatly enhance arts education and the ability of Ohio University to provide quality arts education instruction to students and young artists in the region.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Arts Education Center shall be named The Violet L. Patton Center for Arts Education.
The Violet L. Patton Center for Arts Education does not meet the definition of a Board of Trustees-approved center as defined by university policy 01-015, “Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes,” and therefore is exempt from the review process outlined in that policy. I fully support the resolution that the Arts Education Center shall be named the Violet L. Patton Center for Arts Education, so that Ohio University may provide quality arts education instruction to students and young artists in the region.

cc: Tom Davis, Secretary, Board of Trustees
    Renée Middleton, Dean, College of Education
    Charles McWeeny, Dean, College of Fine Arts
RUSS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY
NAME CHANGE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3163

WHEREAS, the department chair and faculty of the Department of Industrial Technology have proposed a name change to the Department of Engineering Technology and Management, and

WHEREAS, changing the name of the department to Engineering Technology and Management more accurately describes the curriculum of the department’s academic program and better describes the skill set and employment opportunities of its graduates and alumni, and

WHEREAS, the name change has the support of the faculty, alumni, and accreditation body, and

WHEREAS, the name change will best represent the program and has excellent name recognition for recruiting, retention and graduate placement and advancement,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees of Ohio University hereby approves changing the name of the department from Industrial Technology to Engineering Technology and Management.
This memorandum is written to express my support for a change in the name of the Department of Industrial Technology within the Russ College of Engineering and Technology to the **Department of Engineering Technology and Management**.

The department has made a compelling case to add the terms “engineering” and “management” to the title of the department. Changing the name of the department to Engineering Technology and Management more accurately describes the curriculum of the department’s academic program and better describes the skill set of its graduates and the employment history of its alumni. The department has involved its faculty, alumni, employers of its graduates and its accreditation body in this decision and all of these groups agree that the name change better describes the faculty research/scholarship interests, curriculum of the academic program offered through the department and will benefit in recruiting, retention and employment placement of its students and graduates.

I am therefore pleased to provide my full support for this suggested name change.
PROPOSAL FOR CHANGES IN PROGRAM

_XX_ Undergraduate  _Masters  _Ph.D.  _Certificate

Title of Program: Industrial Technology
Date of Submission: February 23, 2010

Brief Summary of Proposed Changes and Rationale (Attach additional information if needed)

This proposal includes four requests:
1. Change the name of the department to Engineering Technology and Management.
2. Change the name of the program to Engineering Technology and Management.
3. Change the name of the degree to a B.S in Engineering Technology and Management.
4. Change the prefix of all IT classes to ETM.

Proposal Summary: The Department of Industrial Technology has been discussing changing the department and degree name for over a decade. Faculty, Industrial Advisory Board, alumni and employers have recommended many alternatives over the years but continue to agree that two words best represent the curriculum, the graduates skill set and alumni employment history. "Engineering" and "management" describe the types of careers most graduates pursue. We have surveyed alumni to seek agreement on the specific name to be proposed and they agree with faculty and the advisory board that "Engineering Technology and Management" (ETM) best describe the program and has excellent name recognition for recruiting, retention and graduate placement and advancement.

Please see the attached proposal as well as the letters of support for this change.

Signatures:

Dr. Todd Myers 125 Stocker Center 593-1921 mverst2@ohio.edu

Dr. Pete Klein 125 Stocker Center 593-1456 klein@ohio.edu

Dr. Darin Ridgway 167B Stocker Center 593-1504 ridgway@ohio.edu

Approved by:

University Curriculum Council Program Chair

University Curriculum Council Chair
Brief Rational:
Industrial Technology (IT) as a major has been in place at OU since the 1950’s. For decades the curriculum has continuously changed to meet the needs of business and industry. During this same period, the emphasis of IT has evolved from purely technical knowledge to include management skills as well. The departments accrediting body, the Association of Technology, Management, and Applied Engineering (ATMAE), requires that 10% – 20% of the IT curriculum be business/management content. Our program includes courses in business/management as well as a business component in most technical classes. For example IT363 Quality Assurance and Metrology includes a large component of quality management. Another example is our capstone series IT 452/462 which focuses on both manufacturing engineering issues as well as operations management issues. In fact the College of Business accepts IT 452 in place of their Operations Management course for the minor in Business Administration. All IT majors have been required to complete a business minor since 1995. The primary purpose for this name change proposal is for the department and program to have a name that clearly reflects both a technical and management focused program. This change is necessary for recruiting students, placement of our graduates, and career advancement of our alumni. Surveys continue to indicate that most of our alumni have job titles as engineers and managers. Nearly half of the graduates have engineering job titles and over 30% have management titles. Name recognition is critical for recruiting as well as employment and the proposed name, Engineering Technology and Management (ETM), clearly describes the program as well as the graduates skill set.

The IT seniors rarely find positions posted for Industrial Technology majors; however they typically apply for positions posted for operations management, mechanical engineers, sales engineers, manufacturing engineers, quality engineers, industrial engineers, and others. Often the employer finds the IT experiences fits their needs well and hire our graduates. Career services have done an excellent job alerting companies about the IT major when they are seeking engineering and business students. Historically the IT program has few direct entry freshmen (less than 10 out of over 170 majors currently). About 45% transfer to IT from within the Russ College of Engineering and Technology; many of these enter as undecided engineering majors. The remainder transfer to IT from other colleges within OU. Our department continues to be critical for retention but has added little to the growth of the university. We believe ETM will be a valuable growth recruiting tool as both engineering technology and management have very high name recognition.

Surveys of alumni as well as our Industrial Advisory Board support this name change. Surveys of ATMAE accredited baccalaureate degree programs indicated this change aligns well with changes in the discipline as well. Additionally, the acronym IT now typically refers to information technology in business and industry.

The following information will more completely explain the rational for changing the department name as well as the degree awarded which will be a BS in ETM.
VENN Diagram — NOTE* There are no changes from the current Industrial Technology curriculum!

**Engineering Technology and Management**

![Diagram](image)

**Industrial Technology Defined:**
The Association of Technology, Management and Applied Engineering defines the term Industrial Technology as a field of study designed to prepare technical and/or technical management-oriented professionals for employment in business, industry, education, and government.

Accredited degree programs and graduates of these programs will typically be involved with the:

a. application of theories, concepts, and principles found in the humanities and the social and behavioral sciences including a thorough grounding in communication skills.

b. understanding of the theories and the ability to apply the principles and concepts of mathematics and science and the application of computer fundamentals.

c. application of concepts derived from, and current skill developed in a variety of technical, engineering technology, technical management, and related disciplines.

d. completion of a field of specialization, for example, graphics, construction, safety, manufacturing, automation, electronics, design, transportation, distribution or computer aided design (CAD).
The Departments Faculty:
The department has 8 group I faculty members with a total of 95 years of relevant work experience prior to becoming faculty members. Most of this experience is in the areas of engineering as well as the management of operations including manufacturing / production, materials purchasing, warehousing, logistics, quality assurance, etc. The blend of engineering and management experience of the faculty has created a unique technology program in which students are exposed to both perspectives. Engineers are often educated to answer the question: Can it be done? This requires applying the theories presented in math and physical science courses to the solving of design problems. Some engineers are also educated to answer the question: How can it be done? This is also part of technology programs as well as traditional engineering curriculum. Our students are prepared to answer the questions: Why should it be done? What is the business case for doing it? What is the payback? What is the impact on people, the environment, profits, etc? This blend of engineering, technology and management perspective is unique to our program and Engineering Technology and Management is an excellent descriptor for this uniqueness. An additional note: The IT department and faculty teach service classes for Mechanical, Civil and Industrial Systems engineering majors.

Faculty Preparation:
Three faculty members have taught Operations Management for the College of Business at Ohio University including undergraduate, graduate, MBA, Executive MBA and international MBA levels. These classes were taught a total of 20 times by IT faculty. Two faculty members have earned MBA's. Two faculty members have at least one engineering degree and six faculty members have at least one technology degree.

History:
1956 – 1st B.S. in Industrial Technology degree granted
1978 – BSIT accredited by the National Association of Industrial Technology (NAIT). OU was the 9th program accredited and has been fully accredited ever since.
1979 – The departments of Engineering Graphics and Industrial Technology merged and maintained the name Industrial Technology.
1995 – The IT department at OU became the first program in the country to require a business minor.
2009 – NAIT changed its name to the Association of Technology, Management and Applied Engineering (ATMAE) to better reflect its membership and have improved name recognition.

Alumni Information:
The department surveys IT graduates each year as part of the program assessment. One question asks for the graduates starting job title. This year the survey included alumni that graduated 1, 3 and 6 years ago. The results that follow indicate that alumni job titles align with the proposed name change.

46% of the alumni have a job title of engineer. The specific type of engineer varies. Manufacturing engineer is the most common while other types include project/process engineer, mechanical systems engineer, applications engineer and quality engineer.
32% of the alumni have job titles of manager including: manufacturing manager, project manager, quality manager and sales manager.

14% of the alumni have very diverse job titles which may include technical and business content but were neither engineering nor management by title. These included: vehicle quality specialist and quality assurance technician.

7% alumni are graduate students pursuing MBA's which is the most common graduate degree for the IT alumni.

Note* 21% of the above alumni completed graduate degrees. 14% were MBA's, 3% were engineering management and 3% were environmental science and management.

Alumni Name Change Survey Results:
The department surveys graduates each year as part of the program assessment. There were two questions related to name change proposal specifically. Responses to these questions from alumni that graduated 1, 3 and 6 years ago are presented below.

1. Should the department consider a name change for the degree?
   86% replied yes
2. If yes, select your desired choice.
   Only two choices had a positive response.
   84% recommended Engineering Technology and Management
   16% recommended Applied Engineering Technology

Industrial Advisory Board:
The IT department has a fourteen member Industrial Advisory Board which meets annually to discuss curriculum, program highlights, etc. The board includes ten IT alumni and represents manufacturing, distribution/logistics management, engineering, sales engineering, information technology and development engineering. The department and degree name, Industrial Technology, has been discussed at every meeting for over 20 years. The name has been a long term problem for seniors as well as alumni when they are seeking employment or making career changes. It does not have name recognition and does not appropriately describe the curriculum content completed by the alumni. The Board has also been concerned about the lack of freshman recruiting because of poor name recognition. When the accrediting organization began serious discussion about changing its name, the Advisory Board decided to push a department and degree name change as well. Letters of support were requested from several Board members and these are included in the attachments.

Accrediting Organization Name Change:
The National Association of Industrial Technology (NAIT) has been the accreditation organization for IT programs since 1974. The name of this organization changed in 2009 to more correctly describe its purpose and its membership. Although IT programs have required a blend of technical content with management/business content for decades, the name Industrial Technology did not reflect this content. After many years of meetings, surveys and discussions the organization agreed on a name which truly does describe its membership. The new name is
the Association of Technology, Management and Applied Engineering (ATMAE). The ATMAE accreditation is recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation also known as CHEA.

Accreditation Requirements:
According to the 2009 Accreditation Handbook which describes the requirements for accreditation as an ATMAE program, 20 – 30% of the curriculum content must be technical and 10 – 20% of the curriculum must be management content. The technical content is further described as computer aided design (CAD), computer science/technology, materials science, electronics, manufacturing processes, etc. The management content includes quality management, production planning, supervision, accounting, finance, safety, facilities, marketing, law, materials management including purchasing, inventory control, logistics, etc. The IT program at OU was re-accredited in November 2009 for a five year period.

ATMAE Accredited Baccalaureate Program Survey:
As noted earlier, the accrediting organization has changed its name from the National Association of Industrial Technology (NAIT) to the Association of Technology, Management and Applied Engineering (ATMAE) in 2009. Also noted earlier the IT major has had a real problem with name recognition for decades. Many IT programs saw the association name change as an opportunity to review their own department and degree names. A survey of all ATMAE accredited baccalaureate programs was developed to capture data regarding name changes within the discipline. The return rate was over 50%. The following are the results of that survey:

The key words engineering, technology, and management were used to sort the data received.

College Name
30% had the word Engineering
58% had the word Technology
24% had the word Management

Note* Some colleges included multiple word descriptors such as the College of Science, Engineering and Technology and the College of Business and Technology.

Have you offered a degree in Industrial Technology in the past?
97% of those responding did offer an IT degree in the past.

Have you changed the name of the degree from Industrial Technology to another name?
25% have changed to a name including the word Engineering.
63% have changed to a name including the word Technology.
38% have changed to a name including the word Management.

Do you plan to change the name of your degree from Industrial Technology to another name?
50% plan to change the name to one including the word Engineering.
42% plan to change the name to one including the word Technology.
58% plan to change the name to one including the word Management.
Proposal Attachments – Industrial Technology Name Change

The following are attachment to the proposal to change the name of the department, program and degree from Industrial Technology to Engineering Technology and Management.

College of Business
Ken Cutright, Associate Dean

Advisory Board Members / Alumni

Letters of support were requested from several representative Board members.

(Some of the Advisory Board members are also alumni of this program.)

Brian Bauerbach, President & CEO, CST Industries (class of 1987)
Tony Hollis, Director, Exel / DHL Supply Chain Americas (class of 1991)
Chris Bollinger, Market Segment Manager, Wiseco Performance Products (class of 1998)
Timothy Kerr, Engineering Project Manager, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (class of 1992)
Harry Covington, President, Ferry Industries
Dan Thomas, Corporate Human Relations Manager, Worthington Industries
February 22, 2010

Dr. Klein

The College of Business has no objection to the renaming of your department and program to "Engineering Technology and Management". We also have no objection to renaming your degree to a B.S in Engineering Technology and Management.

Ken Cutright

Associate Dean
College of Business
Ohio University
CST INDUSTRIES, INC.

Peter W. Klein, Ph.D.
Professor & Chair
Department of Industrial Technology
Ohio University
125 Stocker Center
Athens, Ohio 45701

Brian Joseph Bauerbach
President and CEO
CST Industries
5400 Kansas Avenue
Kansas City Kansas 66106

Dear Mr. Klein,
I am writing this letter to express my support for the name change of the Industrial Technology program. As a 1987 graduate of the program, I am extremely proud of my BSIT degree. The program prepared me for and extremely exciting and successful career. However, I have always believed that the name was not indicative of the degree and often led to confusion. I believe the name Engineering Technology and Management is much more appropriate. When I graduated from the IT program I started my career, as most IT grads do, with the title of engineer working for a fortune 100 company (ALCOA). As I worked as a reliability engineer, the company began to utilize my management skills by assigning other people to report to me. My management responsibilities evolved over several years to include multiple senior level management positions. Five years ago I left ALCOA to assume a post of President and CEO which is where I remain today. My career progression is somewhat typical of IT graduates. Most begin as engineers and advance into management positions. The IT program at Ohio University prepares people for these roles through the curriculum offered. As a former graduate, and now as a member of the IT advisory board, I again express my extreme support for the Engineering Technology and Management title for this outstanding program!

Sincerely,
Brian Bauerbach

P.O. BOX 2907  •  KANSAS CITY, KS 66110-2907  •  PHONE: 913-621-3700  •  FAX: 913-621-4071

CST INDUSTRIES, INC.
January 28, 2010

Peter W. Klein, Ph.D.
Professor & Chair
Department of Industrial Technology
Ohio University
125 Stocker Center
Athens, Ohio 45701
T: 740-593-1465
E: klein@ohio.edu

RE: Department & Degree Renaming - Engineering Technology and Management (ETM)

Professor Klein,

Given my own personal experiences, feedback from other Industrial Advisory Board (IAB) members, comments from IT alumni and from senior classes each year regarding the difficulty that IT grads have had over the years explaining what Industrial Technology means in the context of their businesses, I fully support the proposed department and degree name change to Engineering Technology and Management (ETM).

Since manufacturing sector has contracted considerably within our country in the past 10 to 15 years, companies have higher expectations regarding new hires and it is also a greater challenge for recent graduates to differentiate themselves when they are trying to compete for a fewer number of highly sought after positions. With this in mind, companies must be able to quickly and clearly perceive your department's graduates as highly skilled professionals that can learn their business and create value quickly. ETM from a branding perspective gives companies ample understanding of their potential since that these graduates do have a broad range of valuable capabilities, which could be well utilized within their companies. While engineering and technology are indeed the pillars of the Russ College, I believe that the decision to require that the students have a business minor and that inclusion of business oriented discussions be a part of the classes is a critical success factor regarding graduates ability to get their first job and continue to grow professionally. Otherwise, graduates will struggle with translating their problem solving skills into discernable business value, which will not allow either the graduate or the university an opportunity to fully demonstrate your unique value proposition.

I sincerely hope that my perspective as an IAB member and as an IT alumni is of value to both the IT Department and to the Russ College of Engineering And Technology overall.

Please let me know if there is anything else that I can do to assist.

Tony Hollis
Director
Product Development & Innovation
Exel / DHL Supply Chain Americas
570 Polaris Parkway
Westerville, Ohio 43082
Phone 614-865-8267
Cell 614-309-9355
Fax 614-865-8882
tony.hollis@us.exel.com
www.exel.com
Peter Klein, Ph.D.
Department of Industrial Technology
Ohio University
125 Stocker Center
Athens, OH 45701

Dear Dr. Klein,

I am writing you to show my support for changing the department name from Industrial Technology to Engineering Technology & Management (ETM). I am a 1998 graduate of the Industrial Technology department, and recipient of the F. Theodore Paige Outstanding Graduating Senior Award and Robe Leadership Institute Outstanding Senior Leadership Award. My current position is Market Segment Manager at Wiseco Performance Products, and my previously held positions include Field Sales Engineer, Product Engineer, and Forging Sales Engineer. I am also a current member of the Industrial Technology Industrial Advisory Board.

Since becoming an Industrial Technology major my freshman year, I can probably count on one hand how many times I could tell someone my major and have them understand what it is. I usually end up saying, "It's a lot like manufacturing engineering, only with more practical applications of technology, and includes supporting technology such as materials, quality, and the business aspects of manufacturing." Unfortunately without an explanation, many people think an IT degree is from a tech school, or they don't fully understand the depth and breadth of our knowledge related to manufacturing processes.

Most IT graduates take engineering job titles such as manufacturing, process, quality, or sales engineer. This is because of the ability of IT majors to understand a broad scope of manufacturing processes, including business and management aspects of safety, quality, cost, and delivery. IT classes are very technical, and are based on engineering processes and principles. In addition, IT classes include a business approach to solving problems, and couple the technical principles with business-based reasoning. The course work to achieve a business minor also supports what is studied in the IT classes. IT graduates are prepared to apply engineering and technology to solve problems, and work very well within an organization to make positive improvements through their background in processes, quality, materials, CAD/software, and (both) project and people management.

I don't feel the name Industrial Technology captures the broad scope of education and training IT graduates receive. We usually hold engineering positions within organizations, and apply engineering and technology to solve problems and make continuous improvements. I support and encourage changing the department name to Engineering Technology & Management. It is much more specific and appropriate for the type of education and training the department provides, and is more reflective of the career path graduates choose.

Kind regards,

Chris Bollinger
10 February 2010

Dr. Peter Klein
Professor & Chair
Ohio University
Department of Industrial Technology

Subject: Proposed Department and Undergraduate Degree Name Change

Dr. Klein;
I am writing in support of the proposal to change the name of both the Department of Industrial Technology and the Industrial Technology undergraduate degree to Engineering Technology and Management. This proposed change represents the true essence of the degree since you striving to graduate Engineering Technology generalists who have knowledge which crosses normal engineering disciplines and have in depth studies in applied business management. These two disciplines together provide the basis for eventually what will be a well rounded technical manager.

Many of your graduates already find positions as general engineers in manufacturing environments, quality and reliability organizations, sales, facilities engineering and process engineering. Employers who are not familiar with Ohio Universities program are initially leery of the current degree, confusing it with the IT of old, and being a shop teacher or the new IT standing for Information Technology. Neither could be further from the truth and I feel that the name change will help to eliminate this confusion.

Employers today are looking for the well rounded technical generalists. One that is a plug and play type of engineer, who has the tools in their mental tool box to be both technically proficient and can be counted upon to make sound business decisions. I believe that this program graduates this type of person. The challenge is to properly communicate to the employer this skill set. The proposed name change, if adopted will go a long way in aiding in this communication. Good luck.

Timothy J. Kerr
US. Army Corps of Engineers
Engineering Project Manager
St. Louis District
St. Louis, Mo. 63103-2833
314-331-8780
Ohio University
Department of Industrial Technology Class of 1992
Member Ohio University College of Engineering
Industrial Advisory Board
February 16, 2010

Peter W. Klein, Ph.D.
Professor & Chair
Department of Industrial Technology
Ohio University
125 Stocker Center
Athens, Ohio 45701

Dear Peter

Thank you for the opportunity to correspond to you and the IAB regarding the proposed name change for the Industrial Technology program at Ohio University.

Having served on the IAB for several years I have had the opportunity to review numerous curriculum changes for the IT program and moreover have had the opportunity to review the students in classroom environments as well as when they are participating in presentations to the IAB. It is clear that Ohio University is imparting more knowledge and experience to the graduates than just plain "industrial technology" as the program is currently named. The students have a clear grasp of engineering studies on scientific and practical levels. And as the IAB has noticed, these graduates are starting careers with corporations that view the educational experience as engineering based thus most of the students fill "engineering" titled openings in the corporations that they join.

For the most part, as I have observed, the IT curriculum does not focus on the highly theoretical aspects of engineering, but moreover it focuses on the plant floor application (practical application) of engineering. Ohio University's IT graduates are prepared to make an engineering impact to the employer immediately upon entering the manufacturing world.

My company, Ferry Industries, Inc. is an engineering company that produces machinery for the plastics industry. As such we employ staff with titles of Mechanical, Electrical and Software engineer in the pursuit of the design, manufacturing and installation of our products. But because our engineers need to be versed more in the practical and applied aspects of the engineering sciences, we tend to hire engineers who have more "hands on" knowledge rather than the theoretical engineers. An IT graduate is a perfect candidate for our work.
in both the design office and in the factory and also in the installation and startup of the machines after they have been delivered.

My son Adam is a 2005 graduate of Ohio University's Industrial Technology program and on questioning him he responded with the following comments:

"The Engineering Technology component of the proposed name describes the application and use of the technical aspects of the degree. As engineers we apply practical technical know-how and practices to a diverse selection of engineering projects in a wide range of industries. The Engineering Technology and Management degree title will allow employers and professionals to be open to an ETM grad who can understand past, current and future technical details of both processes and the materials used in his company."

The Management component of the proposed name change refers to the business component that we studied as a minor to our degree. That part of the title informs the employer that the ETM graduate has knowledge and capability to manage people, data, and systems within a project or organization/business."

Prior to Adam's graduation in 2005 he was hired by BMW Motorsports with the title of Data Acquisition Engineer. Now Adam is working in industry as a Sales Engineer in a very technical business. While serving as a Coop student, Adam carried the title of engineer for the three motorsports organizations that he worked for.

I strongly recommend that Ohio University change the name of the program to Engineering Technology and Management. This name change will clearly reflect how the graduate is prepared and will reward the graduate and the employer with a true reflection of his capabilities. I have long felt that the program needed the word "engineer" in its name. In the long run, this name change will also provide Ohio University with a stronger recruiting capability.

It is hoped that my recommendations and support for the name change will be considered.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Harry Collington
President
February 9, 2010

Peter W. Klein Ph.D.
Dept of Industrial Technology
Ohio University
125 Stocker Center
Athens, Ohio 45701

Dear Dr. Klein,

As a member of the Industrial Technology Advisory Board for several years, we have discussed the need to change the name of this department and major. Also, as a recruiter of graduates of Industrial Technology for over 17 years, I can speak to the positions these students find themselves in both as co-ops and graduates.

The proposed department name of Engineering Technology and Management describes the knowledge and skills the students of Industrial Technology possess. The companies I have recruited for have place co-ops and graduates in the positions of manufacturing supervisors, quality engineers, process engineers, project engineers and technical sales. This versatile major has the "hands on" applied engineering skills that manufacturing companies seek.

The required minor in business has enabled many Industrial Technology graduates to advance into management positions. I have seen several IT graduates advance quickly to plant superintendent (managing several multi-shift manufacturing departments) and eventually to plant manager.

In my view, there is clearly a need to change the name of the IT department and degree. The proposed name of Engineering Technology and Management fits the knowledge and skills that these graduates possess. Dr. Klein, I applaud your efforts to make this change, it is long overdue.

Sincerely,

Dan Thomas
Corporate Human Resources Manager
Committee Chair Marnette Perry called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm. Other committee members present included Trustee Charles R. Stuckey, Jr., Trustee Norman E. Dewire, Trustee Sandra J. Anderson, Trustee C. Robert Kidder, Trustee David A. Wolfort, Student Trustee Chauncey J. Jackson, Faculty Representative Joe McLaughlin, and President Roderick J. McDavis.

Chair Perry commented on the extensive agenda and highlighted the important issues that are to be discussed.

- **University Advancement Report**

Howard Lipman, Vice President for University Advancement, reviewed Gifts and Commitments performance results in total and at the College and Unit level as of February 28, 2010 - $50 million in total gifts year-to-date – performance is on target with plan when the large, unsolicited gifts are removed from the totals.

Kickoff of the campaign was announced in today’s Columbus Dispatch with a goal noted as “somewhere north of $350 million”. The Campaign Steering Committee met in March and the co-chairs for the campaign are Trustees Wolfort and Stuckey. VP Lipman highlighted some of the committee work including the Campaign Priorities table showing priority targets and the impacts of those targets and resulting payouts at 4% annually. The committee reviewed the distribution of gifts for campaign goals of $400 million, $450 million and $500 million. $207 million has been raised as part of this campaign to date. Other campaign details are progressing and the committee plans to meet in person every other meeting.

Campaign resources are being finalized as the university works through the difficult FY 2011 budget and information will be brought to the June board meeting.

- **Budget Updates**

Rebecca Vazquez-Skillings, Assistant Vice President for Budget Planning and Analysis, shared the agenda for the budget presentation which includes an update on FY 2010 to date and FY 2011 budget development and the assumptions being used in the budget build. The Joint Committee presentation highlighted the process being employed to garner campus input throughout the budget development.
A brief discussion of FY 2010 results through December 31 reflect increased tuition and fee income due to higher than budgeted fall enrollments. Enrollments have been strong to date and have contributed to an over attainment of planned revenue. Spring enrollments are in the process of being finalized.

State revenues continue to be down but, at this time, there is no discussion of a mid-year cut. The last payment of the FY 2010 state share of instruction is actually being deferred until the start of the next fiscal year; we optimistically await that final distribution. The entire forecast for FY 2010 shows we might end the year $.5M net favorable to budget. The third quarter interim financial report will be distributed to the board within the next month and will include commentary on final Spring quarter enrollments.

The FY 2011 budget effort is focusing us toward a multi-year view. Student enrollments are the primary variable in the long range view and we are building conservatism and contingencies into any long range planning. Chair Perry reminded that there is a fine balance between conservatism versus too aggressively estimating future enrollments. The board will be informed on the basis of the assumptions to build out the future projections as the multi-year planning is refined.

Refinement of the FY 2011 expenditure assumptions call for more money for student financial aid and an analysis of retention trends indicate that our aid programs are being successful. Salary increases for FY 2011 are proposed to provide a 1% raise pool and an additional $750,000 faculty raise pool to be paid based on attainment of Fall 2010 enrollments. Increases in health benefits and utilities are still being analyzed. Tuition is budgeted based on factors of estimated incoming freshman, retention of continuing students, and other factors as well as a 3.5% increase in tuition on the Athens campus. The budget still reflects the loss of $10.4 million in state subsidy with the total impact of the new taxonomy on our state share of instruction unknown.

Trustee Kidder discussed that the salary assumptions built into the budget do not support the strategic priorities and the trustees will discuss this further with the President and the Provost prior to the June meeting and the approval of the budget. Chair Perry also challenged on the difference between budgeting trends and budgeting strategy -> there is a need to understand the balance and take advantage of being aspirational where possible.

- **FY 2011 Fees Approval**

AVP Vazquez-Skillings reviewed the requested fees and increases, the process for review and recommendation of requests, the rationale supporting the various requests, and the impact on competitive advantage for the requested fees. A discussion occurred about pricing strategies and the fact that varying factors enter into those decisions in each specific area which establishes tuition rates. The student course fees reflect the real pricing variances for higher cost programs.
and their related materials. This approach starts to look like ‘differential tuition’, but is becoming a reality across all institutions.

Impacts of the 3.5% increase for undergraduates plus room and board increases will result in a quarterly increase of $178. The state has imposed tuition caps at 3.5% but there is not a limit on room and board increase. Preliminary information on tuition increases across the state suggests that most of our peers are also increasing by 3.5%. If the increases for room and board are not approved the capital plans tied to the realization of those revenues will slip in timing or may need to be eliminated completely. If tuition increases are not approved, we will not have funding to help offset the loss of state share of instruction and federal stimulus funds and we won’t make progress toward academic strategic priorities. No increase is requested for Regional campus tuition in recognition of our affordability and access mission and recognizing that those are the campuses for growth.

