BOARD ACTIVITIES FOR June 20 - 21, 2013
Ohio University – Athens Campus

Activity & Committee Meeting Schedule

Thursday, June 20, 2013

8:30 a.m. Meet at Margaret M. Walter Hall, Governance Room
8:45 a.m. Campus Facilities Tour
10:30 a.m. Joint Academics & Resources Committee Meeting; Margaret M. Walter Hall, Governance Room
12:30 p.m. Trustee Luncheon; Margaret M. Walter Hall Rotunda
1:30 p.m. Academics Committee; Margaret M. Walter Hall, Governance Room
1:30 p.m. Resources Committee; Margaret M. Walter Hall, Room 125/127
3:30 p.m. Governance Committee; Margaret M. Walter Hall, Room 125
3:30 p.m. Audit Committee; Margaret M. Walter Hall, Room 127
6:15 p.m. Reception – Trustees, President, Board Secretary, Executive Staff; Bobcat Lounge
6:30 p.m. Dinner – Trustees, President, Board Secretary, Executive Staff; Latitude 39

Friday, June 21, 2013

7:30 a.m. Breakfast, Executive Committee; John W. Galbreath Room, Ohio University Inn
10:00 a.m. Board Meeting; Margaret M. Walter Hall, Governance Room
Noon Media Availability; Margaret M. Walter Hall, Room 127
Noon Trustee Luncheon; Margaret M. Walter Hall, Room 125
AGENDA
Board of Trustees Meeting
Friday, June 21, 2013 – 10:00 a.m.
Margaret M. Walter Hall, Governance Room 104-Athens Campus

OPEN SESSION

Roll Call

Approval of Agenda

1. Minutes of Board of Trustees’ Meeting of April 19, 2013.

Comments from the Chair of the Board of Trustees

2. Report from the President

Committee Reports and Information Items and items apart from the Consent Agenda

- Joint Resources & Academic Committee
- University Resources Committee
- University Academics Committee
- Governance Committee
- Audit Committee
- Executive Committee
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 matter 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.

Tab 8: Resolution, eLearning & Off-Campus Graduate Rate Changes
Tab 9: Resolution, OPERS and STRS Retirement System Rates
Tab 10: Resolution, Guaranteed Tuition Program
Tab 13: Resolution, Construction Projects
Tab 15: Resolution, Dublin Extension Campus Naming
Tab 20: Resolution, Regional Higher Education Coordinating Council Appointments
Tab 26: Resolution, Graduate