The board recognized that the university is providing great affordability and accessibility through the regional campuses and the on-line offerings, that we have suffered tremendous cuts, and that we are doing the work to stay true to the strategic priorities. We need to continue to analyze capacity issues, explore building revenues, and defining what type of institution we want to be and the board appreciates the materials provided and the efforts made by the leadership. The Board thought it was important and asked if the tools are available for students to accurately analyze the costs of attendance at OU versus the other state schools.

The committee recommended moving the following four resolutions to approve the FY 2011 Fees to the full Board for approval.

1. College of Medicine and University Outreach & Regional Campuses Instructional Fee, General Fee and Non-resident Surcharge
2. Student Course, Technology and Miscellaneous Fees
3. Residence and Dining Hall Fee Rates
4. Athens and Regional Campuses Instructional Fee, General Fee and Non-resident Surcharge

- Construction Projects

No Discussion. Item is included in the Consent Agenda.

- Third Frontier Bond Initiative

No Discussion. Item is included in the Consent Agenda.

- Transforming South Green Housing
Interim Senior Vice President Michael Angelini reminded the board we are not asking for any action at this time. A preliminary recommendation has been noted in the agenda materials but this meeting is for discussion and to gain board understanding of the options and the basis for the current recommendation. The pace of renovation or complete razing and rebuilding of segments of the housing stock needs to be accelerated and we are looking at alternatives through the efforts of an active, cross-organizational team. The issue of out-of-date housing stock is epidemic across the state encouraging residential campuses to explore these same issues and alternatives. The team is mindful of the ‘control’ that can be maintained in any of these options over our facilities and the programming.

Alternative 2 is recommended at this point. This alternative would allow the university to maintain much control. Additionally, the debt would not be on the university’s financial statements and, therefore, would not impact the state SB6 ratio. However, most likely the debt would be considered within the university’s credit profile from the perspective of the rating agencies. Sensitivity analyses have been conducted on the impact of various levels of debt on our SB6 ratio – most importantly the debt burden ratio.

We are currently in the process of reviewing potential ‘owner’s representatives’ to assist with the planning for any project. The firm would not be a vendor for future project development work. They would assist with revising the housing master plan, address the totality of our current housing stock and needs, consider possible phasing options, and provide other assistance with investigation of funding options.

The Board requests that there is an update on this topic at every upcoming meeting in order to keep abreast of the technicalities and progress. In June, the board expects an update on the housing master plan process and what it takes for us to remain competitive over the next 10 years. Once the plan exists, the financing and alternatives can be discussed. This order of progress is important to the board so that a long-term solution is ensured. ‘Control issues’ need to be delineated. USO assistance should be sought on dealing with the SB6 implications of this debt and the possibility of assisting the campuses through this process since these housing stock issues impacts so many of the state’s institutions.

- **Board of Regents 6 Year Capital Plan Update**

  No Discussion.

- **Energy Project Performance Contract Initiative Update**

  No Discussion.

- **5 Year Financial Ratio Analysis**
Most Ohio institutions showed a decline in their ratio results due to the poor financial market performance during FY2009. Although the ranking for Ohio University improved from the prior year, our ratio did decline to 3.2. Chair Perry requested the Board members submit questions to Interim SVP Angelini regarding the ratios and that the ratios be reviewed in more detail at the June meeting.

- **Treasurer’s Report**

No Discussion.

Other Business: None.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 pm.
WHEREAS, the Ohio University 2010-2011 Current Funds Budget contains fixed and mandated cost increases, and

WHEREAS, the appropriate planning and consultations within the University have been accomplished, resulting in recommendations of fee increases, and

WHEREAS, the University will experience a significant loss in State revenue through the State Share of Instruction in FY 2011 and FY 2012, and

WHEREAS, the Amended Substitute House Bill 1 permits the combined instructional and general fees for undergraduate students to increase by up to 3.5%, and

WHEREAS, the planning within the Athens Campus results in a recommendation of a 3.5% increase to the instructional fee and general fee, and

WHEREAS, the University desires to maintain Athens Campus graduate tuition and fees and the Athens Campus non-resident surcharge fees for undergraduates and graduates at the Fiscal Year 2010 rates to maintain competitiveness.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees authorizes the attached schedule of fees, effective Fall Quarter 2010, except as noted above.
WHEREAS, the Ohio University 2010-2011 Current Funds Budget contains fixed and mandated cost increases, and

WHEREAS, appropriate planning and consultations within the University have been accomplished, and

WHEREAS, the planning within the College of Osteopathic Medicine results in a recommendation of a 5% increase to the instructional fee and non-resident surcharge, and

WHEREAS, the planning within the University Outreach and Regional Campuses results in recommendations for an increase in tuitions for Independent Study Programs and the Masters in Financial Economics, and

WHEREAS, the planning within the University Outreach and Regional Campuses results in recommendations for the Masters in Athletic Administration and Masters in Coaching Education effective Summer Quarter 2010, and

WHEREAS, the proposed fee schedules are consistent with Amended Substitute House Bill 1.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees adopts the proposed fee schedules (Attachment B), effective Fall Quarter 2010, unless otherwise noted.
WHEREAS, the Ohio University 2010-2011 Current Funds Budget will contain program enhancements as well as fixed and mandated cost increases, and

WHEREAS, the planning and consultation within the University regarding student course and miscellaneous fees have been accomplished, resulting in recommendations of fee increases, and

WHEREAS, the planning and consultation within the University regarding technology fees have been accomplished, resulting in recommendations to establish an undergraduate technology fee for the College of Health & Human Services and an increase to the College of Osteopathic Medicine medical resources technology fee, and

WHEREAS, the attached fee schedules (Attachments C and D) are consistent with House Bill 1, the state appropriations act as introduced in the Ohio General Assembly.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees adopts the attached fee schedules, effective Fall Quarter 2010.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees authorizes the President or his designee to make non-substantive adjustments to the fee schedules, including but not limited to changes in course and fee identification numbers.
FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011
RESIDENCE AND DINING HALL FEE RATES

RESOLUTION 2010-3148

WHEREAS, sustained effort has been made to achieve financial stability for Ohio University’s Residence and Dining Hall Auxiliary while providing necessary services for students, and

WHEREAS, the Residence and Dining Hall Auxiliary has planned for all operating expenses and debt service obligations by means of fees which are collected from students who use the residence and dining hall facilities, and

WHEREAS, the fee increases being requested for Fiscal Year 2010-2011 support progress on the Auxiliary 10 Year Plan.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees adopts the attached schedule of fees (Attachment E), effective Fall Quarter 2010.
Date: March 15, 2010

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Michael Angelini, Interim Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer

Re: FY 2011 Proposed Student & Other Fee Adjustments

At the upcoming April Resources Committee meeting, board members will be asked to consider miscellaneous fees for approval. The categories of fees are as follows:

☐ **Request to Increase College of Medicine Tuition & Fees:** Consistent with the College of Medicine’s 5-year plan shared August 2007, the University will seek approval of a 5% increase to the instructional fee and non-resident surcharge. Based on projected enrollments that include an increased class size, these changes will produce an estimated $765,000 increase in tuition and fee revenue. The proposed tuition and fee increases will support projected inflationary expenditure increases, expenses associated with increased enrollment, the college’s plan for Vision Ohio, accreditation-related activities, and help to partially offset reductions in state funding.  

*(See Attachment B, page 1.)*

☐ **Request to Increase University Outreach & Regional Campus (UORC) Tuition & Fees:** Outreach: UORC seeks approval to increase the Master in Financial Economics from $3,532 to $3,650 per quarter and increase the program fee from $375 to $390 per course; increase tuition for Independent Study Programs, including correspondence courses, by 3.5%; and increase tuition for the Master in Coaching Education program from $1,565 to $2,132 per quarter and establish a non-resident fee of $83 per quarter. Lastly, UORC seeks to lower the tuition for the Master in Athletic Administration from $2,715 to $2,084 per quarter and establish a non-resident fee of $81 per quarter.  

*(See Attachment B, pages 2-3.)*

☐ **Request for Approval of New/Increased Student & Other Fees:** Please find attached to this memorandum a summary of student course fees, technology fees and miscellaneous fees for review and consideration. Attachments C and D, "New or Increases of Academic Course-Related Fees" and “New or Increases of Broad-based Fees” present proposed revisions to fees for approval by the Board of Trustees. Adjustments are primarily requested to support the increased costs of consumable goods, employee compensation and voluntary activities.
Request for Approval of Room & Board Increases: The University will seek approval of 2.5% and 2.0% increases in room and board rates, respectively. This request is less than the room and board rates of 6% and 3.5% presented with the 10-year capital plan approved by the Board at the October 2009 meeting. Adjustments to the capital plan based upon these revised rates will be presented at a later time.

(See Attachment E, "Residence & Dining Hall Rate Schedule").

Materials included with this board agenda item are as follows:

Resolutions for Board Action (Attachment A – 3 pages)
- Instructional Fee, General Fee, and Non-Resident Surcharge (Multiple Campuses)
- Student Course, Technology and Miscellaneous Fees
- Residence and Dining Hall Fee Rates

Fee Schedules (Attachments B thru E – 12 pages)
- Attachment B: Instructional, General and Non-Resident Surcharge Fee Schedules (3 pages)
- Attachment C: New or Increases of Academic Course-Related Fees (7 pages)
- Attachment D: New of Increases in Broad-based Fees (1 page)
- Attachment E: Residence & Dining Hall Rate Schedule (1 page)

Items not Included with this Mailing: Athens & Regional Campus Tuition Rates and Nursing Fees
Currently, the Administration continues to review potential rates for tuition with a strong focus on the balance between affordability and successful achievement of strategic goals, particularly in light of the current state budget situation. The Budget Planning Council has forwarded its recommendation for a 3.5% increase to tuition on the Athens and Regional Campuses for consideration. Also, the Budget Planning Council continues its review of proposed nursing course fees; a recommendation is anticipated in the coming weeks. A formal request may be presented at the April board meeting pending further discussion and review.

I will be happy to answer any questions you have prior to the meeting regarding changes to current fees and look forward to our upcoming discussion regarding the FY 2011 operating budget at the April meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
<th>Instructional Fees</th>
<th>General Fees</th>
<th>Resident Total</th>
<th>Non-Resident Surcharge</th>
<th>Non-Resident Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>8,860</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>9,373</td>
<td>4,013</td>
<td>13,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OHIO UNIVERSITY
ATHENS CAMPUS
FY 2011 GRADUATE STUDENT TUITION AND FEE SCHEDULE
(PER QUARTER)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Instructional Fees</th>
<th>General Fees</th>
<th>Program Fees</th>
<th>Resident Total</th>
<th>Non-Resident Surcharge</th>
<th>Non-Resident Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters in Financial Economics</td>
<td>3,532</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>4,617</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters in Financial Economics</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>4,765</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Part-time rate is one-half the full-time rate reflected above.
5Tuition rate is effective for the cohorts beginning prior to Fall Quarter 2010-11.
6Tuition rate is effective for the cohorts beginning Fall Quarter 2010-11 or later.

### Independent Distance Learning (IDL)

#### 2010-2011 STUDENT TUITION AND FEE SCHEDULE

#### FEES PER QUARTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Credit by Examination (CCE)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence Courses (COR)</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College Program for Incarcerated (CPI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Fees</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-8 Hours</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11 Hours</td>
<td>1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14 Hours</td>
<td>2122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17 Hours</td>
<td>2940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20 Hours</td>
<td>3012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Masters in Athletic Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instructional Fees</th>
<th>General Fees</th>
<th>Program Fees</th>
<th>Resident Total</th>
<th>Non-Resident Surcharge</th>
<th>Non-Resident Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011 Proposed</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Masters in Coaching Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instructional Fees</th>
<th>General Fees</th>
<th>Program Fees</th>
<th>Resident Total</th>
<th>Non-Resident Surcharge</th>
<th>Non-Resident Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011 Proposed</td>
<td>2,132</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Tuition schedule is effective for the cohorts beginning Summer Quarter 2010.
2 Tuition schedule is effective for the cohorts beginning prior to Summer Quarter 2010
3 A deposit of $250 is added to the first quarter of registration.
4 A deposit of $300 is added to the first quarter of registration.
# New or Increases of Academic Course-Related Fees
## Fiscal Year: FY11

### ATHENS CAMPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>SIS Course Name*</th>
<th>Office/Dept/School</th>
<th>Fee Name</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART 311</td>
<td>DRAWING MEDIA</td>
<td>School of Art</td>
<td>Digital Lab Fee</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 130</td>
<td>HUM ANAT &amp; PHYS I</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Human Anatomy and Physiology I Lab Fee</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 131</td>
<td>HUM ANAT &amp; PHYS II</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Human Anatomy and Physiology II Lab Fee</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 170</td>
<td>INTRO TO ZOOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Intro to Zoology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 171</td>
<td>INTRO TO ZOOL</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Intro to Zoology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 173</td>
<td>INTRO ZOOL LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Intro to Zoology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 204</td>
<td>HUM BIOL II LAB: ANATOMY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Human Biology II: Anatomy Lab Fee</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 222</td>
<td>MICROBES &amp; HUMANS LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Microbes and Humans Lab Fee</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 300</td>
<td>ANATOMY &amp; HISTOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Anatomy and Histology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 301B</td>
<td>HUMAN ANATOMY LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Human Anatomy Lab Fee</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 303</td>
<td>COMP VERT ANATOMY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Comp Vert Anatomy Lab Fee</td>
<td>$51.00</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 321</td>
<td>GENERAL MICROBIOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>General Microbiology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 322</td>
<td>ANIMAL CELL BIOLOGY LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Animal Cell Biology Lab Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 326</td>
<td>LAB GENETICS</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Lab Genetics Lab Fee</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 354</td>
<td>PRINC PHYSIOL I LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Principles of Physiology I Lab Fee</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 355</td>
<td>PRINS PHYSIOL II LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Principles of Physiology II Lab Fee</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 364</td>
<td>FORENSIC BIOL</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Forensic Biology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 376</td>
<td>FIELD ECOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Field Ecology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 413B</td>
<td>HUMAN NEUROSCIENCE LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Human Neuroscience Lab Fee</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 422</td>
<td>MICROBIOLOGICAL TECHNIQUE</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Microbiological Techniques Lab Fee</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If blank, course is not currently an approved course to be offered.*
## New or Increases of Academic Course-Related Fees
### Fiscal Year: FY11

#### ATHENS CAMPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>SIS Course Name*</th>
<th>Office/Dept/School</th>
<th>Fee Name</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 423B</td>
<td>PATHOGENIC BACTERIOL LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Pathogenic Bacteriology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 429</td>
<td>MARINE BIOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Marine Biology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 431</td>
<td>AQUATIC BIOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Aquatic Biology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 433</td>
<td>BIOMONITORING</td>
<td>Biologica Sciences</td>
<td>Biomonitoring Lab Fee</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 436</td>
<td>FIELD ENTOMOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Field Entomology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 446</td>
<td>EXER PHYSIOL LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Exercise Physiology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 458</td>
<td>BIOLOGY OF AMPHIBIANS</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Biology of Amphibians Lab Fee</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 459</td>
<td>BIOLOGY OF REPTILES</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Biology of Reptiles Lab Fee</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 465</td>
<td>ICHTHYOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Ichthyology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 471</td>
<td>ORNITHOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Ornithology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 474</td>
<td>MAMMALOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Mammology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 486B</td>
<td>IMMUNOLOGY LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Immunology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 489</td>
<td>MICROBIAL PHYSIOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Microbial Physiology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 501B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Human Anatomy Lab Fee</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 513B</td>
<td>HUMAN NEUROSCIENCE LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Human Neuroscience Lab Fee</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 521</td>
<td>GENERAL MICROBIOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>General Microbiology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 522</td>
<td>MICROBIOLOGICAL TECHNIQUE</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Microbiological Techniques Lab Fee</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 523B</td>
<td>PATHOGENIC BACTERIOL LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Pathogenic Bacteriology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 529</td>
<td>MARINE BIOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Marine Biology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 531</td>
<td>AQUATIC BIOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Aquatic Biology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If blank, course is not currently an approved course to be offered.
# New or Increases of Academic Course-Related Fees

**Fiscal Year: FY11**

## ATHENS CAMPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>SIS Course Name*</th>
<th>Office/Dept/School</th>
<th>Fee Name</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 533</td>
<td>BIOMONITORING</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Biomonitoring Lab Fee</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 536</td>
<td>FIELD ENTOMOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Field Entomology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 546</td>
<td>EXER PHYSIOL LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Exercise Physiology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 554</td>
<td>PRINC PHYSIOL I LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Principles of Physiology I Lab Fee</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 555</td>
<td>PRINC PHYSIOL II LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Principles of Physiology II Lab Fee</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 571</td>
<td>ORNITHOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Ornithology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 574</td>
<td>MAMMALOLOGY</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Mammology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOS 586B</td>
<td>IMMUNOLOGY LAB</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Immunology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOL 341</td>
<td>PALEONTOLOGY</td>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
<td>Paleontology Course Fee</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOL 448</td>
<td>PALEOECOLOGY</td>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
<td>Advanced Paleoeology Course Fee</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOL 475B</td>
<td>FIELD GEOLOGY II</td>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
<td>Field Geology Course Fee</td>
<td>$485.00</td>
<td>$730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOL 548</td>
<td>PALEOECOLOGY</td>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
<td>Advanced Paleoeology Course Fee</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSE 206</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSE 208</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing and Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>plus pending $100 Simulation/Lab fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSE 211</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing and Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>plus pending $100 Simulation/Lab fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSE 612</td>
<td>ADV HLTH ASSESSMENT NSG</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Lab Fee</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSE 681</td>
<td>NURSING CARE WOMEN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSE 682</td>
<td>NURSING CARE ADULTS</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSE 683</td>
<td>NURSING CARE CHILDREN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Lab Fee</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If blank, course is not currently an approved course to be offered.*
# New or Increases of Academic Course-Related Fees

**Fiscal Year: FY11**

## ATHENS CAMPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>SIS Course Name*</th>
<th>Office/Dept/School</th>
<th>Fee Name</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NRSE 684</td>
<td>FAMILY PRACTITIONER PRACT</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Lab Fee</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PED 162</td>
<td>SKATING I</td>
<td>Campus Recreation/Bird Arena</td>
<td>Ice Skating Fee</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PESS 415</td>
<td>PHYSIOLOGY EXERCISE LAB</td>
<td>Recreation and Sport Sciences</td>
<td>Exercise Physiology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PESS 515</td>
<td>PHYSIOLOGY EXERCISE LAB</td>
<td>Recreation and Sport Sciences</td>
<td>Exercise Physiology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 327</td>
<td>HUMAN PSYCHOPHYSIO</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Human Psychophysiology Lab Fee</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC 211</td>
<td>OPEN WATER COASTAL KAYAK</td>
<td>Recreation &amp; Sport Sciences</td>
<td>Trip Fee</td>
<td>$87.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC 327</td>
<td>COASTAL KAYAK IDW</td>
<td>Recreation &amp; Sport Sciences</td>
<td>Trip Fee</td>
<td>$138.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC 328</td>
<td>COASTAL KAYAK ICE</td>
<td>Recreation &amp; Sport Sciences</td>
<td>Trip Fee</td>
<td>$157.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHILLICOTHE CAMPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>SIS Course Name*</th>
<th>Office/Dept/School</th>
<th>Fee Name</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NURS 101</td>
<td>FOUNDATIONS OF NURSING</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 201</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH I: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 201</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH I: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 202</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH II: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 202</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH II: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 203</td>
<td>LPN TO RN TRANSITION</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 207</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH III: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 207</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH III: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If blank, course is not currently an approved course to be offered.*

---

Tuesday, March 16, 2010
New or Increases of Academic Course-Related Fees  
Fiscal Year: FY11

**CHILLICOTHE CAMPUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>SIS Course Name*</th>
<th>Office/Dept/School</th>
<th>Fee Name</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NURS 208</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH IV: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 208</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH IV: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 212</td>
<td>ALTERATIONS III</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 212</td>
<td>ALTERATIONS III</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$65.00 $80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 225</td>
<td>INTEGRATED NSG PRACTICE</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 225</td>
<td>INTEGRATED NSG PRACTICE</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$65.00 $80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 260</td>
<td>TRANSITIONS</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 260</td>
<td>TRANSITIONS</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$65.00 $80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EASTERN CAMPUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>SIS Course Name*</th>
<th>Office/Dept/School</th>
<th>Fee Name</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PESS 228</td>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>Recreation and Sport Sciences</td>
<td>CPR Certification Fee</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOUTHERN CAMPUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>SIS Course Name*</th>
<th>Office/Dept/School</th>
<th>Fee Name</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NURS 101</td>
<td>FOUNDATIONS OF NURSING</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 201</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH I: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 201</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH I: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$65.00 $80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 202</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH II: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 202</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH II: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$65.00 $80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 203</td>
<td>LPN TO RN TRANSITION</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If blank, course is not currently an approved course to be offered.*
### SOUTHERN CAMPUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>SIS Course Name*</th>
<th>Office/Dept/School</th>
<th>Fee Name</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NURS 207</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH III: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 207</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH III: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 208</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH IV: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 208</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH IV: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 212</td>
<td>ALTERATIONS III</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 212</td>
<td>ALTERATIONS III</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 225</td>
<td>INTEGRATED NSG PRACTICE</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 225</td>
<td>INTEGRATED NSG PRACTICE</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 260</td>
<td>TRANSITIONS</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 260</td>
<td>TRANSITIONS</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ZANESVILLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>SIS Course Name*</th>
<th>Office/Dept/School</th>
<th>Fee Name</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NURS 101</td>
<td>FOUNDATIONS OF NURSING</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 201</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH I: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 201</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH I: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 202</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH II: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 202</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH II: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 203</td>
<td>LPN TO RN TRANSITION</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If blank, course is not currently an approved course to be offered.
## New or Increases of Academic Course-Related Fees

**Fiscal Year: FY11**

### ZANESVILLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>SIS Course Name*</th>
<th>Office/Dept/School</th>
<th>Fee Name</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NURS 207</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH III: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 207</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH III: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 208</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH IV: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 208</td>
<td>ADULT HEALTH IV: ADN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 212</td>
<td>ALTERATIONS III</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 212</td>
<td>ALTERATIONS III</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 225</td>
<td>INTEGRATED NSG PRACTICE</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 225</td>
<td>INTEGRATED NSG PRACTICE</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 260</td>
<td>TRANSITIONS</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Simulation/Lab Fee</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
<td>$100 Simulation/Lab Fee Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS 260</td>
<td>TRANSITIONS</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Testing Fee</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBI0 333</td>
<td>RESTORATION ECOLOGY</td>
<td>Environmental and Plant Biology</td>
<td>Restoration Ecology Wilds Course Fee</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC 209</td>
<td>WHITEWATER RAFTING</td>
<td>Recreation and Sport Sciences</td>
<td>White Water Rafting Course Fee</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If blank, course is not currently an approved course to be offered.
### New or Increases of Broad-Based Fees
#### Fiscal Year: FY11

**ATHENS CAMPUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office/Dept/School</th>
<th>Fee Name</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>College of Health and Human Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate Technology Fee</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Osteopathic Medicine</td>
<td>Application Fee</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Osteopathic Medicine</td>
<td>Medical Learning Resource Fee</td>
<td>$274.00</td>
<td>$288.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OHIO UNIVERSITY
RESIDENCE & DINING HALL RATE SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROOM RATES (QUARTERLY)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single without A/C</td>
<td>2,077</td>
<td>2,129</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single with A/C</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovated Single with A/C</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Double without A/C</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Double with A/C</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovated Double with A/C</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple without A/C</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple with A/C</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovated Triple with A/C</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad without A/C</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad with A/C</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovated Quad with A/C</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple Bromley Hall with A/C</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suite Double</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOARD RATES (QUARTERLY)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Meal Plan</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Meal Plan</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Meal Plan</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super 14 Meal</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super 20 Meal</td>
<td>1,791</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Meal Plan - Flex</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Meal Plan - Flex (New FY10)</td>
<td>1,839</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed FY 2011 Fees

The University Seeks Approval of the Following:
- College of Osteopathic Medicine Tuition & Non-Resident Surcharge
- Outreach Instructional, General & Program Fees
- Student Course & Other Fees (Multiple Campuses)
- Athens Campus Room & Board

The Following are Still Under Review and May be Presented at the April 2010 Board Meeting:
- Athens & Regional Campus Instructional & General Fees
- Nursing Course Fees

Proposed FY 2011 Fees
College of Medicine Fees

- Proposed 5% Increase to Instructional Fee and Non-Resident Surcharge, in Combination with Projected Enrollment Increases, Will Support:
  - Projected inflationary expenditure increases
  - Vision Ohio Initiatives
  - Expenses associated with increased enrollment
  - Accreditation-related activities
  - Help to partially offset reductions in state funding
## Proposed FY 2011 Fees
### College of Medicine Fees

(Data not Final – Subject to Board Approval)

Updates will be Presented at the Board Meeting, If Applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Medicine</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>Proposed FY 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor Fee</td>
<td>Non-Resident Surcharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>$25,887 $15,466</td>
<td>$26,589 5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>$25,486 $15,066</td>
<td>$26,180 5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State</td>
<td>$24,486 $10,996</td>
<td>$25,770 5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNL/UCOM</td>
<td>$20,613 $14,614</td>
<td>$21,472 4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>$20,197 $17,750</td>
<td>$21,077 5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>$20,560 $15,510</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2011 Rates Noted are Based on Results of Informal Survey of Institutions

## Proposed FY 2011 Fees
### University Outreach & Regional Campuses

### Masters in Financial Economics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Instructional Fees</th>
<th>General Fees</th>
<th>Program Fees</th>
<th>Residential Surcharge</th>
<th>Non-Residential Surcharge</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master in Finance...†</td>
<td>$3,307</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>4,187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master in Finance...†</td>
<td>$3,603</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>4,355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†The tuition rate is subject to change.

Table rates effective for students beginning in 2020-2021.

†Rates are effective for the cohorts beginning in the fall of 2021-22.

†Rates are effective for the cohorts beginning in the fall of 2020-21.
Proposed FY 2011 Fees
University Outreach & Regional Campuses

2010-2011 STUDENT TUITION AND FEE SCHEDULE
FEES PER QUARTER 3.5% Increase for Fall
Independent Distance Learning (IDL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY 2010 Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>FY 2011 Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Credit By Examination (CCE)</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence Courses (COR)</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td>$141</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Program for Incarcerated (CPI)</th>
<th>Comprehensive Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-9 Hours</td>
<td>$1,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11 Hours</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14 Hours</td>
<td>$2,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17 Hours</td>
<td>$2,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20 Hours</td>
<td>$3,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed FY 2011 Fees
University Outreach & Regional Campuses

Masters in Athletic Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2011 Proposed</th>
<th>Instr. Fees</th>
<th>General Fees</th>
<th>Program Fees</th>
<th>Resident Total</th>
<th>Non-Resident Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010^3</td>
<td>2,684</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>2,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011^3</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,020</td>
<td>3,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Masters in Coaching Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2011 Proposed</th>
<th>Instr. Fees</th>
<th>General Fees</th>
<th>Program Fees</th>
<th>Resident Total</th>
<th>Non-Resident Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010^3</td>
<td>2,132</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,437</td>
<td>2,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011^3</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>2,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^1 Tuition increase effective for courses beginning January 2011.
^2 Revised FY 2010-2011 effective for courses beginning in Summer Quarter 2010.
^3 Revised effective for courses beginning in Fall Quarter 2010
^4 Revised FY 2010-2011 effective for courses beginning in Fall Quarter 2009
^5 Revised FY 2010-2011 effective for courses beginning in Fall Quarter 2008

OHIO UNIVERSITY
Proposed FY 2011 Fees
Student & Other Fees

FY 2011 Supplemental Fee Process:
- BPC Established Sub-Committees to Organize & Review Supplemental Fee Proposals
- Student Course & Technology Fee Committee
- General Fee Committee
- Direct BPC Review of Other Miscellaneous Fees & Tuition

Proposed FY 2011 Fees
Student & Other Fees

BPC Directed Fee Sub-committees to Limit New / Increased Student Fees to Support:

- New Activities (e.g. Newly Approved Course)
- Pass-through & Activity Fees (e.g. Recreation)
- Direct Consumables (e.g. Lab Supplies)
Proposed FY 2011 Fees
Student & Other Fees

The BPC Recommends Approval of New and Increased Course Fees on All Campuses, Including:

- 20 new course fees to support recently approved courses with consumable goods and voluntary recreation activities
- 47 increased course fees on Athens Campus to support increases in consumable goods primarily in the sciences
- Increases to 3 nursing course fees on Chillicothe, Southern & Zanesville Campuses to support degree program are still under review

Proposed FY 2011 Fees
Technology & Application Fees

The BPC Recommends Approval of 3 Broad-based fees:

- New Health & Human Services Undergraduate Technology Fee of $45
- Increase to College of Medicine Technology Fee to Support Technology Learning Resources for Students from $274 to $288 per quarter
- Increase to the College of Medicine Application Fee from $40 to $50
### Proposed FY 2011 Fees
#### Room & Board Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarterly Assessment</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>$ Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident Undergraduate</td>
<td>$1,404</td>
<td>$1,432</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>$28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Rate</td>
<td>$1,732</td>
<td>$1,775</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>$43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$3,136</td>
<td>$3,207</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>$71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Rate: Based on 20 Meal Plan
Room Rate: Based on Standard Double with A/C

---

### Proposed FY 2011 Fees
#### Room & Board Fees

- Propose 2.5% Increase in Room Rates and 2% Increase in Board Rates
- Support for Operating & Debt Service Expenses
- Focus on Affordability
Proposed FY 2011 Fees
Room & Board Fees

Proposed Fees of IUC Universities
(Data not Final – Subject to Board Approval)
Updates will be Presented at the Board Meeting, If Applicable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>FY 2010 Rates*</th>
<th>Proposed FY 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>$ 9,429</td>
<td>$ 5,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>$ 9,702</td>
<td>$ 5,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>$ 9,563</td>
<td>$ 5,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>$ 9,408</td>
<td>$ 5,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>$ 9,139</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green</td>
<td>$ 9,370</td>
<td>$ 5,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>$ 8,727</td>
<td>$ 5,791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standard Double Room Rates with A/C and Full Meal Plan Option (19/20 Meals)

Proposed FY 2011 Fees

The University Seeks Approval of the Following:
- College of Osteopathic Medicine Tuition & Non-Resident Surcharge
- Outreach Instructional, General & Program Fees
- Student Course & Other Fees (Multiple Campuses)
- Athens Campus Room & Board

The Following are Still Under Review and May be Presented at the April 2010 Board Meeting:
- Athens & Regional Campus Instructional & General Fees
- Nursing Course Fees
## FY2010 Gifts & Commitments by Donor Type as of 2/28/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Individuals</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$438</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Gift Types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts In Kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Gifts - Revocable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledge Payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequest Payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Gifts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY2010 Gifts & Commitments by College/Unit as of 2/28/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/Unit</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Gifts</th>
<th>New Pledges</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>($22)</td>
<td>$1,175</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>$342</td>
<td>$677</td>
<td>($698)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>($46)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$665</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>$792</td>
<td>($2,208)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripps College of Communication</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>($45)</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$598</td>
<td>$93</td>
<td>$691</td>
<td>($1,109)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$57</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$6,801</td>
<td>$28,086</td>
<td>$34,886</td>
<td>$34,386</td>
<td>6977%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ College of Engineering &amp; Technology</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>($60)</td>
<td>$1,850</td>
<td>$152</td>
<td>$233</td>
<td>$385</td>
<td>($1,465)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Fine Arts</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>($22)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$7,178</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$7,203</td>
<td>$6,703</td>
<td>1441%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>($22)</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$155</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$217</td>
<td>($283)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Tutorial College</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>($3)</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>($23)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Osteopathic Medicine</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>($16)</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$353</td>
<td>$345</td>
<td>$698</td>
<td>($52)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>($3)</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>($54)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$274</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$307</td>
<td>($193)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>($6)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>($188)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutler Scholarship Program</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>($47)</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$107</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$108</td>
<td>($1,392)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chillicothe Campus</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$43</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Campus</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Campus</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Campus</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanesville Campus</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First meeting of the Campaign Steering Committee was held March 9 & 10
The purpose of the Campaign Steering Committee is the oversight of the comprehensive fundraising effort to meet the needs of Ohio University.

The committee is responsible for the successful completion of a significant fundraising effort. These efforts include: understanding the top priorities and key needs; recommending a campaign goal to the University President and ultimately the University and Foundation Trustees; setting a pacesetting goal for the campaign steering committee; supporting the fundraising efforts through personal involvement; and overseeing the ongoing campaign efforts.
Chairman Chuck Stuckey, ’66 (Engineering)
Vice Chairman David Wolford, ’74 (Arts & Sciences)
Laura Brege, ’78 (Honors Tutorial College)
Dan DeLawder, ‘71 (Education)
Chuck Emrick, ’51, ’52 (Business, Communication)
Frank Krasovec, ’65, ‘66 (Business)
Howard Lipman
Roderick McDavis, ‘70 (Education)
Sheila McHale, ‘68 (Arts & Sciences)
Alan Riedel, ’52 (Arts & Sciences)
Steve Schoonover, ’67 (Fine Arts/Communication)
Jeff Stanley, ’82 (Osteopathic Medicine)
Barbara Strom Thompson, ’76 (Arts & Sciences)
Robert Walter, ’67 (Engineering)
1. Agreement on the top university priorities and key needs
2. Consensus on the campaign goal
3. Agreement on the “Case Statement” and campaign branding
4. Commitment to the Campaign: personal gift and involvement in fundraising
5. Establish the CSC meeting dates for the next 24 months
## Campaign Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campaign Priority</th>
<th>Non-Endowed</th>
<th>Examples of Impact</th>
<th>Endowed</th>
<th>Endow. Payout (4%)</th>
<th>Examples of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultivate Learning:</strong> Cultivate outstanding academic and student-life experience.</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>Academic Support Ctrs; Student Activities; Athletics Gender Equity; Centers of Excellence</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>Centers of Excellence; study abroad programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expand Opportunity:</strong> Increase access and opportunity.</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>Non-endowed scholarships; student recruitment funds; learning communities</td>
<td>$140,000,000</td>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
<td>229 full-ride endowed scholarships; summer &quot;bridge&quot; programs; student mentoring funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspire Discovery:</strong> Invest in research, discovery and creative activity.</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>Technology &amp; research funds; faculty recruitment and mentoring funds; library collections</td>
<td>$85,000,000</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
<td>22 endowed chairs; 45 endowed professorships; lectureship and speakers endowments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nurture Place:</strong> Enrich the campus environment.</td>
<td>$90,000,000</td>
<td>New/renovated facilities for A&amp;S, Ath, Business, Chll, Comm, Educ, Fine Arts and the Museum</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Endowments for facilities maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encourage Community:</strong> Expand outreach and partnerships.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Community Health Programs; Kids On Campus</td>
<td>$17,000,000</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td>Center for Entrepreneurship; Kennedy Museum programs; arts education programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$113,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$287,000,000</td>
<td>$11,480,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Capital Campaign Comparative Gift Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dollar Amount</th>
<th>Third Century</th>
<th>Bicentennial</th>
<th>Promise $400M</th>
<th>Promise $450M</th>
<th>Promise $500M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.5M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500K</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100K</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50K</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$50K</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>many</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arrived at agreement on case statement and branding
Discussed the commitment of committee members to the campaign.
Calendar for future Campaign Steering Committee meetings is being developed
### Campaign Timeline

#### Campaign Planning

**2009 to 2010**
- √ Determine how to fund the campaign.
- √ Recruit campaign chair and campaign cabinet.
- √ Complete wealth screening and donor analytics and incorporate into prospect development systems.
- √ Improve BSR
  - Advance database to support campaign.
- √ Conduct skill development sessions for staff, deans, etc.
- √ Estimate dollar targets for university-wide and college/unit campaign priorities.

Engage and cultivate top gift prospects.

- Plan and begin implementing internal and external marketing and communication strategies for:
  - Print and electronic media
  - Website
  - Electronic communications
  - Other communication vehicles

Prepare and begin implementing plan to engage college/unit advisory boards.

Prepare campaign case-stating materials.

Begin campaign feasibility study targeted toward selected prospects to evaluate overall dollar goal.

#### Nucleus and Leadership Gifts

**2010 to 2012**
- Complete campaign feasibility study.
- Engage campaign leadership in prospect cultivation and pre-selling campaign priorities.
- Focus Foundation Board on increasing awareness about campaign priorities.
- Raise awareness about campaign priorities among Ohio University faculty and staff, alumni, parents, and friends.

Partner with Ohio University National Alumni Board to increase campaign awareness among alumni.

- Develop plan and begin holding regional “campaign awareness” events.

#### Major and General Gifts

**2012 to 2015**
- Cultivate and solicit top prospects.
- Secure 100% major gift participation by all campaign volunteer leadership groups.
- Continue executing internal and external marketing and communications strategies.
- Continue raising awareness about campaign priorities internally and externally.
- Set final dollar goal.

- Hold festive campaign public kick-off and announce dollar goal.

#### Public Announcement/Kick-Off: 2012

- Continue cultivating and soliciting top prospects.
- Cultivate and solicit other major gift prospects.
- Recognize and steward campaign donors.
- Adjust prospecting work and staffing, as needed, to achieve campaign goals.
- Hold multiple campaign events for alumni, parents, and friends.
- Conduct faculty and staff campaign.
- Celebrate campaign victory.
- Evaluate campaign.

#### Victory Celebration: 2015
Memorandum

Date: March 15, 2010

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Michael Angelini, Interim Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer

Re: FY 2010 & FY 2011 Budget Updates

At the upcoming April Resources Committee meeting, an update regarding the FY 2010 and FY 2011 operating budgets will be presented. Please find attached the Powerpoint presentation titled, “Budget Updates.”

This presentation will include the following:

- Brief update of the FY 2010 budget and current challenges,
- Update on the FY 2011 budget development process
- Review of preliminary FY 2011 budget proposal and assumptions, and
- Next steps

Also attached to this memorandum is the December 2009 Interim Financial Reports. Highlights from this report will be discussed at the upcoming board meeting.

Should you have any questions about the presentation prior to the January, please feel free to contact Rebecca Vazquez-Skillings, Assistant Vice President for Budget Planning & Analysis (740.597.1564 or skillinr@ohio.edu).
**FY 2010 BUDGET OUTLOOK – ATHENS CAMPUS**

**SUMMARY OF CURRENT FINANCIAL ISSUES**

Year-to-date, budget-to-actual the university is projecting revenue over-attainment of $500,000 on the Athens campus net of designated program revenue. Over-attained revenue will bolster the University’s fund balance and help to offset the impact of long-term structural issues, thus, lessening the burden on planning units. Year-to-date expenditures are on target.

The University continues to monitor each revenue and expenditure category with close attention being paid to enrollment-driven fee revenues and the State’s budget.

As reported at the September and January meetings of the Board of Trustees, the Athens Campus has developed plans to address a number of budget-related issues impacting the Unrestricted Educational and General (E&G base) base budget; one-time impacts to the Athens General Fee and General Fund; and the 15 Park Place capital project budget. As of this report, favorable investment income for the Ohio University Foundation (OUF) relieves the need to increase support for Advancement operations. Below is a revised view of the issues (both potential and realized), which present a potential total net gain of $500,000. The highlighted items below reflect revisions since the September report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(in millions)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>E&amp;G Base</th>
<th>1 Time Gen Fee</th>
<th>1 Time Gen Fund</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>OUF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Share of Instruction (SSI)</td>
<td>$ (2.20)</td>
<td>$(2.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Increase eff Winter Qtr</td>
<td>$ 3.14</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add’l Revenue due to Enrollments*</td>
<td>$ 2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 0.50</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Park Place / Jepson residual</td>
<td>$ 0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$ 4.19</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>$ 0.50</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td>$ 0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expense:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERIP payouts</td>
<td>$ 0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severance payouts</td>
<td>$ 0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to OCOG-eligible Students</td>
<td>$ 0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to Full-Scholarship Students</td>
<td>$ 0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Park Place renovation shortfall</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Benefits</td>
<td>$ 0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Football Bowl Game</td>
<td>$ 0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc funding requests</td>
<td>$ 0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$ 3.69</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>$ 0.15</td>
<td>$ 1.40</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net:</strong></td>
<td>$ 0.50</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>$ 0.35</td>
<td>$ 0.60</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An update regarding the above items will be presented at the April 2010 committee meeting.
The December 2009 report focuses on areas of substantive change for the Total University, with notes regarding each campus as appropriate.

**STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES AND OTHER CHANGES – Current Funds – Unrestricted – Educational & General (E&G)**

**TOTAL UNIVERSITY:**
Year-to-date, budget-to-actual the university is projecting a net over-attainment of $500,000 on the Athens campus. The College of Osteopathic Medicine’s total revenues are on target, while UORC anticipates the five Regional Campus revenues will exceed the FY 2010 budget by up approximately $6 million.

**Revenues:**

- **Summary of Revenues (line 10):** Total FY 2010 year-to-date revenue receipts are $27.6 million above FY 2009 as of December ($291.5 million in FY 2010 compared to $263.9 million in FY 2009). This increase reflects increased enrollments on all campuses, the implementation of a new fee to support SIS and network upgrades and revenue from the Student WellBeing Fee.

- **State Subsidy (line 5):** Total FY 2010 year-to-date state subsidy amounts are 2.6% or $1.9 million below FY 2010 as of December, reflecting a delay in subsidy payments. As reported in August, the FY 2010 actual revenues are anticipated to be $2.2 million less on the Athens Campus than originally budgeted. To-date, no additional reductions have been announced for 2010. The Office of Budget and Management reports Ohio’s financial position through the month of December remained stable, however, revenues were reported 2.5% or $375 million below estimate through January.

  *Deferred SSI Subsidy Payment:* As noted in earlier reports, the State intends to defer the final FY 2010 subsidy payment to campuses until July to comply with ARRA requirements. The University planned for this temporary impact on cash flow to be offset through unbudgeted investment gains. However, while not yet a significant concern, we are considering the potential loss of that final payment if State revenues continue to fall below estimate. The total anticipated deferment for Ohio University totals $6.4 million; this deferment will have a temporary impact on the University’s fund balance.

- **Tuition Revenue (lines 1, 2, 3):** While the Athens campus Fall to Winter quarter retention was below estimate, total tuition revenue continues to be projected above budget, resulting largely from the overall increase in enrollments and the mid-year increase in tuition, which was set to offset losses in State funding. Projected general fee over-attainment has decreased to $500,000 which reflects a higher level of adjustments for designated graduate programs than earlier estimates. The University will continue to monitor this revenue source. Based on preliminary second quarter data, the Athens campus estimates an additional $3.14 million as a result of the winter quarter rate increase and $2.5 million as a result of over-attained enrollments. The total $5.6 million in additional revenue is net of estimated resources to support designated programs. Approximately $11 million of projected fee revenue through Winter 2010 will support designated programs.

  Tuition revenues on our regional campuses continue to exceed the original budget and are on track to exceed the FY 2010 budget by $6 million, while tuition revenues on the College of Osteopathic Medicine are substantively on target with the original budget.

- **Enrollments:** Preliminary Winter Quarter enrollment news continues to have a positive impact on the budget however retention rates are 1% below the University’s goal for retention. Significant work is currently being undertaken to forecast enrollments and retention rates for the remainder of FY 2010 as well as FY 2011.

  As previously noted, a portion of the record-level Fall 2009 enrollments resulted from increased retention of students from Spring 2009 and the delayed timing of graduations compared to University estimates. At this time, the University does not consider the Fall enrollment level, and the related revenue, as a new base-level for enrollments or revenue in its planning of the FY 2011 budget.
Enrollments, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>14,447</td>
<td>14,433</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>16,382</td>
<td>16,132</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>2,643</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Campuses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chillicothe</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>2,384</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanesville</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>-116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>9,628</td>
<td>8,783</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Athens on-campus graduate activity only.

Source: Institutional Research

Investment Income (line 8)

University: Through December, the University reports $4.6 in net gains. These gains are anticipated to assist the University with two major efforts: offset any temporary cash flow issues resulting from the State’s deferred subsidy payment; and to build the fund balance and facilitate resolution of structural financial issues described in earlier reports.

University Foundation: While not reflected on the statement of Unrestricted E&G, the September 2009 report identified a one-time need for General Fund funding of $750,000 to offset a base budget deficit in the Ohio University Foundation unrestricted fund budget. As of this December 2009 report, the Foundation has recorded a $1.6 million net gain in the diversified pool, and, thus, support from the Athens General Fund is no longer required.

Expenditures:

Health Benefits: Through December 2009, benefits expenses exceed the budget by 4% (or $1.6 million) and final expenditures are projected to exceed the total budget by $2 million given the current trend. Any over-expenditure in this category will be supported by the health benefits reserve.

Growth in Medical expenses is in line with original estimates or 2% higher fiscal year-to-date compared to FY 2009. However, Prescription Drug expenses are nearly 20% over budget or 8% higher fiscal year to date compared to last year. The university was aggressive in budgeting for benefits this fiscal year due to plan design changes implemented in July 2009 as well as the move to the Rx Ohio Collaborative group purchase for prescription benefit management. The University estimated significant reductions in prescription drug costs due to these changes. Human Resources is working with the prescription benefit manager to review reasons for a higher than projected prescription drug trend.
UORC Summary of Expenditures: Expenditures at regional campuses in FY 2010 are trending toward $6 million over the FY 2010 budget. Two years of significant enrollment growth are increasing costs for faculty, course-related supplies, marketing and communication, and scholarships. In FY 2009, despite double-digit enrollment growth, expenses for regional campuses grew by just 3.5%. Expenditures for University Outreach and the Division of Lifelong and Distance Learning are trending lower and in FY 2010 are projected to decrease by approximately 19% in comparison to FY 2009 levels, reflecting the program reorganizations described in the September 2009 report. In total, expenditures for the combined UORC are projected to increase by approximately 3%.

COM Summary of Expenditures: COM expenses have been trending as planned for FY 2010. COM will be covering the budgeted state reductions through planned expense reductions and savings from vacant positions. COM is in process of strategically planning for long term budget reductions to cover current and anticipated future state reductions.

AUXILIARY OPERATIONS

General Note Regarding Auxiliaries:
- **Supported Auxiliary units:** Intercollegiate Athletics, Campus Recreation, Student Union, and Airport receive supplemental revenue from either the General Fund or General Fee to support operating costs.
- **Self-supporting Auxiliary units:** Parking Services, Residential Housing, Dining Services, Telephone Operations and Athena function within the revenues generated from their operations without the support of the General Fund or General Fee.

Below are the FY 2010 budget totals for each auxiliary unit. The budgeted ‘Net’ is compared to the ‘Projected Net’ with a resultant ‘Favorable (Unfavorable) to budget’. Where appropriate, notes follow the table to explain the projected variances to budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Budgeted Expense</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Net</th>
<th>Projected Net</th>
<th>Favorable (Unfavorable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Housing</td>
<td>$40,596</td>
<td>$18,616</td>
<td>(19,762)</td>
<td>$2,218</td>
<td>$2,218</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Services</td>
<td>$36,314</td>
<td>$34,653</td>
<td>(4,931)</td>
<td>$3,270</td>
<td>(3,270)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>$3,684</td>
<td>$18,700</td>
<td>14,069</td>
<td>(947)</td>
<td>(947)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Recreation</td>
<td>$1,198</td>
<td>$3,389</td>
<td>2,191</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone and Tech Stores</td>
<td>$2,912</td>
<td>$1,659</td>
<td>(1,253)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Union</td>
<td>$1,253</td>
<td>$2,460</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$1,399</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$1,303</td>
<td>$1,042</td>
<td>(261)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athena Theater</td>
<td>$174</td>
<td>$184</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$87,884</td>
<td>$82,102</td>
<td>(7,791)</td>
<td>(2,009)</td>
<td>(2,009)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Residential Housing:** As a result of the historically high enrollments, Residential Housing anticipates an over-attainment of revenue compared to the original budget. The University is currently working to review retention and will prepare an updated forecast for presentation in the third quarter interim financial report.

- **Dining Services:** Like Residential Housing, Dining Services anticipates an over-attainment of revenue compared to the original budget due to high enrollments. The University is currently working to review retention and will prepare an updated forecast for presentation in the third quarter interim financial report.

- **Inter-Collegiate Athletics (ICA):** As of this report, ICA is on track to operate within the authorized budget.

- **Airport:** The Airport Auxiliary currently projects expenditures to exceed the original budget by approximately $33,000 primarily as a result of unbudgeted maintenance and repairs. These expenditures will be offset by reductions in other expenditure categories.
Ohio University  
Statement of Net Assets - All Funds  
Unclassified and Unaudited  
As of December 31, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Current Funds</th>
<th>Noncurrent Funds</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational &amp; General (E&amp;G)</td>
<td>Auxiliaries</td>
<td>Plant</td>
<td>Endowment (including quasi)</td>
<td>Loan</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>December 31, 2009</td>
<td>June 30, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>47,369,361</td>
<td>18,915,814</td>
<td>(6,760,167)</td>
<td>14,329,892</td>
<td>(3,544,271)</td>
<td>3,017,788</td>
<td>1,883,976</td>
<td>75,212,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Restricted cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,072,946</td>
<td>23,239,448</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,312,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Investments</td>
<td>70,666,698</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46,422,590</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117,089,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Accounts receivable, net</td>
<td>23,318,893</td>
<td>8,158,420</td>
<td>15,421,493</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>228,243</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47,127,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Accrued interest and dividends receivable</td>
<td>189,499</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>189,499</td>
<td>372,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Notes receivable, net</td>
<td>420,001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,665,515</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,085,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Prepaid expenses and deferred charges</td>
<td>1,487,464</td>
<td>39,030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,526,494</td>
<td>15,429,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Inventories</td>
<td>772,799</td>
<td>1,843,003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,615,802</td>
<td>2,062,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Capital assets, net</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>612,267,452</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>612,267,452</td>
<td>604,963,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Total assets</td>
<td>144,224,715</td>
<td>28,956,267</td>
<td>10,734,272</td>
<td>649,836,792</td>
<td>42,878,319</td>
<td>16,911,546</td>
<td>1,883,976</td>
<td>895,425,887</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Accounts payable</td>
<td>23,065,945</td>
<td>2,214,949</td>
<td>123,456</td>
<td>53,370</td>
<td>2,062,736</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,883,976</td>
<td>29,404,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Deferred revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,929,931</td>
<td>4,789,101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,719,041</td>
<td>32,530,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Refunds and other liabilities</td>
<td>2,180,619</td>
<td>40,745</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,799</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,227,163</td>
<td>21,435,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Capital lease obligations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,498,265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,498,265</td>
<td>1,498,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Bonds and notes payable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176,775,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176,775,000</td>
<td>191,220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Bond premium, net</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,453,857</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,453,857</td>
<td>6,094,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Refundable advances for federal student loans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,416,141</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,416,141</td>
<td>8,526,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Total liabilities</td>
<td>25,246,564</td>
<td>28,185,607</td>
<td>4,912,557</td>
<td>183,786,291</td>
<td>2,062,736</td>
<td>8,416,141</td>
<td>1,883,976</td>
<td>254,493,872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net assets:

<p>| 19 Current year net change | 68,112,902 | (4,514,207) | (1,859,652) | 16,026,473 | (376,894) | 39,194 | 0 | 77,427,816 | 20,771,844 | 56,655,972 | 272.75% |
| 20 Prior year net assets   | 50,865,249 | 5,284,867  | 7,681,367    | 450,024,028 | 41,192,477 | 8,456,211 | 0 | 563,504,199 | 542,732,355 | 20,771,844 | 3.83%  |
| 21 Total net assets        | 118,978,151 | 77,060,771 | 5,821,715    | 466,050,501 | 40,815,853 | 8,456,405 | 0 | 640,932,016 | 563,504,199 | 77,427,816 | 13.74% |
| 22 Total liabilities and net assets | 144,224,715 | 28,956,267 | 10,734,272   | 649,836,792 | 42,878,319 | 16,911,546 | 1,883,976 | 895,425,887 | 872,106,402 | 23,319,485 | 2.67%  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Budget FY10</th>
<th>Actual to Date FY10</th>
<th>Percentage of Budget FY10</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease over prior year FY10 YTD</th>
<th>Actuals as a Percent of Total Actuals FY10 YTD</th>
<th>Budget as a Percent of Total Budget FY10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Instructional fee</td>
<td>$211,306,988</td>
<td>$153,644,097</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>10,660,862</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 General fee</td>
<td>$32,195,112</td>
<td>$23,037,197</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>278,593</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nonresident surcharge</td>
<td>$24,871,728</td>
<td>$20,098,200</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>5,106,262</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Other student fees</td>
<td>$8,177,353</td>
<td>$5,918,550</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>1,969,205</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 State subsidy</td>
<td>$151,972,787</td>
<td>$171,770,668</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>(1,856,769)</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sales and services</td>
<td>$6,453,776</td>
<td>$4,983,515</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>500,902</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Indirect cost recovery</td>
<td>$6,498,000</td>
<td>$3,532,306</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>236,119</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Investment income</td>
<td>$4,641,647</td>
<td>$5,100,665</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>5,100,665</td>
<td>152.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Other revenues</td>
<td>$3,962,032</td>
<td>$3,378,197</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>(288,013)</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenues</td>
<td>$463,877,776</td>
<td>$291,497,377</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>27,644,433</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURES - functional view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Instruction and departmental research</td>
<td>$178,222,983</td>
<td>$81,245,089</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>731,095</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Separately budgeted research</td>
<td>$5,437,725</td>
<td>$3,630,490</td>
<td>104.0%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>(505,025)</td>
<td>-8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Public service</td>
<td>$2,023,341</td>
<td>$1,452,502</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>(371,830)</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Academic support</td>
<td>$65,912,764</td>
<td>$58,202,244</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>2,006,399</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Student services and aid</td>
<td>$72,052,064</td>
<td>$38,959,548</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>1,479,530</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Institutional support</td>
<td>$41,906,997</td>
<td>$39,394,591</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>(1,701,393)</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Operation and maintenance of plant</td>
<td>$48,646,874</td>
<td>$24,106,047</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>2,557,116</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Central and academic reserves</td>
<td>$3,436,607</td>
<td>$5,355,197</td>
<td>-0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditures</td>
<td>$486,209,316</td>
<td>$290,571,450</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>4,534,922</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 TRANSFERS - Mandatory and non-mandatory</td>
<td>$27,668,460</td>
<td>$16,812,019</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>4,264,252</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Total expenditures and transfers</td>
<td>$463,877,776</td>
<td>$223,384,475</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>8,796,174</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT YEAR NET CHANGE TO NET ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$86,112,902</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>4,534,922</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Line 16 - Institutional Support: The FY 2010 budget reflects increased investments in University Advancement to offset losses in Ohio University Foundation income previously used to support operations.

Line 17 - Operation and Maintenance of Plant: The FY 2010 budget includes increases in the CCMC to support maintenance and $10 million for Athens campus facilities operations previously budgeted within auxiliary operations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Budget FY10</th>
<th>Actual to Date FY10</th>
<th>Original Budget FY09</th>
<th>Actual to Date FY09</th>
<th>Actuals as a Percent of Budget FY09</th>
<th>Increase(Decrease) of actuals over prior year FY09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% YTD</td>
<td>% YTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructional fee</td>
<td>211,300,988</td>
<td>153,644,097</td>
<td>199,375,130</td>
<td>142,963,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>General fee</td>
<td>32,195,112</td>
<td>23,037,197</td>
<td>31,156,904</td>
<td>22,758,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nonresident surcharge</td>
<td>24,877,728</td>
<td>20,588,200</td>
<td>26,675,542</td>
<td>17,424,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other student fees</td>
<td>8,177,353</td>
<td>5,918,550</td>
<td>8,435,871</td>
<td>5,949,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>State subsidy</td>
<td>151,972,187</td>
<td>71,770,668</td>
<td>148,356,841</td>
<td>73,868,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sales and services</td>
<td>9,453,775</td>
<td>4,951,515</td>
<td>8,053,200</td>
<td>4,392,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Indirect cost recovery</td>
<td>6,498,000</td>
<td>3,535,306</td>
<td>7,220,000</td>
<td>3,300,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,441,547</td>
<td>5,100,665</td>
<td>(8,268,225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other revenues</td>
<td>9,362,032</td>
<td>3,378,197</td>
<td>6,409,265</td>
<td>3,666,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Total revenues</td>
<td>453,877,776</td>
<td>291,497,377</td>
<td>439,164,235</td>
<td>263,852,944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURES - planning unit view**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>64,597,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>14,524,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>14,986,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>10,497,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>16,682,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>16,704,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Health and Human Services</td>
<td>16,167,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Honors Honor</td>
<td>864,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>5,534,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>17,625,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>11,473,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>5,279,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>13,831,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>20,854,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Summer Sessions</td>
<td>447,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Telecommunications Center</td>
<td>1,902,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>University College</td>
<td>3,822,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>VP Finance and Administration</td>
<td>43,382,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>VP Research</td>
<td>31,657,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>VP Student Affairs</td>
<td>8,131,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>VP University Advancement</td>
<td>5,303,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Voinovich School</td>
<td>2,645,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>College of Medicine</td>
<td>26,444,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>University Outreach and Regional Campuses</td>
<td>72,443,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Central Pools and Other</td>
<td>27,968,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Total expenditures and transfers</td>
<td>453,877,776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CURRENT YEAR NET CHANGE TO NET ASSETS**

|                    | - | 68,112,902 |

**Line 28 - VP Finance & Administration (VPFA):** Beginning in FY 2010, the VPFA budget reflects transfers of $10.3 million for facilities operations previously budgeted and expended by auxiliary operations. When these transfers are factored out, the VPFA budget reflects the addition of general fund investment to the loss of investment income previously used to support operations.

**Line 31 - VP University Advancement:** The FY 2010 budget reflects additional general fund investment to offset the loss of investment income previously used to support operations.

**Line 22 - Voinovich School:** The FY 2010 budget reflects an additional investment of general fund support to offset the loss of restricted state revenues.
Budget Updates Agenda

- FY 2010 Budget Implementation
  - Update on Key Revenue Drivers
  - Update on Budget Challenges
- FY 2011 Budget Development
  - Overview of Budget Development Process
  - Update to Budget Assumptions
  - Next Steps

FY 2010 Budget Implementation Update on Key Revenue Drivers

- Tuition & Fee Revenues:
  - Preliminary Winter Enrollments
- State Budget Update
## FY 2010 Budget Implementation Update on Budget Challenges

### FY 2010 Budget Challenges
- Updates Since January Meeting
  - Investment Income
  - Estimated General Fee Revenue
  - Bowl Game Expenditures
- Addressing Budget Challenges

### FY 2010 Budget Implementation Update

| Revenues  | Total | RGQ Base | 1 Time Gen Fd | 1 Time Gen Fund | Capital | OHI
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Share of Instruction (SS)</td>
<td>$ (2.20)</td>
<td>$ (2.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$ 3.14</td>
<td>$ 3.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add'l Revenue due to Enrollment*</td>
<td>$ 2.20</td>
<td>$ 0.50</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Park Place / Japan residual</td>
<td>$ 0.74</td>
<td>$ 0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$ 4.18</td>
<td>$ 0.94</td>
<td>$ 0.50</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td>$ 0.74</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>RGQ Base</th>
<th>1 Time Gen Fd</th>
<th>1 Time Gen Fund</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>OHI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERP project</td>
<td>$ 0.99</td>
<td>$ 0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severance payrolls</td>
<td>$ 0.10</td>
<td>$ 0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to CCOS (eligible students)</td>
<td>$ 0.70</td>
<td>$ 0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to Full-Scholarship students</td>
<td>$ 0.24</td>
<td>$ 0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Park Place relocation shortfall</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Benefits</td>
<td>$ 0.31</td>
<td>$ 0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Football Bowl Game</td>
<td>$ 0.15</td>
<td>$ 0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc funding requests</td>
<td>$ 0.20</td>
<td>$ 0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$ 1.64</td>
<td>$ 1.14</td>
<td>$ 0.15</td>
<td>$ 1.40</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- $ 0.36 | $ (0.20) | $ 0.35 | $ 0.60 | $ 0.25 | $ - |
FY 2011 Budget Development
Overview of Budget Development Process

- Update of Budget Development Process
  - FY 2011 Budget Development
  - Multi-Year Planning Efforts
- Preliminary Budget Reduction Proposal
  - $13.75 Million Planning Unit Reductions
  - Campus-wide Participation & Feedback on Proposal
    - Forums
    - Web-site Feedback
    - Formal Response to Campus Feedback

FY 2011 Budget Development
Overview of Budget Development Process

- Budget Development Incorporates:
  - Focus on Instructional Capacity & Link to Revenue
  - Transformational Changes in Activities
    - For Implementation in FY 2011 and Beyond
    - Reconfiguration/Realignment of Academic Programs
    - Pursuit of Efficiencies in Administrative Units
    - Revenue Generation Initiatives
FY 2011 Budget Development
Updates to Budget Assumptions

- Key Expenditure Drivers to be Updated
  - Vision OHIO Investments
  - Financial Aid
  - Salary Adjustments
  - Health Benefits
  - Utilities

- Key Revenue Drivers to be Updated
  - Projected Enrollments
  - Tuition
  - State Support

FY 2011 Budget Development
Next Steps

- Finalize Budget Assumptions
- Develop Final Budget Proposal
- Engage in Multi-year Planning
- Continue Contingency Planning
APPROVAL OF PROJECTS AND AUTHORIZATION TO DEVELOP CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS, RECEIVE BIDS AND AWARD CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS FOR RESIDENCE HALL ROOF REPLACEMENT, JAMES HALL CASEWORK REFURBISHMENT, BROMLEY HALL RENOVATIONS, AND WEST GREEN LANDSCAPE AND INFRASTRUCTURE

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3164

WHEREAS, the following four capital projects with total project budgets of $500,000 or more have been planned and developed

A. Residence Hall Roof Replacements with a total project budget of $1,130,000,

B. James Hall Casework Refurbishment with a total project budget of $640,000,

C. Bromley Hall Renovations with a total project budget of $3,000,000,

D. West Green Landscaping and Infrastructure with a total project budget of $1,500,000, and

WHEREAS, the above mentioned projects have been planned, developed, and funded by the Housing Auxiliary as part of the 10 Year Capital Plan.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees authorizes the receipt of bids and the President or his designee to accept and award construction contracts within the total project budgets identified.
Interoffice Communication

Date: March 15, 2010

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Michael Angelini
Interim Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer

Re: CONSTRUCTION PROJECT APPROVAL REQUESTS

All construction project approval requests for the April 2010 Committee meeting relate to auxiliary major and minor capital facility planning. Major and minor capital projects are planned and implemented each year in order to upgrade facilities incrementally. Vigilant maintenance of the residential community’s housing and dining facilities on the Athens campus is crucial to the Vision Ohio strategic priority of Enrollment Management to secure and maintain optimal enrollments.

A capital plan for the Housing Auxiliary was part of the overall 10 Year Capital Plan approved by the Board of Trustees in October of 2009. For note, the Housing Auxiliary according to plan, is proceeding with program and schematic design and estimating for renovation of Bush Hall. As the estimate for that project at its schematic stage is finalized the project will be brought to the Board for approval consideration.

At this time, four of the planned projects are budgeted at $500,000 or more in total project costs and are presented to the Board for construction project approval. A resolution is provided that addresses all four of these projects.

FY 2011 Residence Hall Roof Replacements:
This project will replace the tile roof on Voigt Hall near College Green, and the fiberglass shingled roofs on Dougan, Wray, and Hoover Halls on South Green. The total project budget is $1,130,000. This is the first roofing replacement on the 1954 Voigt Hall. The roofs on the three South Green Buildings are 10 to 12 years old. These roofs were replaced with improper fasteners and the company that did the work went out of business.

James Hall Casework Refurbishment:
The project will refurbish all the casework in the residence rooms in James Hall. 84,900 gross square foot James Hall houses 379 students. A typical double room includes two wardrobes, two drawer units, and two overhead bins. Hardware and wardrobe doors will be replaced. All casework will be refinished. The total project budget is $640,000 for all 178 rooms in the building.
FY 2011 Bromley Hall Renovations:
Bromley Hall was built in 1966 and purchased by the University in 2001. Bromley houses approximately 440 students in singles, doubles and triple occupancy rooms. Infrastructure improvements have been on-going since the purchase of the facility in 2001. Renovations of the student rooms in Bromley Hall have been undertaken since 2006. Thus far 72 rooms and 48 bathrooms have been renovated. 72 rooms and 40 bathrooms are anticipated to be renovated with this project. Renovations will include asbestos abatement, plumbing, lighting, mechanical work, interior finishes, casework, furnishings and window replacement. The total cost for this project is estimated at $3,000,000. Future phases to renovate additional rooms are anticipated. With this phase completed, there will be 128 rooms and 64 bathrooms left to renovate.

FY 2011 West Green Landscape and Infrastructure:
The total project cost for this project is estimated at $1,500,000 for the first phase. Underground storm water, sewer lines, and gas line will be replaced on the green flanked by Irvine, Wilson, James, and Sargent Halls. The walkways will be replaced and plant material will be replaced and added. An improved fire lane access will be developed off Richland Avenue as requested by the Athens City Fire Department. Handicap Access will be improved with the elimination of steps in various areas. Additional phases will be proposed in a future years which will address the area of the green adjacent to Boyd Hall and the area adjacent to Richland Avenue.

There will be an opportunity to discuss the resolution at the upcoming April Resources Committee meeting. Please feel free to contact me with any questions regarding these projects.
Construction Projects

Tab

Construction Projects
Agenda

- Residence Hall Roof Replacement
- James Hall Casework Refurbishment
- Bromley Hall Renovations
- West Green Landscape and Infrastructure
Construction Projects
Residence Hall Roof Replacement

- Replace tile roof on Voigt Hall near College Green and fiberglass shingled roofs on Dougan, Wray, and Hoover on South Green.
- Budget: $1,130,000
- Fund source: Housing Auxiliary as part of the overall 10 Year Capital Plan.

Construction Projects
James Hall Casework Refurbishment

- Refurbish all casework in the residence rooms in James Hall. Hardware and wardrobe doors will be replaced.
- 84,900 gross square feet houses 379 students
- Budget: $640,000
- Fund source: Housing Auxiliary as part of the overall 10 Year Capital Plan
Construction Projects
Bromley Hall Renovations

- Infrastructure improvements have been ongoing since the purchase.
- Budget: $3,000,000
- Fund source: Housing Auxiliary as part of the overall 10 Year Capital Plan.

Construction Projects
West Green Landscape and Infrastructure

- Underground storm water and sewer lines will be replaced on the green flanked by Irvine, Wilson, James and Sargent Halls. The walkways and plant materials will be replaced. An improved fire lane access will be developed off Richland Avenue.
- Budget: $1,500,000
- Fund source: Housing Auxiliary as part of the overall 10 Year Capital Plan.
Interoffice Communication

Date: March 15, 2010

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Michael T. Angelini
   Interim Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer

Re: Transforming South Green Housing

This mailing includes a presentation regarding the investigation of opportunities for funding improvements to portions of student housing on the Athens Campus.

Excluding Adams Hall, the University's South Green is comprised of 19 residence halls with a total of 2,887 beds and makes up approximately one-third of the University's total housing. 15 of these halls were built between 1968 and 1970 while the remaining halls, known as the "Front Four", were constructed between 1965 and 1967. None of these halls have seen a major renovation since completion 40 years ago and none are considered for renovation within the current ten-year residential capital plan.

A collaborative team including staff from Residential Housing, Legal Affairs, and Finance and Administration has been exploring alternatives (i) for the development of a project that would renovate or replace the aforementioned housing stock and (ii) for the potential management of the housing. These alternatives include the potential for a public-private partnership for the development and/or property management of this project. The team is interested in identifying methods by which to develop and transform a portion of the aforementioned outdated and inefficient housing stock into high-quality living environments that will support the academic mission and enhance recruitment and retention efforts. The purpose of the presentation is to update the Board of the team's efforts to date and discuss recommendations that will lead to the issuance of a request for proposals for potential partners which is anticipated during summer 2010.

If you have any questions prior to the April committee meeting, please contact the Vice President for Finance and Administration office.
Transformation of the University's South Green Residential Housing

Summary
Excluding Adams Hall, the University's South Green is comprised of 19 residence halls with a total of 2,887 beds and makes up approximately one-third of the University's total housing. 15 of these halls were built between 1968 and 1970 while the remaining halls, known as the "Front Four", were constructed between 1965 and 1967. None of these halls have seen a major renovation since completion approximately 40 years ago and none are considered for renovation within the current ten-year residential capital plan. Further, the design styles of these halls are outdated and inefficient. Student Affairs has evidence that suggests that the current condition of existing residence halls places the University at a significant competitive disadvantage with its peers. Improvement of these facilities is aligned with one of the University's strategic priorities - to realize and maintain optimal enrollments.

University personnel are reviewing alternatives for transforming the aforementioned housing stock into affordable, high-quality living environments that will support the academic mission and enhance recruitment and retention efforts, while improving the University's balance sheet and financial strength - an additional University strategic priority. These alternatives are summarized as follows as well as in Exhibit A which includes the major advantages and disadvantages related to each.

Alternative Solutions
It is important to note that the University's opportunity to avoid adverse impacts to its balance sheet and credit improves as one proceeds through the alternatives below. However, improvement in this factor is inversely related to the University's control over the project, including development management (e.g., planning, design and construction) and property management.

Alternative 1 - The University issues general receipts bonds to finance construction of the improvements which would be delivered through a conventional construction delivery method.

- Major advantage - University maintains control of development and property management
- Major disadvantage - Adversely impacts the University's balance sheet and credit

Affirming the financial position of the University in April 2009, Moody's Investors Service ("Moody's") suggested that the "broad general receipts pledge and annual cash flow provide adequate debt service coverage". This review assumed total debt outstanding of $238.6 million, including debt related to the Ohio University Foundation's affiliate, Housing for Ohio, Inc. ("HFO"). As of January 31, 2010 the University had outstanding debt related to general receipts bonds of $205.0 million including HFO's outstanding debt. HFO was established in 2000 as a public-private partnership to improve the condition of off-campus housing in the Athens area through development of University Courtyard, a 580-bed apartment complex. Both major rating agencies, Moody's and Standard & Poor's, include HFO debt when assessing the University's credit rating.

As debt principal continues to be paid at a reasonably aggressive pace, adding additional debt in an environment of declining state appropriations must be accomplished strategically. Unfortunately, with as much as $480 million of deferred maintenance on the Athens Campus, there are more priorities than there are sources of funds. In the interest of limiting the University's debt capacity for the institution's academic buildings, Alternative 1 is not recommended.

Alternative 2 - The University would create a separate but affiliated entity to issue debt and fund the improvements in a manner similar to that of Alternative 1 with the possibility of creating a public-private partnership for the delivery of the improvements and a portion of the property management responsibilities.
• Major advantages - University maintains some control of project and avoids impact to its balance sheet
• Major disadvantage - Adversely impacts the University's credit

This approach is commensurate to the strategy by which HFO was established and, in turn, University Courtyard was created. Debt would be issued by an affiliate of the University but would not be included directly within its financial statements. It would, however, impact the University's credit. The affiliated entity could be created in the interest of the University's mission and, therefore, could be aligned with University goals including preservation of campus design standards, the parietal rule and affordability. Due to the amount of control the University would retain and the avoidance of University issued debt, Alternative 2 is recommended. It should be noted, however, that this alternative may be reconsidered should the cost of debt for project-specific financing be problematic as compared to the University's general receipts bonds (Alternative 1) or the opportunity to develop a property through Alternative 3 becomes more attractive.

Alternative 3 - The University would lease property to a private developer who utilizes corporate debt or equity to finance the project.

• Major advantage - University avoids impact to its balance sheet and, possibly, credit
• Major disadvantage - University cedes an undetermined amount of control over the project

This approach is commensurate to the strategy by which the University provided a ground lease to a private developer who constructed the existing Mill Street Apartments on Stimson Avenue (the "Mill Street Project"). While the University receives ground rent and a share of the revenues from the property, it is not entitled to participate in decisions related to property management including the establishment of rates. While neither rating agency currently includes the Mill Street Project on the University's credit, Moody's considered the possibility during their rating analysis in April 2009. Moody's neglected to incorporate this debt due to the University's lack of involvement in the management of the property. Through ground lease negotiations, if interested in this alternative, the University could require that some control be included in the terms of the agreement. Due to the amount of control the University would likely cede in such a project and the undetermined impact to the University's credit, Alternative 3 is not recommended. Should a potential partner who would afford the University reasonable control over the project be identified, this alternative may be reconsidered.

Alternative 4 - The University would sell property to a private developer who would finance and construct the improvements and, most likely, provide property management.

• Major advantage - University receives property sale proceeds and avoids balance sheet and credit impacts
• Major disadvantage - The University cedes most if not all control and creates new competition

The University has received purchase offers from developers for various properties on the edge and away from the central portion of the Athens campus. In the immediate term, the University is interested in establishing housing that is located in an area that is central to campus. In the interest of preserving all control over property and improvements that are central to the Athens campus, Alternative 4 is not recommended. Should the University have real estate holdings away from central campus that might interest a private developer, a strategy to dispose of the asset(s) in exchange for funds or consideration may be recommended.

Next Steps

University personnel, including individuals from Legal Affairs, Residential Housing, Procurement, Facilities Design and Construction, and Finance are in the process of developing a request for proposal (the "RFP") to be sent to firms interested in participating in the renovation or replacement of all or a portion of the residence halls described above. The RFP will focus on delivering the project utilizing Alternative 2 but will also explore opportunities for public-private partnerships. Potential benefits and risks to be considered are as follows:
Potential Benefits

- Cost savings - The University will explore the opportunity for cost savings for the construction of capital projects as well as the operation and maintenance of services. Cost savings can also be realized in the operation and maintenance of facilities and service systems. Of some interest, private partners may be able to reduce the cost of operating or maintaining facilities by applying economies of scale, innovative technologies, more flexible procurement and compensation arrangements, or by reducing overhead.

- Risk sharing - The University will analyze sharing risks related to development and property management with a private partner. Risks could include cost overruns, inability to meet schedules for service delivery, difficulty in complying with environmental and other regulations, or the risk that revenues may not be sufficient to pay operating and capital costs.

- Enhancement of revenues – The University will incorporate pro-forma revenues and expenses related to the renovated South Green residence halls into its residential housing master plan. Wherein evident, public-private partnerships will be explored for the opportunity to introduce more innovative revenue sources that would not be possible under conventional methods of service delivery.

Potential Risks

- Loss of control - Public-private partnerships, by their nature, involve a sharing of risks, benefits and decision making between the partners. Depending on how significant the private entity’s investment, the University may need to allow for involvement of the private partner in decisions concerning how services are delivered and priced. The issue of control needs to be addressed at the time the project is defined and kept in mind as the contract is negotiated. In the final analysis, the University has the authority and responsibility to establish service standards.

- Increased costs - The University will need to consider the true costs of providing services when establishing their pricing policies for fees for services. For example, the costs of overhead or administration and depreciation of assets are often not included in the pricing of individual services. In some cases, there are explicit subsidies for specific services. The delivery of services through public private partnerships requires pricing policies and fees to reflect all relevant costs. The cost of managing public controversy over increased fees can negate the value of the partnership.

- Political risks - Unfamiliarity with such a partnership may result in higher political risks with the city and neighborhood associations.

- Unacceptable levels of accountability - With public-private partnerships, the lines of accountability for the provision of services are less clear than under conventional service delivery. This may result in criticism of the partnership arrangement and the private partner, or require increased involvement of the University in ensuring compliance and responding to public demands.

- Unreliable service - Private partners may be prone to labor disputes, financial problems or other circumstances that may prevent them from honoring their commitments. Public-private partnership contracts should anticipate such difficulties and put in place measures to address them.

- Inability to benefit from competition - Competition among private partners to secure the right to enter into a public-private partnership is an important benefit for the University. Competition leads to innovation, efficiency and lower costs. The student housing market has a tremendous number of capable firms.

- Reduced quality or efficiency of service - If not properly structured, public-private partnership contracts can result in a reduction in service quality, inefficient service delivery or a lack of proper facility maintenance. For
example, cost-plus contracts provide little incentive for the private partner to maintain quality or increase efficiency. The University will also consider the life-cycle cost approach in establishing evaluation criteria for projects or services.

- Bias in the selection process - The potential for the University to be accused of bias in selecting a partner may be more prevalent with public-private partnerships given that “low bid” may not always win the contract due to the presence of other valuable criteria. The potential for accusation of bias can be reduced through a well developed RFP and a resulting agreement which includes these alternative measures of value.

- Labor issues - The University’s obligations to its AFSCME contract must be respected.

The University Team identified above expects to distribute an RFP during summer 2010 in the hopes of identifying a potential partner shortly thereafter. The partner and relationship will be presented to the University’s Board of Trustees for approval prior to executing an agreement for the project.
## INVESTIGATION OF SOUTH GREEN HOUSING ALTERNATIVES
### EXHIBIT A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
<th>IMPACT TO THE UNIVERSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The University finances the project through the issuance of its own debt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ohio University Example (2005): Adams Hall**

| 2 | The University creates a separate corporation to finance the project through the issuance of debt | The University engages with a private developer to construct the Improvements | An affiliate of the private developer manages the property in conjunction with the University | Yes | No | - The corporation retains exclusive control: planning, programming and design, all future revenue, establishing room rates | - Impacts University's credit | - The University's credit rating may be negatively impacted | - The corporation would not be under University control | - AFSCME obligations |

**Ohio University Example (2001): University Courtyard (Housing for Ohio, Inc.)**

| 3 | The University ground leases land to a private entity who finances the project with equity and/or corporate debt | The private entity is responsible for developing the project | The private entity is responsible for management of the property | Yes | Possibly | - The University retains some control: planning, programming and design, share of future revenue, works with private entity to establish room rates | - The University cedes some control | - The University's credit rating may be negatively impacted | - New competition may be created | - AFSCME obligations |

**Ohio University Example (2006): Mill Street Apartments**

| 4 | The University sells land to a private entity for the purpose of developing a student housing project | The private entity is responsible for developing the project | The private entity is responsible for management of the property | Yes | Yes | - Does not impact University's balance sheet | - New competition is created | - The University most likely cedes most if not all control | - The University's credit rating may be negatively impacted |

No Example - this has not been done by the University
Transforming South Green Housing

Tab

Transforming South Green Housing

- 19 Residence Halls
- 2,887 Beds
- Constructed: 1965 – 1970
- Renovations: Minimal

Note: Information above excludes Adams Hall
Transforming South Green Housing Solution Considerations

- Strategic Priorities
  - Enrollment – Recruitment and Retention
  - Improving the Balance Sheet and Financial Strength
- Control
  - Planning, Programming and Design
  - Property Management
  - Revenue and Room Rates

Transforming South Green Housing Alternatives

1 - University-led Project Financed with University Debt
2 - Creation of a Separate Entity to Finance and Construct the Improvements
3 - University Leases Property to a Private Entity
4 - University Divests Property to a Private Entity
Transforming South Green Housing
Preliminary Recommendation

Alternative 2

Creation of a Separate Entity to Finance and Construct the Improvements
- Project-specific Debt
- Private Developer and/or Property Manager
- Maintain Much Control
Interoffice Communication

Date: March 15, 2010

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Michael T. Angelini
Interim Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer

Re: Update - Board of Regents 6 Year Capital Plan

In October 2009, the University’s 10 Year Capital Plan was presented to the Board of Trustees and approved. At that time it was made clear that the Athens campus capital plan was based on assumptions of state appropriations at a level of $25 million per biennium. The Board of Regent’s capital plan submission process was behind its typical schedule. There was uncertainty about the level of the next capital appropriation and the timing of its availability then, and some of that uncertainty still exists today.

The University received instruction from the Board of Regents in early February to submit a plan for state capital appropriations by February 26. With those instructions was the direction to base the plan on a $22 million per biennium appropriation, not only for the first biennium, but also for the subsequent biennium’s of the six year plan required submission. This has the effect of being $3 million short of our first biennium plan, $9 million short of the six plan we envisioned, and $15 million short of the ten year plan the Board approved. The ten year plan scope will now take approximately 12 years to complete if the same mix of state appropriations and gift funding hold.

The Facilities Planning Council, chaired by Provost Benoit and myself, discussed possible modifications to the first biennium of the plan and trades offs of reducing one project in the plan over another. We in turn discussed alternatives with President McDavis and he approved a plan for submission. No major capital project in the first biennium of the plan was deleted. The project to upgrade the systems in Clippinger Hall, which has been an on-going effort over several years, will have one phase reduced and the scope of the work deferred to the next biennium in the plan, and we will not be able to accomplish the number of deferred maintenance projects as originally envisioned, but all in all the goals of the original plan were met with the submission.

As noted above, this was a six year plan required submission and the project scope that was originally planned to occur in the last biennium was not shown and assumed deferred to a subsequent biennium.

There still may be further iterations in the capital plan submittal and approval process, and if significant, we will provide an update. Otherwise when the appropriation is approved by the legislature we will bring the specific project list, matched to the legislatively approved appropriation, back to the Board of Trustees for approval. A specific list of deferred maintenance projects will be provided at that time as well.

If I can be of further assistance or provide additional information regarding this matter prior to the meeting, please contact me.
Interoffice Communication

Date: March 15, 2010

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Michael T. Angelini
Interim Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer

Re: UPDATE - ENERGY PROJECT PERFORMANCE CONTRACT INITIATIVE

In order to keep the committee informed on developments regarding performance contracting for energy projects, what follows is the January agenda memo which introduced the topic, edited in bold print to reflect updates and additional information.

The Board of Trustees was introduced to the concept and role of performance contracting in October of 2008 in relation to House Bill 251 Energy Conservation legislation, and again in April 2009 after more exploration in relation to new processes and contract templates for implementation at Ohio public agencies. The concept is energy conservation projects accomplished through a contractor at risk relationship. At the January, 2010 meeting the Board of Trustees was advised that Facilities had embarked on a process to gauge interest among qualified contractors.

Performance contracted energy conservation projects have the potential to move the university towards stated goals and priorities through:

- addressing campus and Vision Ohio goals for sustainability,
- moving the university toward meeting its House Bill 251 energy intensity reduction targets and toward compliance with the President’s Climate Commitment,
- supporting our USO recognized Center of Excellence for Energy and the Environment,
- accessing funding through a contractor at risk relationship, thereby preserving available debt capacity for academic priorities and not negatively impacting debt burden ratios, and
- addressing deferred maintenance through project packages with up to 15 year paybacks, thereby positively impacting facilities ratios and aiding in the strengthening of the balance sheet.

The process has been delayed slightly while the Attorney General’s Office clarified how the House Bill 7 language is now interpreted and the limitations that places on a university’s lack of ability to prequalify contractors. The RFP is planned to be issued by the time of the
April Board meeting and responses received and analyzed two months later with a final agreement in place by fall 2010.

Ohio University has good history in identifying energy conservation project packages with a good pay back opportunity, funding those projects through debt, and implementing them. Physical energy conservation projects of approximately $7M were accomplished in the period from 1998 to 2007. The contractor at risk relationship was however not part of the implementation of those projects and they were done at a time when the required payback period was 10 years.

Revised legislation now allows for a 15 year payback on energy project packages. The increased payback time frame will lead to more deferred maintenance issues being taken care of through the initiative. The integrity of the building envelope----roofs, wall structure, insulation, windows, etc.----has a direct impact on energy savings.

The Attorney General’s office has brought better structure to the agreement process with templates for contractor selection and contract award. Under the arrangement the contractor will guarantee a certain amount of savings due to physical energy conservation projects they finance and implement and the University will agree to pay the contractor a set amount based on those savings. That payment amount will come from the University’s utility budget. During the period of the agreement the savings must be monitored carefully to ensure the integrity of the agreement. Any modifications the University might make during that period might modify campus utility cost in the aggregate positively or negatively and those changes may or may not be due to performance of the projects under the agreement. Metering, monitoring, and auditing of each project covered by the agreement is necessary to maintain the integrity of the guarantee.

There are also financing opportunities, e.g the Ohio Air Quality Commission, that the University will explore that might reduce the total cost of the overall package of projects, and increase the number of projects that can be included.

It is anticipated that the value of proposed energy projects proposed by prospective contractors for the Athens Campus and one regional campus could be in the general range of $200M or more. This is highly dependent on the analyses provided by the prospective contractors. The University will need to decide a level of tolerance and the number and magnitude of projects to accept under the agreement. Based on past investment and return on energy conservation projects, the University estimates that in order to meet the House Bill 251 energy intensity reduction target, the University would need to undertake $35M in energy conservation projects in order to meet the goal for the Athens campus alone. This could be off balanced with behavioral changes on campus and better focus of major capital rehabilitation projects to the degree the level of major capital funding continues.

A phased approach may be considered that would ultimately bring energy analysis and improvements to each of the regional campuses.

If I can be of further assistance or provide additional information regarding this matter, please contact me.
Interoffice Communication

Date:     March 15, 2010

To:       The President and Board of Trustees

From:     Michael Angelini
          Interim Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer

Re:       Financial Ratio Analysis

Included with the board materials is the Financial Ratio Analysis for Ohio University (Ohio) and our national aspirational peers, excluding University of Delaware whose statements follow non-profit instead of governmental accounting standards. Three of our sister institutions in Ohio are included in the analysis as well, chosen based on their similarities to Ohio.

For each ratio, the current year calculation for Ohio is shown as well as information on how annual results have impacted the resulting calculation and our ranking among our peers. There are two charts for each ratio which graphically show the FY 2009 ranking of Ohio to the peers and five year ratio trend lines for Ohio compared to the peers.

Appendices are included which detail the calculations for each of the five years for each peer institution, five years of audited financial statement information for Ohio and FY 2008 bar graphs of Ohio compared to peers, for comparative purposes.

I will be happy to answer any questions you may have about the reports prior to or during the April meeting.
Ohio University
Financial Ratio Analysis

With 5 years of comparative data
with peer institutions

June 30, 2005 through June 30, 2009
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Introduction:

In an effort to improve the University’s financial position on several fronts, we have embarked on a continual project to assess the University’s progress in key financial areas over the years (a longitudinal view) and as compared to its peer institutions using their audited financial statements as source data. The peer institutions were selected in the summer of 2004 with assistance from the Office of Institutional Research. The objective was to produce a list of institutional peers based on defined data and to identify available and reliable measures for benchmarks to be used in the University’s strategic planning efforts. There were 10 peer institutions selected and they are:

- Auburn University Main Campus **
- Clemson University
- Indiana University – Bloomington **
- University of Connecticut
- University of Delaware
- University of Missouri – Columbia **
- University of New Hampshire Main Campus **
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- University of Tennessee
- Washington State University

The population of universities for the study was the 102 public doctoral/research-extensive universities, (now referred to as, “Research University (high research activity)”) in the United States, as defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in its 2000 classification. According to the Carnegie Foundation, “These institutions typically offer a wide range of baccalaureate programs, and they are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. During the period studied, they awarded 50 or more doctoral degrees per year across at least 15 disciplines.”

Variables were selected primarily from *U.S. News and World Report’s “America’s Best Colleges”* and the US Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). US News ranks colleges and universities based on measures related to undergraduate education, using data it collects from the institutions themselves and from other sources, such as IPEDS. The selection of variables was based on relevance to Ohio University’s mission as well as reliability and availability of data. Nine broad categories were created:

- Peer Assessment
- Freshman Admissions Selectivity
- Retention and Graduation Rates
- Student Experience
- Institutional Finances
- Faculty Salary
- Institutional Characteristics
- Race/Ethnicity
- Tuition and Financial Aid

** Financial statements of these schools do not isolate the activity of the benchmark campus site only, so the benchmark financial data is of a broader picture
Within these nine categories, 48 individual variables were used. For each variable, similarities were sought between Ohio University and each of the 102 public universities. Natural “break points” were identified for each variable, with scores both above and below Ohio University’s data point. For example, for freshman retention, universities were identified that had similar retention rates, both above and below Ohio University’s 84 percent rate at that time. For each university, a count was taken of the number of commonalities with Ohio University. A list of 29 universities was produced that had the most commonalities across the broadest range of categories and variables. Ohio University’s administrative officers reviewed this list and collaborated to identify the final 10.

The data for all of the universities are being updated annually on Institutional Research’s website. If needed, additional measures may be added as they become available to assist the strategic planning effort. Institutional Research’s website entitled, “Ohio University Peer University Study” is located at:

http://www.ohiou.edu/instres/univ/peerstudy/index.html

and includes the following links:
- Listing of Peer Institutions and Web Links (PDF)
- Peer Institution Comparisons by Type of Variable 2008-09 Update (PDF)
- Data Definitions and Sources (PDF)
- Peer Institutions and Carnegie Classifications (PDF)
- NCES - IPEDS Peer Comparisons (PDF)

In addition to the peer institutions chosen by the administrative officers (minus the University of Delaware whose statements follow non-profit instead of governmental accounting), we are including 3 of our sister institutions in the State of Ohio for the purpose of this analysis. They were selected based on similarities such as size of student population, bond rating, residential composition, and competition for many of the same students. Those institutions are:

Kent State University
Miami University
University of Cincinnati

Assessing Financial Health:

“We believe the fundamental concept of assessing financial health by using a limited number of ratios has improved the understanding of the financial health of colleges and universities.” The preceding quote is from Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education, sixth edition ©2005 by Prager, Sealy, & Co., LLC; KPMG LLP; and BearingPoint Inc. and many of the following ratios are among those recommended by that document.

Any discussion of where we want to be, must ultimately determine where we are in order to determine strategy of how to get there. The analysis of each ratio will begin with how each is calculated, including a reference to line items of Ohio University’s audited financial data for frame of reference. Most numbers will come from the Statements of Net Assets (SNA) or the Statements of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Net Assets (SRECNA), which are included as Appendix II. The analysis includes a short explanation of the meaning of each ratio presented here and some discussion of our relative performance when compared to the prior year and to our peer institutions. To enhance understanding we have graphed the presentation of each ratio. The first graph compares our ratio with those of our peer and chosen sister institutions for FY 2009 and shows the average of the group. The second graph shows the longitudinal view of the University’s performance over the last five years (FY 2005 through FY 2009) compared to the University’s peer (9 of them here) and 3 Ohio sister institutions.

All information in italics represents excerpts from Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education, sixth edition, referenced above.
Primary Reserve Ratio:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expendable Net Assets</th>
<th>Total Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lines 31 + 32 of SNA</td>
<td>116,267,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 20 + 28 + 29 of SRECNA</td>
<td>563,568,909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Primary Reserve Ratio measures the financial strength of the institution by comparing expendable net assets to total expenses. Expendable net assets represent those assets that the institution can access relatively quickly and spend to satisfy its debt obligations. This ratio provides a snapshot of financial strength and flexibility by indicating how long the institution could function using its expendable reserves without relying on additional net assets generated by operations. Trend analysis indicates whether an institution has increased its net worth in proportion to the rate of growth in its operating size.” Increasing over time denotes strength.

- In order to improve the Primary Reserve Ratio, expendable net assets must increase, expenses decrease, or some combination of the two. Expendable net assets, specifically **Unrestricted Expendable Net Assets** (bolded for emphasis) are critical to cover unforeseen contingencies and to provide funds to invest in strategic priorities. The ratio, observed over a period of time, shows whether or not we have increased our net worth in relation to our expenses. The numerator is expendable net assets of the institution which includes both unrestricted and restricted net assets.

- According to the reference materials used, a Primary Reserve Ratio of .40x or better is advisable. At this level an institution has the ability to cover about 4.8 months of expenses from reserves, without the need to generate additional net assets through operations. We are in a position to cover about 2.5 months of expenses (down from FY 2008’s number of 3.0) from reserves, whereas the group average would cover about 4.7 months (down from FY 2008’s number of 5.4). In order to achieve the recommended ratio level we would need to increase expendable net assets by approximately $109.2 million (up from last year’s number of $76.6 million). Our level of expendable net assets is more suited for an institution whose annual expenses are $272.9 million less, or almost half as much, as ours.

- In summary, our Primary Reserve Ratio went down in FY 2009, the group’s average went down, and we lost an additional place in the ranks, now being second from the bottom instead of third. It does appear from the trend line that we are experiencing less volatility over time than that of our peers.
Viability Ratio:

Expendable Net Assets
Long-Term Debt (current and noncurrent portions)

| Lines 31 + 32 of SNA | 116,267,732 |
| Lines 18 + 19 + 23 + 24 of SNA | 192,718,265 |

- The Viability Ratio measures one of the most basic determinants of clear financial health: the availability of expendable net assets to cover debt should the institution need to settle its obligations as of the balance sheet date.

- The calculation of the Viability Ratio is the same as the one used in the Senate Bill 6 calculation. A ratio of 1:1 implies that we have sufficient expendable net assets to pay off all our long-term debt. Due to the on-going nature of a public institution and the long-term nature of debt payoff, it is not necessary to have expendable net assets to cover all amounts borrowed for long-term purposes. According to the resources used for this study, the determination of the right level for this particular ratio is University-specific and we should determine our own desired level. For example, if we are in a major capital expansion phase, this ratio may very well be lower than normal.

- Although there is no absolute measure which determines when an institution is no longer financially viable, the Primary Reserve Ratio, when considered with the Viability Ratio, both begin to define our ability to respond to external adverse conditions with internal resources, make strategic one-time investments, and make strategic use of long term debt.

- Expendable net assets decreased from $133.2 million in FY 2008 to $116.3 million in FY 2009, whereas long-term debt increased from $167.4 million to $192.7 in the same time period. Both events affected the variance in a negative way, although not enough to change the Senate Bill 6 score value of 3. We continue to rank in the lower half of our peer institutions on the Viability Ratio, although we maintained our relative position from FY 2008. The group’s average decreased from 1.026 to .915 and our rating decreased from .795 to .603.
Net Income Ratio:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Net Assets</th>
<th>Total Revenues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 36 of SRECNA</td>
<td>20,771,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines 9 + 22 through 27 + 35 of SRECNA</td>
<td>584,340,753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Net Income Ratio offers a measure of profitability and is the third ratio in the Senate Bill 6 series included in the composite score. The numerator is made up of the entire change in net assets and the denominator is all institutional revenues. This includes revenues received for capital needs.

- Our Net Income Ratio increased in FY 2009 – from .029 to .036 and we went up 3 places in our relative position among our peers. We were the lowest of the group experiencing a positive ratio. The average of the peer group decreased from .039 to -.041. Of the 7 institutions experiencing a negative ratio, 3 of them are the Ohio schools we have chosen to benchmark against. Investment losses were the single-most contributing factor to the increase in number of institutions experiencing net losses and the magnitude of those losses. The University of Cincinnati with the lowest Net Income Ratio experienced investment losses of $329.6 million in FY 2009 compared to investment losses of $96.6 million in FY 2008. Most of their endowments are held in their university as opposed to their foundation, skewing comparability to us where that is reversed.

- Compared to other institutions, the volatility of our Net Income Ratio as viewed from the trend line appears to be less.
Senate Bill 6 (SB 6) Composite Score:

- The Senate Bill 6 Composite Score is a calculation required by Ohio Revised Code to be computed by the Ohio Board of Regents on the audited financial statements of all public institutions of higher education in the State of Ohio. Its calculation is comprised of the Viability Ratio, Primary Reserve Ratio, and Net Income Ratio all assigned scores based on a range for each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Viability Ratio</th>
<th>Primary Reserve Ratio</th>
<th>Net Income Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt; 0</td>
<td>&lt; -.1</td>
<td>&lt; -.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 to .29</td>
<td>-.1 to .049</td>
<td>-.05 to 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.30 to .59</td>
<td>.05 to .099</td>
<td>0 to .009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6 to .99</td>
<td>.10 to .249</td>
<td>.01 to .029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0 to 2.5</td>
<td>.25 to .49</td>
<td>.03 to .049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&gt; 2.5 or N/A</td>
<td>.5 or greater</td>
<td>.05 or greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and further weighted as follows:

- Viability Ratio – 30%
- Primary Reserve Ratio – 50%
- Net Income Ratio – 20%

Ohio University Calculation:

Primary Reserve Score: 3 * 50% = 1.5
Viability Score: 3 * 30% = 0.9
Net Income Score: 4 * 20% = 0.8

SB 6 Composite Score: 3.2

- Ohio University's composite score decreased to 3.2 in FY 2009 from a score of 3.5 in FY 2008, primarily the result of a decrease by 1 in the Primary Reserve Ratio score which is 50% of the composite. The Viability Ratio score stayed the same and the Net Income Ratio score increased by 1, serving to partially offset the decrease in the score of the Primary Reserve Ratio.

- Among our peers we gained 2 positions from FY 2008, and are slightly below the average of 3.362, down from the average of 3.754 in FY 2008.

- Both Miami and Kent were at 4.7 in FY 2007. They are both now at 2.9. This demonstrates the impact that only two years can have on this composite ratio.

- Auburn has remained at a score of 4.7 for all the years under study. We are alternating to and from a score of 3.2 over the last 5 years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Composite Score</th>
<th>Ratio*</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOWLING-GREEN R.C.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>151.5%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL STATE</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>385.1%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVELAND STATE</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>412.3%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-13.1%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENT STATE</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-12.6%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIAMI UNIV.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEOLCOM</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1239.0%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO STATE</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>124.0%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAWNEE STATE</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV. AKRON</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV. CINCINNATI</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-40.5%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV. TOLEDO</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIGHT STATE</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>294.6%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUNGSTOWN ST.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>135.5%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Ratio*</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BELMONT TECH</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINCINNATI ST.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARE STATE</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBUS ST.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTC</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>481.7%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUYAHOGA</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDISON STATE</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hocking</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>179.1%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO COMMUNITY COLLEGE ST.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>340.1%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>494.5%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKELAND</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>114.5%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>698.9%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARION TECH</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CENTRAL</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>664.6%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST ST.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2288.3%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWENS ST.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>7029.6%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIO GRANDE</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-21.3%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN ST.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>112.8%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STARK STATE</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRA STATE</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON ST.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZANE STATE (MATC)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1104.6%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The viability ratio is not calculated for campuses that do not have long-term plant debt in such instances, a viability score of 5.0 is automatically assigned.

NOTE: Pursuant to the administrative rule (136-19-3) of the Board of Regents, a composite score of or below 1.3% for two consecutive years would result in a campus being placed on fiscal watch.
Debt Burden Ratio:

Debt Service

Total Expenditures

Debt Principal and Interest Payments, less Refinancing = 21,106,011
Lines 20+28+29-18 of SRECNA + Debt Principal Payments = 543,107,370

- The Debt Burden Ratio is a key tool in measuring debt affordability and should be considered as a key financial indicator for any institution using debt. This ratio examines the institution’s dependence on borrowed funds as a source of financing its mission and the relative cost of borrowing to overall expenditures. It compares the level of current debt service with the institution’s total expenditures.

- Debt service (the numerator) includes both principal and interest payments available from the Statement of Cash Flows, although principal repayment amounts through refinancing should be factored out as anomalies. The footnotes to the financial statements also include information for the purpose of calculating this ratio as well as providing for a better understanding of the University’s outstanding debt. In FY 2009, footnote 7 entitled, “Bonds and Notes Payable” provides that information.

- The denominator is calculated by including operating and nonoperating expenses less depreciation expense plus debt service principal payments.

The Debt Burden Ratio also serves to highlight that financial decisions, such as incurring debt, have an impact on the University’s ability to fund other initiatives out of its budget. An increasing rate shows an emphasis on debt service, which is usually related to capital investment in physical plant, rather than operational types of expenditures.

- It is suggested in Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education that a rate of 7% be an upper limit and that it might be feasible to operate for a time beyond that limit. The Ohio Office of Budget and Management has used a ratio of 5% as an upper limit. This suggests that Ohio University has room for additional debt, based only upon its current Debt Burden Ratio. A low Debt Burden Ratio could imply that the institution is forgoing necessary investment in plant. Any such investment should directly support the strategic priorities of the university.

- The group average dropped slightly from a .058 in FY 2008 to a .057 in FY 2009, Ohio University’s calculation dropped from an amount of .045 to an amount of .039 and dropped 2 rankings, which for this ratio is a positive move.

- The University of Connecticut has been involved in a major capital asset expansion in recent years which explains its position on the chart. It is also important to note that a large percentage of its debt service payments are funded by the State of Connecticut through special legislation. The University of Cincinnati continues to have the highest Debt Burden Ratio.
Return on Net Assets Ratio:

The Return on Net Assets ratio determines whether the institution is financially better off than in previous years by measuring total economic return. This ratio furnishes a broad measure of the change in an institution’s total wealth over a single year and is based on the level and change in total net assets, regardless of asset classification. Thus, the ratio provides the most comprehensive measure of the growth or decline in total wealth of an institution over a specific period of time.

For FY 2009 this ratio indicates the institution is better off than in the previous year, going from a ratio of .030 in FY 2008 to .038 in FY 2009. As you can see from the line graph, all our peers went down except for the University of Connecticut, primarily due to a further increase in investment losses in FY 2009.

Among our peers we went up 5 positions in the rankings, our most prominent relative climb of all the ratios under study, with the group average decreasing from .035 in FY 2008 to -.014 in FY 2009.

In order to ensure positive and sufficient returns on net assets we must be mindful of both operating and capital budget revenue streams and ensure the adequacy and effectiveness of budgetary and financial controls.
Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Expenditures</th>
<th>Depreciation Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Total capital assets” “Additions” (Footnote 5)</td>
<td>72,663,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 18 of SRECNA</td>
<td>33,075,444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Physical Asset Reinvestment ratio calculates the extent capital renewal is occurring compared with physical asset usage, represented as depreciation expense. A ratio above 1:1 indicates an increasing investment in physical assets, whereas a lower ratio potentially indicates an under-investment in campus facilities. Since this ratio measures current outlays for physical plant against depreciation expense using historical values, institutions should consider even a higher ratio than 1:1 or use an estimate of replacement value depreciation. Since facilities investment is highly variable from year to year, this ratio should be evaluated on a multiyear basis.

- The numerator can also be found in the Statement of Cash Flows under the section, "Cash Flows from Capital Financing Activities" and on the line entitled, "Purchases of capital assets".

- While State capital funding is not keeping up with overall depreciation, total investment in plant continues to occur at a faster rate than depreciation due to debt issued to fund construction projects/acquisitions and internal funding. The University and auxiliary 10 year capital plan provides for an average investment of $32 million per year. This compares to our annual current depreciation of $33.1 million.

- Our rating for this ratio increased to 2.197 in FY 2009 compared to 1.359 in FY 2008, moving us up 3 positions in the ranking among our peers. The peer average decreased to 2.260 in FY 2009 from 2.328 in FY 2008.

- It is important to note that for this ratio, the numerator includes all capital expenditures, including that for equipment. By the same token, the denominator includes all depreciation expense, including that for equipment. Footnote 5 of the audited financial statements includes additional detail about the University’s capital assets.

- An increase to the Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio does not suggest that deferred maintenance is not occurring. In fact, if additions to plant are in areas different from the usage or not in line with the University’s strategic initiatives, deferred maintenance will be occurring.
Age of Facility Ratio:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accumulated Depreciation</th>
<th>Depreciation Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Total Accumulated Depreciation&quot; (Footnote 5)</td>
<td>480,992,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 18 of SRECNA</td>
<td>33,075,444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Age of Facility Ratio measures the average age of total plant facilities by measuring the relationship of current depreciation to total depreciation. This ratio is important because it provides a rough sense of the age of the facilities and the potential need for considerable future resources to be invested in plant to cover deferred maintenance. Since deferred maintenance is not recorded as an unfunded liability in the financial statements, the Age of Facilities Ratio is based on historical accumulated depreciation.

- The group average of this ratio increased to 12.180 in FY 2009 from 11.942 in FY 2008. The age of our facilities increased to 14.542 years from 14.040 in FY 2008 and we moved up one position to having the highest Age of Facility Ratio among the benchmark institutions. According to the article by Prager, Sealy, & Co., LLC, KPMG LLP, and BearingPoint Inc, a benchmark for research institutions in higher education is ten years or less.

- It is important to note that for this ratio, the numerator includes accumulated depreciation on all capital expenditures, including that for equipment. By the same token, the denominator includes all depreciation expense, including that for equipment. Footnote 5 of the audited financial statements includes additional detail about the University’s capital assets.
Facility Maintenance Ratio:

The Facilities Maintenance Ratio assumes that the institution must generate a sufficient stream of income to support its operations and maintain its plant. 'Operations and maintenance of plant' includes all current operating expenses related to the general operation and maintenance of the physical plant. It includes utilities and maintenance, fire protection, property insurance, security and transportation, as well as the plant portion of salaries and staff benefits. Principal and interest payments on plant are excluded. Depreciation is also excluded.

It is suggested that the Facilities Maintenance Ratio be viewed on a longitudinal basis only because of differences in how institutions record and report operation and maintenance of plant expense.

A declining trend would suggest that we are not keeping up with our maintenance needs. When comparing ourselves to other institutions we should select those "with a similar age of plant, in the same geographic region and with the same programmatic focus." In addition, research institutions may need to cast a wider net for appropriate benchmark institutions with similar research effort because of the likely higher expense to maintain state of the art facilities to attract researchers and their federal grants.

Our Facility Maintenance Ratio increased slightly in FY 2009 from FY 2008. The group average increased from .064 to .071 and we dropped 2 positions among our peers. Because there is thinking that older facilities tend to result in the need for higher operation and maintenance of plant costs, it seems reasonable that we would be among the highest ratios given our highest Age of Facility Ratio.
Net Operating Revenues Ratio:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Income (Loss) + Net Non-operating Revenues</th>
<th>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 31 of SRECNA</td>
<td>= -14,945,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 9+Lines 22 through 27 of SRECNA</td>
<td>= 548,623,852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Net Operating Revenues Ratio “is a primary indicator, explaining how the surplus from operating activities affects the behavior of the other three core ratios. A large surplus or deficit directly impacts the amount of funds an institution adds to or subtracts from net assets, thereby affecting the Primary Reserve Ratio, the Return on Net Assets Ratio and the Viability Ratio.”

- A positive ratio indicates an operating surplus for the year whereas a negative ratio indicates an operating loss. The magnitude of positive operating surpluses can signify financial strength if an institution is not foregoing mission critical investments in order to achieve them. By contrast, operating deficits should be closely monitored as they cannot be sustained over time and may indicate that structural changes are necessary to obtain operating surpluses.

- Our performance in this ratio has fluctuated widely from deficits to surpluses to virtually zero in FY 2006 when we ended the year with an operating surplus of $44,147. Primarily due to greater reductions in investment income over the past year, the group average for this ratio went from -.002 to -.090. A number of institutions, including us, experienced a negative Net Operating Revenues Ratio this year. Our relative ranking moved up 3 positions from FY 2008.

- The University of Cincinnati with the lowest Net Operating Revenues Ratio experienced investment losses of $329.6 million in FY 2009 compared to investment losses of $96.6 million in FY 2008. Most of their endowments are held in their university as opposed to their foundation, skewing comparability to us where that is reversed.
Net Tuition Dependency Ratio:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Tuition and Fees</th>
<th>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 1 of SRECNA</td>
<td>= 229,594,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 9+Lines 22 through 27 of SRECNA</td>
<td>= 548,623,852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Net Tuition Dependency Ratio shows the relative importance of our largest revenue stream to operating and non-operating revenues. An increasing trend in this ratio is not necessarily desirable as it shows an increasing reliance on tuition and fees, on which we are already very dependent, to pay our bills. Clearly this is a revenue stream which needs conservative budgeting or a backstop of reserve funds to deal with unanticipated decreases in enrollment. Diversification of revenue streams is also desirable to mitigate the negative impact of fluctuations in any one revenue source.

- The school with the greatest dependency on net tuition is Miami of Ohio. It is interesting to note that the 4 schools with the highest dependency on net tuition and fees are all Ohio schools. Our ratio increased slightly from .410 in FY 2008 to .418 in FY 2009 and we maintained our relative ranking among our peers. The group average also increased from .284 in FY 2008 to .314 in FY 2009.
Net Tuition Per Student FTE Ratio:

Net Tuition and Fees
Full-Time Equivalent Students calculated by Institutional Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line 1 of SRECNA</th>
<th>= 229,594,649</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE Students (Fall Quarter) calculated by Institutional Research</td>
<td>= 26,116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Generally an increase in Net Tuition and Fees to Student FTE’s is desirable in that it indicates that there are more fee-paying customers. This ratio should be analyzed and followed as it relates to the University’s tuition discounting strategy which needs to maintain some balance between attractive aid packages and the need for tuition and fee revenues.

- We maintained our relative position when compared to FY 2008. Our ratio increased by 3.9% and the group average increased by 4.6%.
Net Tuition Discount Per Student FTE Ratio:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Aid</th>
<th>Full-Time Equivalent Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line 17 of SRECNA + Scholarship Discounts &amp; Allowances (Financial Statement pg. 14)</td>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students (Fall Quarter) calculated by Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68,369,443</td>
<td>26,116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This ratio calculates the amount of institutional aid (excluding fee waivers to graduate students which are considered benefits) provided on the basis of student full time equivalents.
- The same as with the Net Tuition per Student FTE Ratio, we maintained our relative position when compared to FY 2008.
- Tuition discounting is an appropriate strategy, but must be used with knowledge of the impact to institutional resources and the intended benefit. Some schools have used tuition discounting to improve or otherwise modify the student profile, encourage students to fill classes at unpopular times, take enough classes to graduate in four years or place a college education within the reach of those who might not otherwise be able to afford it.

Quotes in italics are from Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education, sixth edition ©2005 by Prager, Sealy, & Co., LLC; KPMG LLP; and BearingPoint Inc.
## Appendix I: Longitudinal View Ratio Detail by Institution

### Ratio Analysis - A Longitudinal View

Ratios obtained from "Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education" - Sixth Edition

(A joint project of KPMG, Prager,Sealy & Co., LLC and BearingPoint)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Reserve Ratio</strong></td>
<td>632,744,541</td>
<td>611,080,939</td>
<td>536,110,831</td>
<td>414,970,175</td>
<td>377,967,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income Ratio</strong></td>
<td>59,201,358</td>
<td>114,878,599</td>
<td>159,082,769</td>
<td>80,286,746</td>
<td>58,760,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Tuition Per Student FTE Ratio</strong></td>
<td>257,628,293</td>
<td>235,307,172</td>
<td>219,527,520</td>
<td>204,501,267</td>
<td>192,315,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facility Maintenance Ratio</strong></td>
<td>1,150,418,225</td>
<td>1,035,539,626</td>
<td>876,456,857</td>
<td>796,170,111</td>
<td>737,410,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Tuition Discount Per Student FTE Ratio</strong></td>
<td>50% * Primary Reserve Score + 30% * Viability Ratio Score + 20% * Net Income Ratio Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB6 Composite Score</strong></td>
<td>698,528,258</td>
<td>689,528,258</td>
<td>689,528,258</td>
<td>689,528,258</td>
<td>689,528,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Auburn University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio Analysis</th>
<th>Auburn University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB6 Primary Reserve Ratio Score:</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB6 Viability Ratio Score:</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB6 Net Income Ratio Score:</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio</strong></td>
<td>221,493,168</td>
<td>133,338,157</td>
<td>101,249,905</td>
<td>97,441,498</td>
<td>106,762,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age of Facility Ratio</strong></td>
<td>611,718,000</td>
<td>582,919,000</td>
<td>546,909,000</td>
<td>516,768,000</td>
<td>488,979,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td>15.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</strong></td>
<td>1,150,418,225</td>
<td>1,035,539,626</td>
<td>876,456,857</td>
<td>796,170,111</td>
<td>737,410,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Income (Loss) + Net Non-operating Revenues</strong></td>
<td>43,264,046</td>
<td>101,249,905</td>
<td>97,441,498</td>
<td>94,110,133</td>
<td>81,960,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operating Revenues Ratio</strong></td>
<td>48,008,585</td>
<td>873,622,047</td>
<td>855,628,265</td>
<td>725,915,133</td>
<td>679,755,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB6 Net Operating Revenues Ratio</strong></td>
<td>257,628,293</td>
<td>235,307,172</td>
<td>219,527,520</td>
<td>204,501,267</td>
<td>192,315,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Tuition Dependency Ratio</strong></td>
<td>257,628,293</td>
<td>235,307,172</td>
<td>219,527,520</td>
<td>204,501,267</td>
<td>192,315,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>8.251</td>
<td>7.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-Time Equivalent Students</strong></td>
<td>25,977</td>
<td>25,470</td>
<td>24,922</td>
<td>24,786</td>
<td>24,572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ratios obtained from "Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education" - Sixth Edition

**A joint project of KPMG, Prager,Sealy & Co., LLC and BearingPoint**

### 1. Primary Reserve Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>626,929,868</td>
<td>646,642,240</td>
<td>576,219,998</td>
<td>536,066,409</td>
<td>500,596,069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB6 Primary Reserve Ratio Score: 4 4 4 4 4

### 2. Viability Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Debt</td>
<td>135,904,431</td>
<td>147,299,895</td>
<td>158,430,237</td>
<td>156,005,464</td>
<td>141,329,979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB6 Viability Ratio Score: 4 4 4 4 4

### 3. Net Income Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>650,403,996</td>
<td>677,774,514</td>
<td>699,886,494</td>
<td>594,659,614</td>
<td>552,428,116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB6 Net Income Ratio Score: 5 5 5 5 5

### 4. SB6 Composite Score

50% * Primary Reserve Score + 30% * Viability Ratio Score + 20% * Net Income Ratio Score

### 5. Debt Burden Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>18,186,256</td>
<td>18,350,099</td>
<td>18,759,822</td>
<td>15,402,750</td>
<td>15,316,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>605,134,452</td>
<td>625,248,697</td>
<td>558,022,421</td>
<td>519,452,560</td>
<td>485,038,885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Return on Net Assets Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Assets (prior year)</td>
<td>721,070,195</td>
<td>689,937,921</td>
<td>566,259,425</td>
<td>507,666,220</td>
<td>455,833,172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>33,364,460</td>
<td>32,697,466</td>
<td>29,946,385</td>
<td>25,829,166</td>
<td>24,473,694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Age of Facility Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>33,364,460</td>
<td>32,697,466</td>
<td>29,946,385</td>
<td>25,829,166</td>
<td>24,473,694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. Facility Maintenance Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>627,888,194</td>
<td>646,377,895</td>
<td>628,347,901</td>
<td>563,333,318</td>
<td>530,496,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10. Net Operating Revenues Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>627,888,194</td>
<td>646,377,895</td>
<td>628,347,901</td>
<td>563,333,318</td>
<td>530,496,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11. Net Tuition Dependency Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>627,888,194</td>
<td>646,377,895</td>
<td>628,347,901</td>
<td>563,333,318</td>
<td>530,496,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12. Net Tuition Per Student FTE Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>16,818</td>
<td>16,128</td>
<td>15,934</td>
<td>15,833</td>
<td>15,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13. Net Tuition Discount Per Student FTE Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Aid</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>85,558,637</td>
<td>77,196,849</td>
<td>65,140,701</td>
<td>59,947,053</td>
<td>54,788,083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ratio Analysis - A Longitudinal View

### Indiana University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Reserve Ratio</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Table" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Table" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Table" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Table" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Table" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>923,078,000</td>
<td>927,690,000</td>
<td>814,947,000</td>
<td>692,927,000</td>
<td>629,448,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>2,466,683,000</td>
<td>2,323,694,000</td>
<td>2,275,059,000</td>
<td>2,161,404,000</td>
<td>2,078,122,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Primary Reserve Ratio Score</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Viability Ratio | ![Table](#) | ![Table](#) | ![Table](#) | ![Table](#) | ![Table](#) |
| Expendable Net Assets | 923,078,000 | 927,690,000 | 814,947,000 | 692,927,000 | 629,448,000 |
| Long-Term Debt | 815,782,000 | 791,718,000 | 728,767,000 | 684,371,000 | 598,978,000 |
| SB6 Viability Ratio Score | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |

| Net Income Ratio | ![Table](#) | ![Table](#) | ![Table](#) | ![Table](#) | ![Table](#) |
| Change in Net Assets | 132,071,000 | 139,336,000 | 175,143,000 | 122,820,000 | 119,142,000 |
| Total Revenues | 2,598,754,000 | 2,463,030,000 | 2,450,202,000 | 2,284,224,000 | 2,197,264,000 |
| SB6 Net Income Ratio Score | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |

### Ratio Analysis: A Longitudinal View

50% * Primary Reserve Score + 30% * Viability Ratio Score + 20% * Net Income Ratio Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Debt Burden Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
<th>2,397,845,000</th>
<th>2,293,428,000</th>
<th>2,204,576,000</th>
<th>2,081,777,000</th>
<th>2,021,903,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>97,699,000</td>
<td>122,666,000</td>
<td>191,242,000</td>
<td>191,242,000</td>
<td>147,593,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Return on Net Assets Ratio

| Total Net Assets (prior year) | 2,331,964,000 | 2,293,428,000 | 2,204,576,000 | 2,081,777,000 | 2,021,903,000 |
| Change in Net Assets | 132,071,000 | 139,336,000 | 175,143,000 | 122,820,000 | 119,142,000 |
| Capital Expenditures | 254,898,000 | 261,030,000 | 216,797,000 | 168,651,000 | 144,840,000 |
| Depreciation Expense | 120,819,000 | 116,683,000 | 111,860,000 | 104,700,000 | 104,700,000 |
| SB6 Net Income Ratio Score | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |

### Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio

| Depreciation Expense | 120,819,000 | 116,683,000 | 111,860,000 | 104,700,000 | 104,700,000 |
| Accumulated Depreciation | 1,576,004,000 | 1,494,871,000 | 1,432,341,000 | 1,371,901,000 | 1,292,576,000 |

### Age of Facility Ratio

| Accumulated Depreciation | 1,576,004,000 | 1,494,871,000 | 1,432,341,000 | 1,371,901,000 | 1,292,576,000 |
| Depreciation Expense | 120,819,000 | 116,683,000 | 111,860,000 | 104,700,000 | 104,700,000 |

### Facility Maintenance Ratio

| Operations and Maintenance of Plant Expenses | 188,011,000 | 149,161,000 | 130,480,000 | 134,578,000 | 127,020,000 |
| Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues | 2,568,526,000 | 2,439,498,000 | 2,434,277,000 | 2,263,090,000 | 2,180,490,000 |

### Net Operating Revenues Ratio

| Operating Income (Loss) + Net Non-operating Revenues | 101,843,000 | 116,254,000 | 159,218,000 | 168,651,000 | 144,840,000 |
| Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues | 2,568,526,000 | 2,439,498,000 | 2,434,277,000 | 2,263,090,000 | 2,180,490,000 |

### Net Tuition Dependency Ratio

| Net Tuition and Fees | 852,834,000 | 764,075,000 | 692,278,000 | 644,547,000 | 600,260,000 |
| Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues | 2,568,526,000 | 2,439,498,000 | 2,434,277,000 | 2,263,090,000 | 2,180,490,000 |

### Net Tuition Per Student FTE Ratio

| Net Tuition and Fees | 852,834,000 | 764,075,000 | 692,278,000 | 644,547,000 | 600,260,000 |
| Full-Time Equivalent Students | 85,969 | 83,238 | 81,602 | 81,432 | 80,970 |

### Net Tuition Discount Per Student FTE Ratio

<p>| Student Aid | 274,734,000 | 237,516,000 | 190,204,000 | 101,686,000 | 101,686,000 |
| Full-Time Equivalent Students | 85,969 | 83,238 | 81,602 | 81,432 | 80,970 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio Analysis - A Longitudinal View</th>
<th>Kent State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Reserve Ratio</strong></td>
<td><strong>Expendable Net Assets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>229,351,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>310,696,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>332,829,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>289,080,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>254,663,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viability Ratio</strong></td>
<td><strong>Expendable Net Assets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>276,019,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>273,153,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>289,080,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>254,663,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>254,663,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income Ratio</strong></td>
<td><strong>Change in Net Assets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>(63,499,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>(1,483,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>79,549,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>38,776,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>59,112,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt Burden Ratio</strong></td>
<td><strong>Debt Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>20,329,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>19,516,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>17,625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>10,702,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>15,702,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capital Expenditures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>45,206,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>46,186,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>53,313,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>58,375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>38,767,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age of Facility Ratio</strong></td>
<td><strong>Accumulated Depreciation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>421,060,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>395,346,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>355,816,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>333,212,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>309,795,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facility Maintenance Ratio</strong></td>
<td><strong>Operations and Maintenance of Plant Expenses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>46,471,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>46,186,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>53,313,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>58,375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>38,767,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operating Revenues Ratio</strong></td>
<td><strong>Operating Income (Loss) + Net Non-operating Revenues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>(76,625,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>(21,848,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>44,119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>44,119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>44,119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Tuition Dependency Ratio</strong></td>
<td><strong>Net Tuition and Fees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>205,682,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>205,035,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>203,544,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>194,589,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>193,052,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Tuition Per Student FTE Ratio</strong></td>
<td><strong>Net Tuition and Fees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>205,682,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>205,035,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>203,544,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>194,589,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>193,052,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Ratio Analysis - A Longitudinal View

Ratios obtained from "Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education" - Sixth Edition
(A joint project of KPMG, Prager, Sealy & Co., LLC and BearingPoint)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Primary Reserve Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>168,659,660</td>
<td>216,142,070</td>
<td>245,244,441</td>
<td>203,346,757</td>
<td>198,777,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>526,342,106</td>
<td>505,516,456</td>
<td>481,273,761</td>
<td>451,402,651</td>
<td>421,399,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Primary Reserve Ratio Score:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Viability Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>168,659,660</td>
<td>216,142,070</td>
<td>245,244,441</td>
<td>203,346,757</td>
<td>198,777,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Debt</td>
<td>232,733,775</td>
<td>237,431,124</td>
<td>235,357,582</td>
<td>159,727,329</td>
<td>175,385,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Viability Ratio Score:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Net Income Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>(47,164,696)</td>
<td>(5,544,916)</td>
<td>74,091,778</td>
<td>47,135,302</td>
<td>26,817,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>470,177,410</td>
<td>469,971,540</td>
<td>555,365,539</td>
<td>498,537,953</td>
<td>448,276,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Net Income Ratio Score:</td>
<td>50% * Primary Reserve Score + 30% * Viability Ratio Score + 20% * Net Income Ratio Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SB6 Composite Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Debt Burden Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>19,180,807</td>
<td>20,516,677</td>
<td>16,715,410</td>
<td>16,061,529</td>
<td>24,705,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>500,504,043</td>
<td>486,655,769</td>
<td>459,705,264</td>
<td>434,385,604</td>
<td>414,901,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Return on Net Assets Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>(47,164,696)</td>
<td>(5,544,916)</td>
<td>74,091,778</td>
<td>47,135,302</td>
<td>26,817,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Assets (prior year)</td>
<td>755,184,525</td>
<td>760,729,441</td>
<td>686,347,263</td>
<td>639,502,361</td>
<td>622,391,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>76,214,917</td>
<td>85,945,078</td>
<td>65,956,199</td>
<td>98,150,312</td>
<td>104,672,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>32,304,294</td>
<td>32,034,307</td>
<td>29,169,659</td>
<td>26,073,751</td>
<td>27,626,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Age of Facility Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Depreciation</td>
<td>451,928,917</td>
<td>421,327,583</td>
<td>394,097,490</td>
<td>375,373,337</td>
<td>354,786,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>32,304,294</td>
<td>32,034,307</td>
<td>29,169,659</td>
<td>26,073,751</td>
<td>27,626,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Facility Maintenance Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Maintenance of Plant Expenses</td>
<td>36,353,214</td>
<td>34,701,632</td>
<td>30,777,705</td>
<td>32,477,264</td>
<td>34,076,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>459,049,503</td>
<td>483,382,451</td>
<td>518,404,100</td>
<td>473,698,832</td>
<td>436,832,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Net Operating Revenues Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income (Loss) + Net Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>(67,292,603)</td>
<td>(22,134,005)</td>
<td>37,130,339</td>
<td>22,296,181</td>
<td>15,433,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>459,049,503</td>
<td>483,382,451</td>
<td>518,404,100</td>
<td>473,698,832</td>
<td>436,832,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Net Tuition Dependency Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>254,515,340</td>
<td>238,587,901</td>
<td>232,516,956</td>
<td>219,068,233</td>
<td>200,035,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>459,049,503</td>
<td>483,382,451</td>
<td>518,404,100</td>
<td>473,698,832</td>
<td>436,832,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Net Tuition Per Student FTE Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>254,515,340</td>
<td>238,587,901</td>
<td>232,516,956</td>
<td>219,068,233</td>
<td>200,035,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>19,862</td>
<td>19,008</td>
<td>19,093</td>
<td>20,083</td>
<td>19,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Net Tuition Discount Per Student FTE Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>64,774,211</td>
<td>51,820,777</td>
<td>44,021,400</td>
<td>40,769,415</td>
<td>38,351,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>19,862</td>
<td>19,008</td>
<td>19,093</td>
<td>20,083</td>
<td>19,362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ohio University

**Ratios obtained from "Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education" - Sixth Edition**

(A joint project of KPMG, Prager, Sealy & Co., LLC and BearingPoint)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 PRIMARY RESERVE RATIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>116,267,732</td>
<td>133,157,539</td>
<td>126,327,532</td>
<td>111,343,967</td>
<td>110,491,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>563,568,099</td>
<td>531,743,751</td>
<td>529,109,252</td>
<td>493,692,281</td>
<td>481,483,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Primary Reserve Ratio Score:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 VIABILITY RATIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>116,267,732</td>
<td>133,157,539</td>
<td>126,327,532</td>
<td>111,343,967</td>
<td>110,491,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Debt</td>
<td>192,718,265</td>
<td>167,403,027</td>
<td>182,914,606</td>
<td>192,862,349</td>
<td>167,529,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Viability Ratio Score:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 NET INCOME RATIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>20,771,844</td>
<td>15,938,573</td>
<td>23,267,484</td>
<td>23,547,588</td>
<td>20,257,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>584,340,753</td>
<td>547,682,324</td>
<td>552,376,736</td>
<td>517,239,869</td>
<td>501,740,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Net Income Ratio Score:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 DEBT BURDEN RATIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>21,106,011</td>
<td>23,168,665</td>
<td>17,715,125</td>
<td>18,900,824</td>
<td>15,773,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>543,107,370</td>
<td>515,155,885</td>
<td>508,740,547</td>
<td>475,666,970</td>
<td>460,469,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 RETURN ON NET ASSETS RATIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>20,771,844</td>
<td>15,938,573</td>
<td>23,267,484</td>
<td>23,547,588</td>
<td>20,257,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Assets (prior year)</td>
<td>542,732,355</td>
<td>526,793,782</td>
<td>506,289,862</td>
<td>482,742,274</td>
<td>462,484,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 PHYSICAL ASSET REINVESTMENT RATIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>72,663,394</td>
<td>43,905,610</td>
<td>53,081,762</td>
<td>52,884,868</td>
<td>60,087,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>33,075,444</td>
<td>32,308,560</td>
<td>30,652,754</td>
<td>29,427,367</td>
<td>29,076,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 FACILITY MAINTENANCE RATIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Maintenance of Plant Expenses</td>
<td>44,771,516</td>
<td>41,675,475</td>
<td>42,401,934</td>
<td>39,770,454</td>
<td>36,823,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>548,623,852</td>
<td>526,237,256</td>
<td>534,900,897</td>
<td>493,746,328</td>
<td>485,791,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 NET OPERATING REVENUES RATIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income (Loss) + Net Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>(14,945,057)</td>
<td>(5,506,495)</td>
<td>(5,791,645)</td>
<td>44,147</td>
<td>4,308,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>548,623,852</td>
<td>526,237,256</td>
<td>534,900,897</td>
<td>493,746,328</td>
<td>485,791,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11 NET TUITION DEPENDENCY RATIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>229,594,649</td>
<td>215,984,213</td>
<td>217,404,777</td>
<td>201,446,914</td>
<td>196,518,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>548,623,852</td>
<td>526,237,256</td>
<td>534,900,897</td>
<td>493,746,328</td>
<td>485,791,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 NET TUITION PER STUDENT FTE RATIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>229,594,649</td>
<td>215,984,213</td>
<td>217,404,777</td>
<td>201,446,914</td>
<td>196,518,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>26,116</td>
<td>25,518</td>
<td>25,267</td>
<td>25,532</td>
<td>25,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13 NET TUITION DISCOUNT PER STUDENT FTE RATIO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>68,369,443</td>
<td>62,922,901</td>
<td>57,249,045</td>
<td>57,010,432</td>
<td>54,144,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>26,116</td>
<td>25,518</td>
<td>25,267</td>
<td>25,532</td>
<td>25,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ratio Analysis - A Longitudinal View

Ratios obtained from "Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education" - Sixth Edition
(A joint project of KPMG, Prager,Sealy & Co., LLC and BearingPoint)

### University of Cincinnati

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Reserve Ratio</strong></td>
<td>265,519,000</td>
<td>267,025,000</td>
<td>226,277,000</td>
<td>233,046,000</td>
<td>282,435,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>265,519,000</td>
<td>267,025,000</td>
<td>226,277,000</td>
<td>233,046,000</td>
<td>282,435,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>993,757,000</td>
<td>975,905,000</td>
<td>977,037,000</td>
<td>970,874,000</td>
<td>970,874,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Primary Reserve Ratio Score:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viability Ratio</strong></td>
<td>265,519,000</td>
<td>267,025,000</td>
<td>226,277,000</td>
<td>233,046,000</td>
<td>282,435,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>265,519,000</td>
<td>267,025,000</td>
<td>226,277,000</td>
<td>233,046,000</td>
<td>282,435,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Debt</td>
<td>1,082,985,000</td>
<td>1,082,473,000</td>
<td>1,069,889,000</td>
<td>966,516,000</td>
<td>879,257,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Viability Ratio Score:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income Ratio</strong></td>
<td>(301,144,000)</td>
<td>(45,225,000)</td>
<td>105,091,000</td>
<td>44,478,000</td>
<td>61,432,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>(301,144,000)</td>
<td>(45,225,000)</td>
<td>105,091,000</td>
<td>44,478,000</td>
<td>61,432,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>692,613,000</td>
<td>930,680,000</td>
<td>1,082,128,000</td>
<td>1,015,352,000</td>
<td>953,748,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Net Income Ratio Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB6 Composite Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% * Primary Reserve Score +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% * Viability Ratio Score +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% * Net Income Ratio Score</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt Burden Ratio</strong></td>
<td>250,664,000</td>
<td>234,279,000</td>
<td>155,421,000</td>
<td>67,113,000</td>
<td>83,931,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>1,103,626,000</td>
<td>1,071,887,000</td>
<td>998,866,000</td>
<td>918,208,000</td>
<td>867,829,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>993,757,000</td>
<td>975,905,000</td>
<td>977,037,000</td>
<td>970,874,000</td>
<td>970,874,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Composite Score Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Net Assets Ratio</strong></td>
<td>(301,144,000)</td>
<td>(45,225,000)</td>
<td>105,091,000</td>
<td>44,478,000</td>
<td>61,432,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>(301,144,000)</td>
<td>(45,225,000)</td>
<td>105,091,000</td>
<td>44,478,000</td>
<td>61,432,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Assets (prior year)</td>
<td>1,925,515,000</td>
<td>1,970,740,000</td>
<td>1,865,649,000</td>
<td>1,821,171,000</td>
<td>1,759,736,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>49,789,000</td>
<td>90,514,000</td>
<td>156,665,000</td>
<td>157,014,000</td>
<td>190,845,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>93,393,000</td>
<td>87,765,000</td>
<td>87,360,000</td>
<td>79,096,000</td>
<td>71,708,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age of Facility Ratio</strong></td>
<td>1,007,250,000</td>
<td>927,969,000</td>
<td>850,686,000</td>
<td>768,017,000</td>
<td>704,180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Depreciation</td>
<td>93,393,000</td>
<td>87,765,000</td>
<td>87,360,000</td>
<td>79,096,000</td>
<td>71,708,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facility Maintenance Ratio</strong></td>
<td>60,118,000</td>
<td>63,560,000</td>
<td>61,499,000</td>
<td>88,322,000</td>
<td>56,156,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Maintenance of Plant Expenses</td>
<td>663,016,000</td>
<td>852,422,000</td>
<td>1,053,709,000</td>
<td>975,007,000</td>
<td>882,495,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>663,016,000</td>
<td>852,422,000</td>
<td>1,053,709,000</td>
<td>975,007,000</td>
<td>882,495,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operating Revenues Ratio</strong></td>
<td>(330,741,000)</td>
<td>(123,483,000)</td>
<td>76,672,000</td>
<td>4,133,000</td>
<td>(9,821,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income (Loss) + Net Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>(330,741,000)</td>
<td>(123,483,000)</td>
<td>76,672,000</td>
<td>4,133,000</td>
<td>(9,821,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>663,016,000</td>
<td>852,422,000</td>
<td>1,053,709,000</td>
<td>975,007,000</td>
<td>882,495,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>663,016,000</td>
<td>852,422,000</td>
<td>1,053,709,000</td>
<td>975,007,000</td>
<td>882,495,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Tuition Dependency Ratio</strong></td>
<td>279,822,000</td>
<td>272,910,000</td>
<td>260,650,000</td>
<td>230,778,000</td>
<td>202,036,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>279,822,000</td>
<td>272,910,000</td>
<td>260,650,000</td>
<td>230,778,000</td>
<td>202,036,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>663,016,000</td>
<td>852,422,000</td>
<td>1,053,709,000</td>
<td>975,007,000</td>
<td>882,495,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>663,016,000</td>
<td>852,422,000</td>
<td>1,053,709,000</td>
<td>975,007,000</td>
<td>882,495,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Tuition Per Student FTE Ratio</strong></td>
<td>279,822,000</td>
<td>272,910,000</td>
<td>260,650,000</td>
<td>230,778,000</td>
<td>202,036,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>279,822,000</td>
<td>272,910,000</td>
<td>260,650,000</td>
<td>230,778,000</td>
<td>202,036,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>30,224</td>
<td>29,768</td>
<td>28,778</td>
<td>28,778</td>
<td>28,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Tuition Discount Per Student FTE Ratio</strong></td>
<td>111,070,000</td>
<td>107,952,000</td>
<td>105,984,000</td>
<td>99,259,000</td>
<td>97,455,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>111,070,000</td>
<td>107,952,000</td>
<td>105,984,000</td>
<td>99,259,000</td>
<td>97,455,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>30,224</td>
<td>29,768</td>
<td>28,778</td>
<td>28,778</td>
<td>28,778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ratio Analysis - A Longitudinal View

**University of Connecticut**

Ratios obtained from "Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education" - Sixth Edition

(A joint project of KPMG, Prager, Sealy & Co., LLC and BearingPoint)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Primary Reserve Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>264,999,978</td>
<td>177,412,682</td>
<td>202,689,499</td>
<td>141,621,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>985,647,318</td>
<td>937,972,827</td>
<td>861,930,142</td>
<td>835,628,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Primary Reserve Ratio Score:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **2** Viability Ratio | | | | |
| Expendable Net Assets | 264,999,978 | 177,412,682 | 202,689,499 | 141,621,655 | 126,972,588 |
| Long-Term Debt | 1,114,099,588 | 1,035,651,843 | 1,110,150,139 | 1,086,939,824 | 1,045,090,989 |
| SB6 Viability Ratio Score: | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| **3** Net Income Ratio | | | | |
| Change in Net Assets | 40,381,626 | (39,552,708) | 33,997,935 | 14,194,697 | 14,194,697 |
| Total Revenues | 921,099,241 | 898,303,924 | 895,928,077 | 849,823,347 | 829,331,430 |
| SB6 Net Income Ratio Score: | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |

50% * Primary Reserve Score +
30% * Viability Ratio Score +
20% * Net Income Ratio Score

| **4** SB6 Composite Score | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 |

| **5** Debt Burden Ratio | | | | |
| Debt Service | 121,593,228 | 125,418,351 | 113,731,395 | 106,162,050 | 97,942,625 |
| Total Expenditures | 967,950,401 | 911,115,889 | 839,744,317 | 811,063,494 | 786,823,735 |
| SB6 Debt Burden Ratio Score: | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 |

| **6** Return on Net Assets Ratio | | | | |
| Change in Total Net Assets | 40,381,626 | (39,552,708) | 33,997,935 | 14,194,697 | 14,194,697 |
| Total Net Assets (prior year) | 1,378,096,850 | 1,417,649,558 | 1,383,651,623 | 1,369,456,926 | 1,355,518,978 |
| SB6 Return on Net Assets Ratio Score: | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |

| **7** Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio | | | | |
| Capital Expenditures | 51,171,301 | 63,552,008 | 51,083,253 | 92,433,392 | 111,149,257 |
| Depreciation Expense | 89,556,846 | 100,186,738 | 88,030,170 | 86,528,795 | 84,508,242 |
| SB6 Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio Score: | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |

| **8** Age of Facility Ratio | | | | |
| Accumulated Depreciation | 836,663,231 | 778,713,542 | 692,655,745 | 626,628,022 | 549,132,195 |
| Depreciation Expense | 89,556,846 | 100,186,738 | 88,030,170 | 86,528,795 | 84,508,242 |
| SB6 Age of Facility Ratio Score: | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |

| **9** Facility Maintenance Ratio | | | | |
| Operations and Maintenance of Plant Expenditures | 71,478,092 | 64,110,720 | 60,611,235 | 65,676,823 | 54,321,765 |
| Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues | 917,285,570 | 883,501,338 | 827,168,630 | 778,287,650 | 733,746,499 |
| SB6 Facility Maintenance Ratio Score: | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |

| **10** Net Operating Revenues Ratio | | | | |
| Operating Income (Loss) + Net Non-operating Revenues | (67,923,315) | (53,596,652) | (32,378,096) | (45,849,762) | (43,361,651) |
| Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues | 917,285,570 | 883,501,338 | 827,168,630 | 778,287,650 | 733,746,499 |
| SB6 Net Operating Revenues Ratio Score: | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |

| **11** Net Tuition Dependency Ratio | | | | |
| Net Tuition and Fees | 215,641,536 | 199,720,598 | 183,468,732 | 177,210,259 | 159,054,150 |
| Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues | 917,285,570 | 883,501,338 | 827,168,630 | 778,287,650 | 733,746,499 |
| Net Tuition Dependency Ratio Score: | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 |

| **12** Net Tuition Per Student FTE Ratio | | | | |
| Net Tuition and Fees | 215,641,536 | 199,720,598 | 183,468,732 | 177,210,259 | 159,054,150 |
| Full-Time Equivalent Students | 26,186 | 25,242 | 24,948 | 24,444 | 23,836 |
| Net Tuition Per Student FTE Ratio Score: | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |

| **13** Net Tuition Discount Per Student FTE Ratio | | | | |
| Student Aid | 88,338,691 | 79,449,231 | 75,428,307 | 65,519,865 | 62,012,648 |
| Full-Time Equivalent Students | 26,186 | 25,242 | 24,948 | 24,444 | 23,836 |
| Net Tuition Discount Per Student FTE Ratio Score: | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
### Primary Reserve Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>1,212,004,000</td>
<td>1,272,375,000</td>
<td>1,185,955,000</td>
<td>1,106,973,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>2,399,368,000</td>
<td>2,333,712,000</td>
<td>2,173,239,000</td>
<td>2,079,315,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB6 Primary Reserve Ratio Score: 5

### Viability Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>1,212,004,000</td>
<td>1,272,375,000</td>
<td>1,185,955,000</td>
<td>1,106,973,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Debt</td>
<td>857,961,000</td>
<td>879,559,000</td>
<td>662,139,000</td>
<td>677,233,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB6 Viability Ratio Score: 4

### Net Income Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>(78,999,000)</td>
<td>1,073,020,000</td>
<td>308,225,000</td>
<td>190,947,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>2,320,369,000</td>
<td>2,441,032,000</td>
<td>2,481,464,000</td>
<td>2,270,262,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB6 Net Income Ratio Score: 4

### Debt Burden Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>2,289,682,000</td>
<td>2,266,353,000</td>
<td>2,069,355,000</td>
<td>1,982,968,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>51,168,000</td>
<td>58,637,000</td>
<td>44,508,000</td>
<td>40,652,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB6 Composite Score: 3.9

### Return on Net Assets Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>(78,999,000)</td>
<td>107,320,000</td>
<td>308,225,000</td>
<td>190,947,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Assets (prior year)</td>
<td>3,443,776,000</td>
<td>3,323,122,000</td>
<td>2,994,981,000</td>
<td>2,804,034,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>296,156,000</td>
<td>317,944,000</td>
<td>234,535,000</td>
<td>247,092,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>131,167,000</td>
<td>125,996,000</td>
<td>119,069,000</td>
<td>110,924,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB6 Net Tuition Dependency Ratio: 3.9

### Facility Maintenance Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Maintenance of Plant Expenses</td>
<td>70,002,000</td>
<td>48,202,000</td>
<td>63,432,000</td>
<td>62,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>2,265,800,000</td>
<td>2,375,164,000</td>
<td>2,403,151,000</td>
<td>2,210,364,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB6 Net Tuition Per Student FTE Ratio: 4.9

### Facility Maintenance Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>204,982,000</td>
<td>186,218,000</td>
<td>181,962,000</td>
<td>167,571,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>47,351</td>
<td>45,559</td>
<td>45,372</td>
<td>45,045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB6 Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio: 25.6

### Facility Maintenance Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>204,982,000</td>
<td>186,218,000</td>
<td>181,962,000</td>
<td>167,571,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>47,351</td>
<td>45,559</td>
<td>45,372</td>
<td>45,045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ratio Analysis - A Longitudinal View

#### University of New Hampshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Primary Reserve Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>169,225,000</td>
<td>240,968,000</td>
<td>242,718,000</td>
<td>180,871,000</td>
<td>154,861,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>695,178,000</td>
<td>660,874,000</td>
<td>614,558,000</td>
<td>591,320,000</td>
<td>555,386,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Primary Reserve Ratio Score:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Viability Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>169,225,000</td>
<td>240,968,000</td>
<td>242,718,000</td>
<td>180,871,000</td>
<td>154,861,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Debt</td>
<td>474,878,000</td>
<td>458,195,000</td>
<td>419,044,000</td>
<td>417,479,000</td>
<td>279,081,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Viability Ratio Score:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Net Income Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>(9,233,000)</td>
<td>36,999,000</td>
<td>95,420,000</td>
<td>70,652,000</td>
<td>54,334,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>685,945,000</td>
<td>697,873,000</td>
<td>709,978,000</td>
<td>661,972,000</td>
<td>699,720,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Net Income Ratio Score:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Debt Burden Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>27,884,000</td>
<td>26,820,000</td>
<td>22,573,000</td>
<td>21,221,000</td>
<td>16,202,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>600,243,000</td>
<td>629,081,000</td>
<td>583,188,000</td>
<td>556,227,000</td>
<td>529,416,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Composite Score</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Return on Net Assets Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>(9,233,000)</td>
<td>36,999,000</td>
<td>95,420,000</td>
<td>70,652,000</td>
<td>54,334,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Assets (prior year)</td>
<td>835,874,000</td>
<td>798,875,000</td>
<td>703,455,000</td>
<td>632,803,000</td>
<td>578,469,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>17,293,000</td>
<td>16,813,000</td>
<td>15,038,000</td>
<td>14,084,000</td>
<td>13,058,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>39,683,000</td>
<td>36,594,000</td>
<td>37,920,000</td>
<td>32,672,000</td>
<td>32,672,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Net Income Ratio Score:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Depreciation</td>
<td>548,060,000</td>
<td>508,313,000</td>
<td>476,058,000</td>
<td>446,579,000</td>
<td>424,573,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>43,873,000</td>
<td>39,683,000</td>
<td>36,594,000</td>
<td>37,920,000</td>
<td>32,672,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 Facility Maintenance Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Maintenance of Plant Expenses</td>
<td>28,391,000</td>
<td>25,153,000</td>
<td>21,099,000</td>
<td>25,058,000</td>
<td>26,696,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>713,663,000</td>
<td>679,453,000</td>
<td>655,315,000</td>
<td>610,375,000</td>
<td>566,477,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Net Income Ratio Score:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Net Operating Revenues Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income (Loss) + Net Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>25,485,000</td>
<td>20,579,000</td>
<td>40,757,000</td>
<td>22,192,000</td>
<td>11,091,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>713,663,000</td>
<td>679,453,000</td>
<td>655,315,000</td>
<td>610,375,000</td>
<td>566,477,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Net Income Ratio Score:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11 Net Tuition Dependency Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>249,133,000</td>
<td>233,344,000</td>
<td>216,814,000</td>
<td>200,523,000</td>
<td>182,075,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>713,663,000</td>
<td>679,453,000</td>
<td>655,315,000</td>
<td>610,375,000</td>
<td>566,477,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Net Income Ratio Score:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Net Tuition Per Student FTE Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>249,133,000</td>
<td>233,344,000</td>
<td>216,814,000</td>
<td>200,523,000</td>
<td>182,075,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>14,331</td>
<td>14,277</td>
<td>14,119</td>
<td>13,698</td>
<td>13,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13 Net Tuition Discount Per Student FTE Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>89,257,000</td>
<td>84,210,000</td>
<td>75,153,000</td>
<td>64,905,000</td>
<td>64,255,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>14,331</td>
<td>14,277</td>
<td>14,119</td>
<td>13,698</td>
<td>13,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratios obtained from "Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education" - Sixth Edition
(A joint project of KPMG, Prager,Sealy & Co., LLC and BearingPoint)
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**Ratios obtained from "Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education" - Sixth Edition**

**A joint project of KPMG, Prager,Sealy & Co., LLC and BearingPoint**

---

**University of North Carolina**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Reserve Ratio Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>1,537,434,317</td>
<td>1,871,250,329</td>
<td>1,707,615,952</td>
<td>1,378,646,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>2,276,790,882</td>
<td>2,142,601,605</td>
<td>1,991,292,347</td>
<td>1,842,583,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Primary Reserve Ratio Score:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viability Ratio Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>1,537,434,317</td>
<td>1,871,250,329</td>
<td>1,707,615,952</td>
<td>1,378,646,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Debt</td>
<td>1,059,165,142</td>
<td>1,084,676,533</td>
<td>808,841,350</td>
<td>965,497,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Viability Ratio Score:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income Ratio Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>(246,993,593)</td>
<td>300,398,908</td>
<td>487,866,614</td>
<td>320,122,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>2,029,797,289</td>
<td>2,443,000,513</td>
<td>2,479,158,961</td>
<td>2,162,706,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Net Income Ratio Score:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Composite Score</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Burden Ratio Debt Service</td>
<td>106,395,635</td>
<td>77,474,845</td>
<td>85,450,710</td>
<td>66,405,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>2,263,032,179</td>
<td>2,100,884,648</td>
<td>1,932,240,498</td>
<td>1,826,337,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Net Assets Ratio Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>(246,993,593)</td>
<td>300,398,908</td>
<td>487,866,614</td>
<td>320,122,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Assets (prior year)</td>
<td>3,716,267,655</td>
<td>3,415,868,747</td>
<td>2,928,002,133</td>
<td>2,607,828,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>287,565,273</td>
<td>283,860,475</td>
<td>301,452,335</td>
<td>389,465,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>70,747,110</td>
<td>66,412,469</td>
<td>80,826,849</td>
<td>64,475,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Facility Ratio Accumulated Depreciation</td>
<td>962,302,490</td>
<td>903,682,527</td>
<td>850,005,324</td>
<td>778,142,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>70,747,110</td>
<td>66,412,469</td>
<td>80,826,849</td>
<td>64,475,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Maintenance Ratio Operations and Maintenance of Plant Expenses</td>
<td>145,549,504</td>
<td>133,060,656</td>
<td>124,991,133</td>
<td>111,720,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>1,914,510,657</td>
<td>2,311,071,937</td>
<td>2,252,317,545</td>
<td>2,025,215,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Revenues Ratio Operating Income (Loss) + Net Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>(362,280,225)</td>
<td>168,470,332</td>
<td>261,025,198</td>
<td>182,632,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>1,914,510,657</td>
<td>2,311,071,937</td>
<td>2,252,317,545</td>
<td>2,025,215,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition Dependency Ratio Net Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>236,960,221</td>
<td>218,763,485</td>
<td>210,651,518</td>
<td>195,882,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>1,914,510,657</td>
<td>2,311,071,937</td>
<td>2,252,317,545</td>
<td>2,025,215,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition Per Student FTE Ratio Net Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>236,960,221</td>
<td>218,763,485</td>
<td>210,651,518</td>
<td>195,882,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>25,381</td>
<td>24,902</td>
<td>24,513</td>
<td>24,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition Discount Per Student FTE Ratio Student Aid</td>
<td>132,219,422</td>
<td>124,493,528</td>
<td>115,728,462</td>
<td>105,590,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>25,381</td>
<td>24,902</td>
<td>24,513</td>
<td>24,053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ratio Analysis - A Longitudinal View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Reserve Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>696,272,950</td>
<td>825,965,494</td>
<td>835,085,347</td>
<td>630,477,126</td>
<td>542,708,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>1,640,028,546</td>
<td>1,612,583,709</td>
<td>1,527,274,255</td>
<td>1,447,547,008</td>
<td>1,424,031,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Primary Reserve Ratio Score:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viability Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>696,272,950</td>
<td>825,965,494</td>
<td>835,085,347</td>
<td>630,477,126</td>
<td>542,708,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Debt</td>
<td>520,274,355</td>
<td>464,710,272</td>
<td>351,580,935</td>
<td>278,201,499</td>
<td>248,056,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Viability Ratio Score:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income Ratio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>(26,337,960)</td>
<td>96,610,564</td>
<td>248,834,899</td>
<td>147,863,362</td>
<td>48,556,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>1,613,690,586</td>
<td>1,709,194,273</td>
<td>1,776,109,154</td>
<td>1,595,410,370</td>
<td>1,472,587,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Net Income Ratio Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB6 Composite Score</strong></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Burden Ratio</td>
<td>46,505,783</td>
<td>30,394,683</td>
<td>29,870,957</td>
<td>27,958,846</td>
<td>28,580,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>1,582,663,876</td>
<td>1,552,597,535</td>
<td>1,474,060,022</td>
<td>1,396,384,042</td>
<td>1,369,283,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Debt Burden Ratio Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Net Assets Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>(26,337,960)</td>
<td>96,610,564</td>
<td>248,834,899</td>
<td>147,863,362</td>
<td>48,556,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Assets (prior year)</td>
<td>2,085,018,193</td>
<td>1,988,407,629</td>
<td>1,793,572,730</td>
<td>1,591,709,368</td>
<td>1,543,153,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Return on Net Assets Ratio Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio</td>
<td>240,961,118</td>
<td>286,602,029</td>
<td>162,613,761</td>
<td>141,264,104</td>
<td>93,914,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>83,767,548</td>
<td>72,561,012</td>
<td>68,469,191</td>
<td>68,158,518</td>
<td>67,320,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Facility Ratio</td>
<td>945,178,935</td>
<td>879,850,294</td>
<td>833,800,499</td>
<td>789,658,104</td>
<td>770,078,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>83,767,548</td>
<td>72,561,012</td>
<td>68,469,191</td>
<td>68,158,518</td>
<td>67,320,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Age of Facility Ratio Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Maintenance Ratio</td>
<td>115,034,775</td>
<td>99,573,409</td>
<td>103,055,193</td>
<td>90,225,578</td>
<td>93,914,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Maintenance of Plant Expenses</td>
<td>1,469,709,720</td>
<td>1,571,973,765</td>
<td>1,697,662,662</td>
<td>1,506,311,962</td>
<td>1,428,633,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>1,469,709,720</td>
<td>1,571,973,765</td>
<td>1,697,662,662</td>
<td>1,506,311,962</td>
<td>1,428,633,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Facility Maintenance Ratio Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Revenues Ratio</td>
<td>(170,318,826)</td>
<td>(40,609,944)</td>
<td>174,393,542</td>
<td>11,254,543</td>
<td>12,178,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income (Loss) + Net Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>1,469,709,720</td>
<td>1,571,973,765</td>
<td>1,697,662,662</td>
<td>1,506,311,962</td>
<td>1,428,633,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>1,469,709,720</td>
<td>1,571,973,765</td>
<td>1,697,662,662</td>
<td>1,506,311,962</td>
<td>1,428,633,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Net Operating Revenues Ratio Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>255,578,126</td>
<td>239,567,346</td>
<td>231,621,036</td>
<td>232,960,224</td>
<td>210,613,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>255,578,126</td>
<td>239,567,346</td>
<td>231,621,036</td>
<td>232,960,224</td>
<td>210,613,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>1,469,709,720</td>
<td>1,571,973,765</td>
<td>1,697,662,662</td>
<td>1,506,311,962</td>
<td>1,428,633,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income (Loss) + Net Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>1,469,709,720</td>
<td>1,571,973,765</td>
<td>1,697,662,662</td>
<td>1,506,311,962</td>
<td>1,428,633,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB6 Net Tuition Dependency Ratio Score:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition Per Student FTE Ratio</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratios obtained from "Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education" - Sixth Edition
(A joint project of KPMG, Prager, Sealy & Co., LLC and BearingPoint)
## Ratio Analysis - A Longitudinal View

### Washington State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Primary Reserve Ratio</td>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>171,672,239</td>
<td>192,468,990</td>
<td>179,117,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>835,527,818</td>
<td>828,390,299</td>
<td>743,246,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB6 Primary Reserve Ratio Score:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Viability Ratio</td>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>171,672,239</td>
<td>192,468,990</td>
<td>179,117,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-Term Debt</td>
<td>290,573,000</td>
<td>304,913,461</td>
<td>282,418,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB6 Viability Ratio Score:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Net Income Ratio</td>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>71,129,833</td>
<td>72,044,725</td>
<td>100,068,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>906,657,651</td>
<td>900,435,024</td>
<td>843,315,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB6 Net Income Ratio Score:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SB6 Composite Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Debt Burden Ratio</td>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>23,738,252</td>
<td>25,732,185</td>
<td>20,306,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>776,928,066</td>
<td>774,306,424</td>
<td>702,411,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Return on Net Assets Ratio</td>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>71,129,833</td>
<td>72,044,725</td>
<td>100,068,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Net Assets (prior year)</td>
<td>1,439,092,806</td>
<td>1,367,048,081</td>
<td>1,266,979,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Physical Asset Reinvestment Ratio</td>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>168,230,592</td>
<td>170,727,490</td>
<td>126,554,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>68,493,251</td>
<td>64,557,828</td>
<td>50,595,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Age of Facility Ratio</td>
<td>Accumulated Depreciation</td>
<td>855,954,415</td>
<td>801,697,645</td>
<td>743,643,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Facility Maintenance Ratio</td>
<td>Operations and Maintenance of Plant Expenses</td>
<td>41,529,164</td>
<td>50,622,102</td>
<td>46,464,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>804,920,013</td>
<td>833,250,385</td>
<td>770,245,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Net Operating Revenues Ratio</td>
<td>Operating Income (Loss) + Net Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>(30,607,805)</td>
<td>4,860,086</td>
<td>26,999,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>804,920,013</td>
<td>833,250,385</td>
<td>770,245,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Net Tuition Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>Net Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>173,288,111</td>
<td>165,785,301</td>
<td>143,481,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Revenues + Non-operating Revenues</td>
<td>804,920,013</td>
<td>833,250,385</td>
<td>770,245,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Net Tuition Per Student FTE Ratio</td>
<td>Net Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>173,288,111</td>
<td>165,785,301</td>
<td>143,481,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>22,423</td>
<td>21,578</td>
<td>20,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Net Tuition Discount Per Student FTE Ratio</td>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>105,852,865</td>
<td>92,908,680</td>
<td>80,314,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Students</td>
<td>22,423</td>
<td>21,578</td>
<td>20,827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix II: Ohio University Audited Financial Data

### OHIO UNIVERSITY
(A Component Unit of the State of Ohio)

#### STATEMENTS OF NET ASSETS
As of June 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT ASSETS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$39,033,891</td>
<td>$48,850,210</td>
<td>$37,117,319</td>
<td>$31,594,535</td>
<td>33,308,241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>99,709,943</td>
<td>112,219,274</td>
<td>111,750,833</td>
<td>98,134,548</td>
<td>94,249,146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts and pledges receivable</td>
<td>52,379,198</td>
<td>43,309,109</td>
<td>44,486,015</td>
<td>35,341,172</td>
<td>33,466,417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes receivable - net</td>
<td>2,581,708</td>
<td>2,001,368</td>
<td>3,365,266</td>
<td>19,120,275</td>
<td>3,278,663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses and deferred</td>
<td>15,429,271</td>
<td>13,300,265</td>
<td>16,172,819</td>
<td>16,319,601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>211,568,684</td>
<td>222,328,302</td>
<td>215,222,893</td>
<td>189,771,412</td>
<td>182,764,132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONCURRENT ASSETS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted cash and cash</td>
<td>29,749,815</td>
<td>2,086,503</td>
<td>14,663,754</td>
<td>45,425,214</td>
<td>22,247,912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment investments</td>
<td>13,912,057</td>
<td>16,237,286</td>
<td>16,818,390</td>
<td>15,167,182</td>
<td>11,970,621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes receivable - net</td>
<td>11,912,171</td>
<td>12,737,648</td>
<td>11,650,443</td>
<td>10,717,210</td>
<td>11,030,241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets - net</td>
<td>604,963,765</td>
<td>565,835,713</td>
<td>554,662,276</td>
<td>533,356,958</td>
<td>510,704,592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NONCURRENT ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>660,537,808</td>
<td>596,897,150</td>
<td>597,794,863</td>
<td>604,666,564</td>
<td>555,953,366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>$872,106,492</td>
<td>$819,225,452</td>
<td>$813,017,756</td>
<td>$794,437,976</td>
<td>$738,717,498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued</td>
<td>47,307,506</td>
<td>44,234,027</td>
<td>42,579,902</td>
<td>38,619,310</td>
<td>37,825,767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue</td>
<td>32,620,439</td>
<td>30,607,236</td>
<td>24,523,487</td>
<td>13,772,319</td>
<td>11,970,621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds and other liabilities</td>
<td>4,249,469</td>
<td>3,453,259</td>
<td>4,810,021</td>
<td>1,880,191</td>
<td>1,292,220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital lease obligations</td>
<td>383,390</td>
<td>89,615</td>
<td>86,942</td>
<td>54,526</td>
<td>64,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds and notes payable</td>
<td>14,445,000</td>
<td>16,172,819</td>
<td>16,172,819</td>
<td>16,319,601</td>
<td>15,143,709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits held in custody for</td>
<td>1,238,139</td>
<td>1,235,280</td>
<td>1,562,329</td>
<td>1,426,446</td>
<td>1,292,220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CURRENT LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td>100,143,943</td>
<td>96,239,417</td>
<td>94,332,681</td>
<td>78,859,270</td>
<td>79,854,071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONCURRENT LIABILITIES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensated absences</td>
<td>12,857,622</td>
<td>13,460,923</td>
<td>12,787,146</td>
<td>13,772,319</td>
<td>14,266,269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital lease obligations</td>
<td>1,114,875</td>
<td>348,412</td>
<td>242,647</td>
<td>37,823</td>
<td>64,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other long-term liabilities</td>
<td>3,089,962</td>
<td>2,464,160</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds and notes payable</td>
<td>77,775,000</td>
<td>150,345,000</td>
<td>161,815,000</td>
<td>176,680,400</td>
<td>147,997,261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital lease obligations</td>
<td>6,094,501</td>
<td>5,178,561</td>
<td>5,601,054</td>
<td>6,141,111</td>
<td>5,143,709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refundable advances for</td>
<td>8,526,390</td>
<td>8,456,624</td>
<td>8,621,865</td>
<td>10,666,751</td>
<td>10,248,823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NONCURRENT LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td>208,458,350</td>
<td>180,253,680</td>
<td>189,127,729</td>
<td>176,121,153</td>
<td>168,807,113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td>308,602,293</td>
<td>276,493,097</td>
<td>283,460,410</td>
<td>288,148,114</td>
<td>255,975,224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invested in capital assets</td>
<td>433,324,410</td>
<td>393,337,530</td>
<td>386,411,424</td>
<td>379,778,713</td>
<td>360,279,657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonexpendable</td>
<td>13,912,057</td>
<td>16,237,286</td>
<td>16,818,390</td>
<td>15,167,182</td>
<td>11,970,621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable</td>
<td>38,368,587</td>
<td>46,085,751</td>
<td>40,874,665</td>
<td>39,584,791</td>
<td>47,976,362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>77,899,145</td>
<td>87,071,788</td>
<td>85,452,866</td>
<td>71,759,176</td>
<td>62,515,364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>563,504,199</td>
<td>542,732,355</td>
<td>529,557,346</td>
<td>506,289,862</td>
<td>482,742,274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>$872,106,492</td>
<td>$819,225,452</td>
<td>$813,017,756</td>
<td>$794,437,976</td>
<td>$738,717,498</td>
<td>$872,106,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OHIO UNIVERSITY  
(A Component Unit of the State of Ohio)  

STATEMENTS OF REVENUES, EXPENSES AND CHANGES IN NET ASSETS  
For the year ended June 30  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tuition and fees - net of scholarship allowances</td>
<td>$229,594,649</td>
<td>$215,984,213</td>
<td>$217,740,577</td>
<td>$201,446,914</td>
<td>$196,518,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal grants and contracts</td>
<td>$24,674,768</td>
<td>$26,209,405</td>
<td>$27,404,263</td>
<td>$30,122,163</td>
<td>$28,124,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State grants and contracts</td>
<td>$7,355,636</td>
<td>$5,105,983</td>
<td>$7,294,112</td>
<td>$6,278,728</td>
<td>$6,092,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local grants and contracts</td>
<td>$471,422</td>
<td>$437,340</td>
<td>$383,291</td>
<td>$498,917</td>
<td>$507,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private grants and contracts</td>
<td>$8,262,336</td>
<td>$8,028,607</td>
<td>$7,430,777</td>
<td>$6,893,069</td>
<td>$7,062,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services</td>
<td>$10,331,376</td>
<td>$9,619,377</td>
<td>$10,113,479</td>
<td>$10,419,607</td>
<td>$10,461,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprises - net of scholarship allowances</td>
<td>$75,094,902</td>
<td>$69,154,022</td>
<td>$65,090,980</td>
<td>$59,479,387</td>
<td>$54,502,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sources</td>
<td>$14,291,055</td>
<td>$11,504,445</td>
<td>$10,208,019</td>
<td>$7,901,879</td>
<td>$5,553,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$370,076,144</td>
<td>$346,043,392</td>
<td>$346,415,674</td>
<td>$323,040,664</td>
<td>$309,846,548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Operating Expenses:** | | | | | |
| Instruction and departmental research | $214,971,589 | $202,895,906 | $203,991,047 | $187,478,442 | $179,633,550 |
| Separately budgeted research | $33,495,239 | $32,995,537 | $32,457,968 | $33,712,270 | $33,222,564 |
| Public service | $23,453,952 | $21,917,621 | $20,961,207 | $20,129,885 | $19,726,387 |
| Academic support | $59,343,563 | $58,703,123 | $58,184,520 | $55,429,877 | $52,460,139 |
| Student services | $32,769,600 | $28,522,321 | $27,313,425 | $23,461,283 | $31,928,677 |
| Institutional support | $44,771,516 | $41,675,475 | $42,401,934 | $39,770,454 | $36,823,877 |
| Operation and maintenance of plant | $10,878,749 | $9,344,798 | $10,250,507 | $8,329,253 | $9,833,690 |
| Depreciation | $33,075,444 | $32,308,560 | $30,652,754 | $29,427,367 | $29,076,351 |
| Auxiliary Enterprises | $73,900,573 | $68,845,847 | $70,306,093 | $64,784,092 | $61,874,393 |
| **Total Operating Expenses** | $554,793,537 | $524,121,780 | $520,970,615 | $487,096,469 | $474,757,001 |
| **Operating Income (Loss)** | $(184,717,393) | $(178,078,388) | $(174,554,941) | $(164,055,805) | $(164,910,453) |

| **Nonoperating Revenues and Expenses:** | | | | | |
| State appropriations | $155,105,565 | $144,999,895 | $137,197,682 | $137,369,481 | $139,620,276 |
| Federal grants | $27,083,204 | $23,487,928 | $20,014,075 | $17,198,027 | $20,607,847 |
| Student services | $7,924,417 | $7,142,428 | $6,593,195 | $5,563,372 | $5,619,623 |
| Local grants | $2,301 | $2,706 | $1,785 | $2,450 | $5,007 |
| Private gifts | $3,879,535 | $3,966,477 | $4,566,275 | $2,822,439 | $1,909,437 |
| Interest on capital asset-related debt | $(8,492,106) | $(8,492,106) | $(8,492,106) | $(8,492,106) | $(8,492,106) |
| Disposal and write-offs of plant facilities | $(283,266) | $(283,266) | $(283,266) | $(283,266) | $(283,266) |
| **Net Nonoperating Revenues** | $169,772,336 | $172,571,893 | $180,346,586 | $164,099,952 | $169,219,112 |
| **Income (Loss) Before Other Revenues, Expenses, Gains or Losses** | $(14,945,057) | $(5,506,495) | $5,791,645 | $44,147 | $4,308,659 |
| **Other Revenues, Expenses, Gains, or Losses** | | | | | |
| State capital appropriations | $24,900,161 | $17,603,472 | $14,024,105 | $20,766,812 | $12,408,134 |
| Capital grants and gifts | $10,810,781 | $3,829,024 | $3,443,433 | $2,531,424 | $3,534,963 |
| Additions to permanent endowments | $6,925,382 | $6,925,382 | $6,925,382 | $6,925,382 | $6,925,382 |
| **Total Other Revenues** | $35,716,901 | $21,445,068 | $17,475,839 | $23,503,441 | $15,949,122 |
| **Increase in Net Assets** | $20,771,844 | $15,938,573 | $23,267,484 | $23,547,588 | $20,257,781 |
| **Net Assets** | | | | | |
| Beginning of year | $542,732,355 | $526,793,782 | $506,289,862 | $482,742,274 | $462,484,493 |
| End of year | $563,504,199 | $542,732,355 | $529,557,346 | $506,289,862 | $482,742,274 |
Appendix III: FY 2008 Ratios for Comparative Purposes

### Primary Reserve Ratio - FY 2008

- **University of North Carolina**
- **Auburn University**
- **Kent State University**
- **University of Missouri**
- **University of Tennessee**
- **Miami University**
- **Indiana University**
- **Clemson University**
- **University of New Hampshire**
- **University of Cincinnati**
- **Ohio University**
- **Washington State University**
- **University of Connecticut**

**Average:** 0.450

### Viability Ratio - FY 2008

- **University of Connecticut**
- **University of Cincinnati**
- **Washington State University**
- **University of New Hampshire**
- **Clemson University**
- **University of North Carolina**

**Average:** 1.026
5 Year Ratio Analysis
SB6, National and Ohio Peers

Tab

Senate Bill 6 Ratios
Aspirational Peer Schools – FY 2009

[Diagram showing data for various educational institutions]
Senate Bill 6 Ratios
Ohio Schools – FY 2009

Diagram showing various ratios for different institutions in Ohio for the fiscal year 2009.
In attendance were Trustee Sandra Anderson, Trustee Yvette McGee Brown, Trustee Gene Harris, Trustee David Brightbill and Student Trustee Chauncey Jackson. Also attending were Secretary to the Board Thomas E. Davis and General Counsel John J. Biancamano.

1. Amendment of Board Bylaws

The Committee reviewed amendments to the Board Bylaws. There were no objections to the inclusion of the amendments in the consent agenda at the April 16 meeting.

2. Kennedy Museum of Art Advisory Board Members

The Committee reviewed the resolution on appointments to the Kennedy Museum of Art Advisory Board. There were no objections to the inclusion of the appointments in the consent agenda at the April 16 meeting.

3. Student Trustee Selection Process

Trustee Jackson reported on the student trustee selection process. The Student Trustee Selection Committee of the Student Senate has sent five recommendations for the student trustee position to President McDavis who in turn forwarded them to the Governor. The Governor’s Office will conduct interviews in early May and a final announcement is expected before the June meeting.

4. National Trustee Selection Process
Trustee Anderson reported on the process for appointing the two national trustees whose terms will begin on July 1, 2010. Candidates have been identified. The Governance Committee will make recommendations to the Board at the June meeting.

5. Retreat Planning

The annual Board retreat will be held on September 2 and 3 in Athens. A special meeting of the Governance Committee will be scheduled to develop the agenda for the retreat. The Committee will report to the Board at the June meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.
The Ohio University Board of Trustees By-Laws as Amended

Revised July 14, 1989
Revised June 23, 1990
Revised September 20, 2002
Revised December 17, 2004
Revised February 8, 2008
Revised January 23, 2009
Revised February 8, 2008
Revised July 14, 1989
Revised June 23, 1990
Revised September 20, 2002
Revised December 17, 2004

Article I. Corporate Authority and By-Laws

Section 1. Since by Federal and State law, there shall be and forever remain in the said university, a body politic and corporate, by the name and state of The President and Trustees of the Ohio University in the name and style of The Ohio University. The Ohio University Board of Trustees, hereinafter referred to as the Board, chooses to be governed by these By-Laws and the applicable provisions of Ohio law.

Section 2. The adoption of these By-Laws by the Board automatically nullifies all previous By-Laws.

Section 3. No By-Laws shall be enacted, amended, or repealed, except by a majority vote (5 votes) of the Board, and then only after thirty (30) days notice of a proposed change has been given to all members.

Section 4. In addition to the eleven trustees appointed by the Governor of the State of Ohio in accordance with Section 3337.01 of the Ohio Revised Code, the Board shall include two national trustees and the chair of the Ohio University Alumni Association Board of Directors or his or her designee. One national trustee shall be appointed by the
Board for a term of one year beginning on July 1, 2010. One national trustee shall be appointed by the Board for a term of three years beginning on July 1, 2010. Thereafter, both national trustees shall serve terms of three years.

Section 45. The two student trustees, serving in accordance with Section 3337.01 (B) Ohio Revised Code (ORC), and the two national trustees and the chair /representative of the Ohio University Alumni Association Board of Directors, who are appointed by the Board, may not vote on Board matters but their opinions and advice will be actively solicited and welcomed in Board deliberations.

Article II. Officers of the Board

Section 1. Officers of the Board shall be as follows:

(a) Chairperson

(b) Vice-Chairperson

(c) Secretary

(d) Treasurer

Section 2. The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the Board, and unless otherwise directed by the Board, shall have the authority to appoint members of and to fill vacancies on all standing and special committees. He or she shall serve as Chairperson of the Executive Committee. Subject to these By-Laws, he or she shall fix the date and time of all regular, special, and emergency meetings, and perform such other duties as may be pertinent to the office of the Chairperson.

Section 3. The Vice-Chairperson, in the absence or incapacity of the Chairperson, shall assume the duties and obligations of the Chairperson.

Section 4. The Secretary shall keep minutes of all Board meetings and shall promptly distribute copies to all Board members. He or she shall be responsible for the orderly preservation of all records pertaining to Board business, and shall perform all other duties usual to the office or imposed by the Chairperson or by Board action.

Section 5. The Treasurer shall be responsible for the fiscal management of the University, including supporting budget preparation, the preparation of all officially required financial reports, investments, coordination of audits with auditors, including federal and state auditors, relationships with financial reporting agencies, and all other financial responsibilities generally or specifically assigned by the Board or the President.
Section 1. The Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, Secretary, and Treasurer shall be elected annually by the Board.

Section 2. The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson shall each serve for one year and shall be eligible for re-election to their respective offices for a period up to three (3) years. The Secretary and the Treasurer shall be eligible for annual election to these offices without a yearly limitation.

Article IV. The President and Presidential Duties

Section 1. On the basis of mutual good faith and any contractual relationship pointing to continuous service, the President of the University shall be elected from year to year, and shall be entitled at all times to one (1) year severance notice or one (1) year salary if terminated.

Section 2. The President shall attend all meetings of the Board and shall, in an advisory capacity, have a voice in its deliberations. He or she shall have the authority to initiate any subject at Board meetings.

Section 3. The President shall be responsible to the Board for the administration and discipline of the University.

Article V. Meetings

Section 1. Regular Meetings. The Board shall hold no fewer than four (4)five (5) regular meetings a year, with the date and time fixed in accordance with the provisions of Article II. Section 2.

Section 2. Special and Emergency Meetings. Special and emergency meetings may be held upon the call of the Chairperson or upon the written request of three (3) Board members to the Secretary.

Section 3. Notice of Meetings. The Secretary shall notify all Board members and the President at least five days in advance of all regular and special meetings and at least one day in advance of all emergency meetings. The policy designated "Notification Procedures for Meetings," which has been adopted by the Board pursuant to Revised Code Section 121.22 (P) ORC, is hereby incorporated by reference into this section, and the Secretary shall carry out his or her responsibilities under that policy in accordance with its provision for all meetings.

Section 4. Attendance. It shall be the policy of the Board to require full attendance at all meetings of the Board and committees in accordance with Revised Code Section 3.17 ORC. Excuses for absence from meetings shall be communicated to the Secretary at least two (2) days before meetings. Persistent unreasonable absences in violation of Ohio law shall be cause, at the pleasure of the Chairperson, for reporting such delinquency to the appropriate authority of the State of Ohio.
Section 5. Quorum. For the purpose of doing business, a majority (5 members) of the Board membership shall constitute a quorum; however, a vote of two-thirds (6 votes) of the Board members shall be necessary to elect or remove a President; and a vote of a majority (5 votes) of the Board members shall be necessary to authorize the sale or lease of a University building or the planned demolition of a University building.

Section 6. Agenda. The Chairperson of the Board or the President of the University, except for emergency meeting, shall prepare and place in the hands of the Secretary a suggested agenda of each Board meeting in time for the Secretary to include it in the notice provided for in Section 3 of this Article. The Secretary shall consult with the chairs of the Standing Committees and then prepare a proposed agenda for each Regular Meeting. The proposed agenda shall be delivered to the President for his or her review and then to the Chairperson of the Board for final approval.

Article VI. Standing and Special Committees

Section 1. Standing Committees of the Board, consisting of no fewer than three (3) members each, shall be appointed annually or for longer terms by the Chairperson of the Board, and each Standing Committee shall consider and make recommendations for action by the Board on the various policy matters enumerated below as follows:

(a) University Academics. Responsibilities will include the academic plan; enrollment management; student life; intercollegiate athletics; diversity; research and technology transfer policies and activities; information technology; communications and marketing; academic appointments; promotion and tenure policies and procedures; academic program reviews; and awarding of degrees.

(b) University Resources. Responsibilities will include financial operations; business organization and practices; human resources; university advancement; relations with local, state, and federal legislative and administrative agencies; recommending of the schedule of tuition and fees; borrowing of funds; naming, location, planning, construction, and maintenance and renovation of the University’s facilities and grounds; the purchase, sale and lease of lands and buildings; reviewing and monitoring of all investments including the endowment; contract oversight on public utilities and other large contracts; and recommending of investment policy, advising the Board on investments and appointment of investment advisors to assure compliance with Section 3345.05 ORC.

(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.

(d) Governance. Responsibilities will include the recommendation of general governance policies and procedures, the nomination of Board officers and recommendation of
candidates for future trustees and national trustees. At the last meeting in each fiscal year, the Committee shall review these Bylaws to determine whether any changes are appropriate and shall recommend any such changes to the Board of Trustees.

(e) Executive. Responsibilities will include consulting with the President on the appointment of executive officers and business not specifically assigned to another Standing or Special Committee.

Section 2. The Executive Committee shall be made up of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board of Trustees and the Chairs of University Academics and University Resources Committees and have broad powers to act in all matters not deemed by the Chairperson of the Board and the President of the University as of importance to command the immediate attention of the entire Board. All actions of the Executive Committee shall be subject to approval by the Board, except those wherein the Board has delegated to the Executive Committee or the President full power to act for the Board.

Section 3. Special committees may be appointed by the Chairperson of the Board for the purpose as the Board may deem necessary.

Section 4. The Chairperson of the Board and the President or designee shall be ex-officio members of all Standing Committees and Special Committees; however, neither is eligible to serve as a voting member of a Standing or Special Committee, in his or her ex-officio capacity.

Article VII. Parliamentary Authority

Section 1. When not in conflict with any of the provisions of these By-Laws, the Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised shall govern the proceedings of the Board.
David Wolfort, Chair of the Audit Committee, called the meeting to order at 4:20 pm. Other Committee Members present were Trustee Larry Schey, Trustee Norman Dewire and Student Trustee Kyle Triplett. President McDavis was also present.

• External Audit – 2010 Audit Planning Meeting
Plante Moran, the external auditor, made a presentation to the Board on the upcoming FY10 Audit. Robert Shenton and Keith Martinez of Plante Moran discussed material presented. Discussed reports/letters to be issued and the responsibilities of both Plante Moran and the University. Timing and key dates for the FY10 audit presented to the committee. Informed Trustees of new auditing standards and the potential impact on the audit.

• EthicsPoint Trends
Kathy Gilmore, Chief Audit Executive, presented on EthicsPoint. Ms. Gilmore presented on the history of the Ethicspoint hotline, the whistleblower policy, the advantages of using EthicsPoint as our provider and the process of making a report through EthicsPoint. A summary of reports received since the hotline was implemented and the type of resolution was also provided.

At 4:53 p.m. Trustee Wolfort motioned to adjourn to executive session. Trustee Dewire seconded. Vote was Unanimous. The focus of the Executive Session was for the sole purpose of the consideration of the appointment, employment, dismissal, discipline, promotion, demotion, or compensation of a public employee or official, or the investigation of charges or complaints against a public employee, pursuant to the provisions of R.C. 121.22 (G)(1).

At 4:53 p.m. Trustee Wolfort motioned to adjourn to executive session. Trustee Dewire seconded. Vote was Unanimous. The focus of the Executive Session was for the sole purpose of an audit conference conducted by an independent certified public accountants
with officials of the public office that is the subject of the audit, pursuant to the provisions of R.C. 121.22 (G)(2).

There was no unfinished business.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30p.m.
Ohio University
Board of Trustees
Audit Committee
2010 Audit Planning Meeting

April 15, 2010
Ohio University
Audit Planning Agenda

• The Ohio University Audit Team
• Reporting and Responsibilities
• Audit Approach
• Audit Issues
• Emerging Issues
• Timing
• Letter of Auditor Responsibilities and Peer Review Report
### Ohio University Audit Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Shenton</td>
<td>Engagement Partner</td>
<td>614.222.9064</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robert.Shenton@plantemoran.com">Robert.Shenton@plantemoran.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robb Rose</td>
<td>Technical Partner</td>
<td>419.842.6188</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Robb.Rose@plantemoran.com">Robb.Rose@plantemoran.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Martinez</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>614.222.9086</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Keith.Martinez@plantemoran.com">Keith.Martinez@plantemoran.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Saxton</td>
<td>In-Charge</td>
<td>614.222.9114</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jonathan.Saxton@plantemoran.com">Jonathan.Saxton@plantemoran.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohio University
Reporting and Responsibilities

- **Plante Moran Reports**
  - Opining on FY 2010 University Financial Statements and the University’s Federal programs
  - Opining on FY 2010 for the Foundation, the Inn-Ohio of Athens, Inc., Housing for Ohio, Inc., Russ Research Center LLC, and WOUB’s Financial Statements
  - Procedures related to compliance with NCAA Bylaws
  - State “Special Purpose” Report

- **Plante Moran Responsibilities**
  - To express an opinion on the University’s and the Foundation’s financial statements
  - To express an opinion on the major federal programs of the University
  - To express an opinion on the Inn-Ohio of Athens, Inc., Housing for Ohio, Inc. and Russ Research Center LLC’s financial statements
  - To express an opinion on WOUB’s financial statements
  - To provide reasonable, not absolute, assurance of detecting material misstatement
  - To gain an understanding of internal controls, policies, and procedures to design an effective audit

- **Plante Moran has issued the following Letters for 2010:**
  - **Planning Stage**
    - Letter on Auditor Responsibilities with required attachments
Ohio University
Reporting and Responsibilities (continued)

• **Plante Moran will issue the following Reports and Letters (continued):**
  - **Prior to Fieldwork:**
    - Engagement letter for procedures to be performed in accordance with NCAA Bylaws
  - **At Completion of work:**
    - An opinion on the financial statements of the University, the Foundation, the component units of the Foundation and for WOUB
    - Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of the Financial Statements Performed in Accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* (GAGAS report) for the University, the Foundation, the component units of the Foundation, and for WOUB
    - OMB Circular A-133 reports and schedules
      - Report on Compliance with Requirements Applicable to Each Major Program and on Internal Control over Compliance in accordance with OMB Circular A-133
      - A Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs
    - A Management Recommendation Letter (SAS 115), if applicable
    - A Report on Agreed Upon Procedures related to Intercollegiate Athletics in Accordance with NCAA Bylaws
Ohio University
Audit Approach

- **Financial Statement Audits (includes the Foundation and its component units)**
  - General Controls Assessment and Paperless System testing (i.e., registration, tuition, and endowments)
  - Risk Based Approach – More time will be spent on those areas considered higher risk
  - Documentation and testing of key accounting processes and internal controls by major cycles – purchasing, expenditures and accounts payable, payroll and related year end liabilities, revenue, receipts and accounts receivable, investments and related income, financial reporting
  - P&M to engage Manoranjan & Shaffer, Inc. as minority subcontractor

- **OMB Circular A-133 reports**
  - Audit is performed in compliance with federal regulations and includes compliance and internal control categories as defined by OMB

- **NCAA Agreed-Upon Procedures**
  - Suggested procedures for line items determined by NCAA
  - Higher risk items will be tested based on discussions with management and knowledge of programs and related revenues and expenses
Ohio University
Audit Approach (continued)

• **WOUB Center for Public Media**
  - Accounting process and internal control procedures incorporated into University systems testing
  - Significant asset, liability, revenue, and expense financial statement balances tested for WOUB
  - Review and submission of online financial reporting in accordance with Corporation for Public Broadcasting requirements

• **Plante Moran has been advised:**
  - The University is in compliance with all regulatory, governmental, and grant requirements
  - There have been no material acts of fraud or embezzlement
  - There have been no significant acts of fraud related to federal programs
  - The University is not aware of any accounting entries made which are not in the normal course of business
  - The University is not aware of any material illegal or improper acts

January 9, 2006
Ohio University
Audit Approach (continued)

• **Internal Audit Assessment**
  - Incorporate and review internal audit reports into our audit approach in certain areas
  - Internal audit staff will provide 120 hours towards the audit fieldwork

• **Materiality**
  - **Plante & Moran determines materiality by the users of the statements**
    - Identified users – State and Federal Governmental agencies, bond rating agencies, donors, and the Board of Trustees
    - Factors used – Total Assets, Total Net Assets, and Total Revenues

• **Communications with the Audit Committee:**
  - Required fraud inquiries during planning process
  - All services provided by Plante Moran to Ohio University
  - Independence, in compliance with GAO requirements
  - Passed adjustments schedules
  - Changes in report presentation
    - Nothing significant anticipated

January 9, 2006
Ohio University
New Pronouncements

- GASB 51 - Accounting and Reporting for Intangible Assets
  - Defines intangible assets (patents, copyrights, etc.) and the proper timing of capitalization and related amortization
  - No significant impact expected on June 30, 2010 Financial Statements

- GASB 53 - Accounting and Financial Reporting for Derivative Instruments
  - The fair value of derivatives be reported as assets or liabilities in the financial statements and related footnotes
  - If an effective hedge, the fair value will be recorded as a deferred asset or liability
  - The University does have a swap agreement related to the fair value of bonds which needs to be analyzed
# Ohio University
Timing and Key Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Conference with Executive Management</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit scope presentation to Audit Committee</strong></td>
<td><strong>April 15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary fieldwork begins</td>
<td>May 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary fieldwork ends</td>
<td>May 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end fieldwork – Russ Research Center LLC</td>
<td>August 2 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end fieldwork – Inn-Ohio of Athens, Inc.</td>
<td>August 9 – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end fieldwork – Housing for Ohio, Inc.</td>
<td>August 9 – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end fieldwork begins – University including A-133 and Foundation</td>
<td>August 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Financial Statements to Plante &amp; Moran</td>
<td>September 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end fieldwork ends – University including A-133 and Foundation</td>
<td>September 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing meeting with management &amp; final draft of financial statements</td>
<td>September 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Draft Management Letter to Executive Management, if applicable</td>
<td>October 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Timing and Key Dates (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of draft audited statements and management letter to</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of final University Financial Statements to State Auditor</td>
<td>October 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of final Foundation Financial Statements to State Auditor</td>
<td>October 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of final Russ Research Center LLC Financial Statements to State Auditor</td>
<td>October 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of final Inn-Ohio of Athens, Inc. Financial Statements to State Auditor</td>
<td>October 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of final Housing for Ohio, Inc. Financial Statements to State Auditor</td>
<td>October 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of final management letter to State Auditor</td>
<td>October 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOUB and NCAA procedures fieldwork begins</td>
<td>Mid November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft WOUB reports to be issued to the University</td>
<td>November 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft NCAA reports to be issued to the University</td>
<td>November 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of final WOUB and NCAA reports to State Auditor</td>
<td>December 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification of <em>Corporation of Public Broadcasting</em> online reports for WOUB</td>
<td>December 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohio University
Letter on Auditor Responsibilities and Peer Review Report

Under the Government Accounting Office (GAO) requirements, if a federal expenditure audit is being performed annually, prior to commencement of audit work, the Audit Committee and/or Board of Trustees are required to receive from the audit firm the following documents:

- Letter on Auditor Responsibilities
- Peer Review Report (this is performed every three years)
• **Control Deficiency**
  • A control deficiency exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect misstatements on a timely basis. A deficiency in design exists when (a) a control necessary to meet the control objective is missing or (b) an existing control is not properly designed so that even if the control operates as designed, the control objective is not always met. A deficiency in operation exists when a properly designed control does not operate as designed or when the person performing the control does not possess the necessary authority or qualifications to perform the control effectively. Control deficiencies may involve one or more of the five interrelated components of internal control.

• **Significant Deficiency**
  • A significant deficiency is a control deficiency, or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects the entity's ability to initiate, authorize, record, process, or report financial data reliably in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles such that there is more than a remote likelihood that a misstatement of the entity's financial statements that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected.

• **Material Weakness**
  • A “material weakness” in internal control is a “significant deficiency” for which the design or operation of one or more internal control components does not reduce to a relatively low level the risk that errors or fraud in amounts that could be material in relation to the financial statements may occur and not be detected within a timely period by employees in the normal course of performing their assigned functions.
  • No material weaknesses were identified during the 2009 audit.

• **Fraud**
  • The term “fraud” includes “misstatements” arising from fraudulent financial reporting and misstatements arising from misappropriation of assets.
  • “Misstatements” arising from “fraudulent financial reporting” are intentional misstatements, or omissions of amounts or disclosures in financial statements intended to deceive financial statement users.
  • “Misstatements” arising from “misappropriation of assets” involve the theft of assets where the effect of the theft causes the financial statements not to be presented in conformity with GAAP.
  • The University is responsible for the design and implementation of programs and controls to prevent and detect fraud.

• **GAAP**
  • Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. Used by almost all entities in the USA to prepare periodic financial statements.
Ohio University
Appendix - Definitions

- Allowance
  - An estimate determined by management based on past history of write off of student and contribution’s receivable of the amount of student and contribution receivables at June 30 that are not expected to be received.

- NCAA Agreed Upon Procedures
  - National Collegiate Athletic Association requires procedures to be performed in accordance with their bylaws. These procedures relate to the classification of revenues and expenses by athletic program and the content within the respective line items of revenues and expenses.

- A-133 Audit
  - The U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133 which sets forth standards for obtaining consistency and uniformity among Federal agencies for the audit of States, local governments, and non-profit organizations expending Federal awards. This is also known as “Single Audit” and is focused on programs funded with federal dollars. At Ohio University, this primarily consists of student financial aid and research and development grants.

- 990T
  - Corporate income tax form for exempt organization unrelated income. This primarily relates to income earned on limited partnerships that is considered taxable by the IRS (real estate and natural resources), and non-educational use of institutional property.

- Non-Exchange Transaction
  - Revenues received by the University that are deemed not related to the University providing a service. They consist primarily of gifts, investment income, federal pell grant revenue and state operating appropriations. State appropriations are subject to annual approval by state legislature and are reported based on the state operating budget that funds the appropriation to the University.

- FASB
  - Financial Accounting Standards Board is the governing accounting body that issues reporting pronouncements for private sector organizations. The Foundation prepares their financial statements in accordance with these pronouncements and guidance.
Ohio University
Appendix - Definitions

- **GAAS**
  - Generally Accepted Auditing Standards. The standards that govern the conduct of independent audits of non-public companies, as determined by the Auditing Standards Board (ASB) of the AICPA.

- **GAGAS**
  - Generally Accepted Governmental Auditing Standards. Informally known as “Yellow Book”, these standards guide all audits of governmental units.

- **GASB**
  - Governmental Accounting Standards Board is the governing accounting body that issues reporting pronouncements. Ohio University prepares their financial statements in accordance with these pronouncements and guidance.

- **Unqualified Opinion**
  - A signed representation by an auditor as to the reliability and fairness of a set of financial statements. The opinion could be qualified, unqualified, except for or adverse.

- **Auditor Opinion Date**
  - The date the audit is completed and the auditor can provide their opinion. This is defined as the date the audit fieldwork and reviews are completed and the date management has reviewed the financial statements and provided a signed representation letter to the auditors.

- **Material Misstatement**
  - To present accidental or intentional untrue financial statement information that influences a company’s value.

- **Significant Adjustments**
  - A material error in financial reporting discovered by the auditor during performance of their audit fieldwork which was large enough that it was required to be booked to the financial statements and disclosed to the audit committee or board.

- **Passed Adjustments**
  - A summary of proposed account adjustments not recorded by management and reviewed by auditors and determined, individually or in the aggregate, not to have a significant effect on the financial reporting process and therefore they are not recorded in the financial statements.
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Ohio University’s Ethics Hotline and Whistleblower Policy

Chief Audit Executive
Kathryn Gilmore
Agenda

• Ethics Hotline Background
• Whistleblower Policy
• Association of Certified Fraud Examiners Fraud Survey (ACFE Report to the Nation 2008)
• Why OHIO Implemented a Hotline
• Hotline Description
• EthicsPoint Advantages
• Hotline Process
• EthicsPoint Report Questions
• Hotline FAQs
• Hotline Summary
Ethics Hotline Background

- Implemented in February 2006
- Set the tone for the university’s commitment to promoting a culture of ethics and integrity
- Suspended August 2008 due to concerns about releasing unsubstantiated reports and extraneous personal information
- Reopened in September 2008 and modified to accept telephone-only reports
  - Eliminated HR category to narrow the focus of reporting to fraud, waste, and abuse of university assets
  - Callers speak to a trained professional working for EthicsPoint a Portland, Oregon firm
  - Avoids creating reports that contain unrelated personal information
Whistleblower Policy

• Implemented in February 2006 with the Ethics Hotline

• Purpose
  – Encourages faculty, staff, and students to make "good faith" disclosures of misconduct

• Responsibilities and Expectations
  – No employee may retaliate against a Whistleblower
  – Anyone who violates this anti-retaliation policy is subject to disciplinary action
  – Anyone filing a report or complaint with a willing disregard for the facts may be subject to disciplinary action
Whistleblower Policy (cont’d)

• Provides that Ohio University will:
  – Make every reasonable effort to immediately stop retaliation
  – Conduct an investigation of alleged acts of retaliation
  – Provide remedies to victims of retaliation

• Whistleblowers who believe that they have been retaliated against should contact Legal Affairs
ACFE Fraud Survey Results

• Survey data compiled from 959 cases of fraud resulting in the following information
  – Estimated US organizations lost 7% of annual revenues to fraud
  – 6.5% of reported fraud cases occurred in the education industry (median loss $58,000)
  – Despite the focus on anti-fraud controls such as those related to Sarbanes-Oxley; frauds were much more likely to be detected by a tip (46%) than by audits, controls, or other means
ACFE Fraud Survey Results (cont’d)

• In the 43.5% of victim organizations with a hotline, 51.8% of frauds were detected by a tip
  – Tips include reports made to internal audit, management, etc.
  – Only 45.4% of tips came through the hotline
  – ACFE anticipated tips would be more frequently reported through hotlines but found that employees were not always concerned with making an anonymous report which is the principal benefit of a hotline
Why OHIO Implemented a Hotline

• Provides an option for employees to voice concerns about potential irregularities in an anonymous way
• Increases transparency
• Is a strong deterrent to fraud
• Frauds are most often discovered through tips
• Provides protection for employees concerned about potential retaliation by formally identifying the reporter as a whistleblower
Ethics Hotline Description

• Hotline is a 24/7 anonymous telephone-only reporting system

• Hotline is NOT
  – For 911 or emergency reporting
  – A substitute for existing reporting methods
  – For academic affairs, student affairs, or human resources issues
    • These reports are to be made through existing channels
EthicsPoint Advantages

• Upload capabilities for faxed and mailed documents which support the report
• A report key and password are provided to facilitate an anonymous dialogue
• EthicsPoint is a well respected third-party provider
  – Ohio higher education clients include OSU, Miami, Toledo, and Cincinnati
  – Is endorsed by the Association of College and University Auditors and NACUBO
Ethics Hotline Process

• Links to the Ethics Hotline webpage on the President’s and Internal Audit’s homepages

• Links to non-retaliation (Whistleblower) policy, the President’s letter, and FAQs

• Reporters are directed to call toll-free 1-866-294-9591 to make an Ohio University report

• Calls are answered by a trained operator who states “Thank you for calling the Ohio University Ethics Hotline operated by EthicsPoint”

• Operator walks the reporter through a set of standard questions
EthicsPoint Report Questions

- Whether to remain anonymous
- Relationship to institution
- Estimated monetary value of the issue
- Persons engaged in the behavior
- Whether management is involved or is aware of the issue
- Persons who attempted to conceal the problem and the steps to conceal it
- Where the incident occurred
- Time it occurred
- How long the problem has been going on
- How the reporter became aware of it
- Detailed description of the issue
Ohio University (OHIO) has selected EthicsPoint to provide a simple, anonymous way for employees to report suspected fraud, waste, or abuse of university assets or other compliance and regulatory issues. You may file a report by calling toll-free 1-866-294-9591.

OHIO considers employee concerns very important and desires your cooperation in resolving such issues. However, the Ethics Hotline does not replace or supersede existing reporting methods on campus. The University strongly encourages employees to report concerns directly through normal lines of communication.

Additional Resources

make a report

To make a report to Ohio University, call toll-free 1-866-294-9591. The following categories of reports will be accepted:

Financial Matters
Accounting, fraud, theft, donor stewardship, or other financial issue

Regulatory/Research and Compliance
Concerns related to grants or research, athletics, and violations of local, state, federal or other regulations

Risk and Safety
Unsafe working conditions, vandalism, environmental issues, and other risk and safety issues

Medical
Medical issues related to university medical operations

Information Technology
Data privacy or integrity, inappropriate use of technology, software piracy or copyright infringements.

our commitment

Ohio University (OHIO) asserts that reports submitted via EthicsPoint will be handled promptly and discretely. No retaliatory action will be taken against anyone for reporting or inquiring in good faith about potential breaches of OHIO's policies. Reports submitted through
Ethics Hotline FAQs

• How to make a report

• Reporter’s responsibility to make a “good faith” report
  – Providing false or intentionally misleading information may result in discipline or termination

• What situations to report
  – Suspected fraud, waste, or abuse of university assets or alleged violations of other policies or regulations
Ethics Hotline FAQs (cont’d)

• How to determine the status of the reported issue
  – Anonymous reporters receive a report key and can call and request an update
  – Self-identified reporters will be contacted directly by a university official

• Whether the reporter will be told investigation results
  – Reporters will be told whether the issue was investigated, and whether it was resolved
  – There are legal and other restrictions on what information can be provided
Ethics Hotline FAQs (cont’d)

• To provide additional information after a report is filed reporters are told
  – To call the toll free number and tell the interviewer they are following up on a report
  – To provide their username and unique password
  – That Internal Audit and Legal Affairs will be alerted that the report was amended and will review it

• When reporters should identify themselves
  – If the reporter is concerned about retaliation, the university may be obligated to consider the reporter as a whistleblower and legally protect them against retaliation
Ethics Hotline FAQs (cont’d)

• EthicsPoint system is designed to protect anonymity and does not trace phone calls.

• However, reporters should be cautious about their statements to avoid accidentally revealing their identity through statements such as:
  – “From my cubical next to Jan Smith...” or “In my 33 years...”
Ethics Hotline FAQs (cont’d)

• Whether an anonymous reporter’s identity could be learned
  – An identity may become apparent when particular facts suggest that the report must have come from one person
  – In all cases, the university forbids retaliation against those making a good faith report and provides resources to assist reporters concerned about retaliation
• Whether anyone outside the university might see the report
  – Records generated in the course of an investigation may be subject to disclosure in accordance with applicable law, including Ohio’s Public Records Act

• Whether the reporter’s supervisor and others in the unit will learn of allegation
  – In most cases, area leadership will be notified because employees may be interviewed or asked for documents
  – In some cases, a supervisor may not be told until action is taken to assure the matter is fully investigated and resolved
• Whether the subject of the allegation will learn that the reporter is the source of the report
  – If the incident was observed by several people or if physical evidence exists the university may be able to fully investigate without revealing the reporter
  – If no other evidence exists the university may be unable to fully investigate unless the reporter comes forward
  – If the reporter self-identifies the university will work to assure they will not be treated unfairly for having raised a good faith concern
Ethics Hotline Summary

• 41 reports received from February 2006 through February 2010
• 2 reports resulted in successful prosecution
• Resolution options include unsubstantiated, counseling, repayment, training, substantiated, and other
  – 21 unsubstantiated reports as determined by Internal Audit, Legal Affairs, or previously by Human Resources
Ethics Hotline Summary (cont’d)

- While the hotline primarily serves as a strong deterrent to fraud
  - 4 reports resulted in total repayment to date of $34,941
  - Total cost since inception $28,700
  - Current annual cost of hotline is $3,000
Reports by Fiscal Year

- Total Reports
- Human Resources
- Financial
- Unsubstantiated
Conclusion
Ohio University Board of Trustees  
Executive Committee Meeting  
April, 16, 2010  
Ohio University Inn, Athens, Ohio


Also attending were President Roderick J. McDavis, Board Secretary Thomas E. Davis, Acting Treasurer Michael Angelini, Director of Human Resources Linda Lonsinger, and Legal Counsel John Biancamano

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 a.m. by Chair Kidder.

The meeting began with a brief report from Mr. Minichello who presented the Board with an annual report from the National Alumni Board of Directors.

Secretary Davis offered a brief overview of the newly adopted Consent Agenda process. He addressed the benefits that such an agenda allows.

Trustee Dewire reinforced the idea of posing topics for open discussion by the Trustees on important topics. Two that he offered were factors that lead to accessibility and strategies for Regional Higher Education planning.

Trustee Kidder raised the issue of candidacy for the Chair and Vice Chair of the board for next year. He reminded the Board of the circumstances leading him to serve as the current chairperson. Trustee Anderson indicated that the Governance Committee put forth the name of Trustee Marnette Perry to serve as Chair and Trustee Robert Kidder to serve as Vice Chair.
President McDavis offered a brief update on the search for the Vice President for Finance and Administration. He indicated that a viable candidate did not rise from the initial review, and as a result, the search committee will extend the search. Baker and Associates will continue to make recommendations to the search committee and to the President. Chair Kidder and Vice Chair Perry both offered commendations to Mike Angelini for his efforts and support to the Board. Vice Chair Perry indicated that because of the quality work that Mr. Angelini has done in his interim role, the University has the luxury of conducting an extended and comprehensive search for a replacement.

At 8:15 a.m. by roll call vote of all Trustees present voted (9-0) to move into executive session: Trustees Robert Kidder (presiding) M. Marnette Perry, Sandra J. Anderson, David Brightbill, Yvette McGee Brown, Norman E. “Ned” Dewire, Gene T. Harris, Larry Schey, and David Wolfort voted aye.

The Executive Session began with an update by Mr. Biancamano on legal cases currently in process or recently resolved.

A status report of the recent collective bargaining process was reviewed by Linda Lonsinger, Chief Human Resource Officer and Mike Angelini, Interim Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration.

Mr. Angelini offered a briefing on the potential for public/private partnerships relative to facilities and properties. More on this topic will be addressed at the formal Board meeting. Trustee Wolfort indicated that he would look forward to a comprehensive report that would inform Trustees of the complexities of considering such an initiative. Chair Kidder indicated that he would initiate communications with the Trustees to solicit feedback from them related to the annual performance evaluation of President McDavis in accordance with the Board’s presidential evaluation policy.

At 9:05 a.m. by a roll call vote of all Trustees (9-0) was made to move out of executive session: Trustees Robert Kidder (presiding) M. Marnette Perry, Sandra J. Anderson, David Brightbill, Yvette McGee Brown, Norman E. “Ned” Dewire, Gene T. Harris, Larry Schey, and David Wolfort voted aye.

Chair Kidder asked National Trustees Stuckey and Krasovec to offer a brief update on the status of the upcoming campaign. Mr. Stuckey indicated that a tentative target had been
set, and that it would hopefully be solidified by June. He indicated that he would hope to be able to give a more comprehensive update at the June meeting. Meeting was adjourned at 9:45 a.m. by Chair Kidder.
RESOLVED that M. Marnette Perry be elected Chair of the Board of Trustees for the year beginning May 14, 2010, and ending May 13, 2011.
ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR

RESOLUTION 2010 - 3150

RESOLVED that C. Robert Kidder be elected as Vice Chair of the Board of Trustees for the year beginning May 14, 2010, and ending May 13, 2011.
Interoffice Communication

Date: March 15, 2010

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Michael Angelini
Interim Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration and Treasurer

Re: AFSCME Contract Ratification

At the April Board of Trustees meeting I will be asking for ratification of the recently negotiated contract between Ohio University and Local 1699 and Ohio Council 8 of the America Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME). The new three year contract commences 5:01 P.M. March 1, 2010 and expires 5:00 P.M. March 1, 2013. The AFSCME bargaining unit approved the contract at a meeting of their membership held March 1, 2010.

We are pleased with the outcome of the negotiations and therefore request ratification of the contract. Included with your board materials is a resolution for action at the April meeting.

I will be happy to answer any questions you may have about the contract and its ratification prior to or during that meeting.
RATIFICATION OF LABOR AGREEMENT

RESOLUTION 2010----

WHEREAS, Ohio University and Local 1699 and Ohio Council 8 of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) have collectively bargained a new agreement effective 5:01 P.M. March 1, 2010 to 5:00 P.M. March 1, 2013, and

WHEREAS, the Ohio University Board of Trustees, in accordance with Section 4117.10(B) of the Ohio Revised Code, must ratify the agreement,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby ratify the Agreement between the University and Local 1699 and Ohio Council 8 of AFSCME; and authorizes the president of the University to arrange for execution in accordance with Ohio law.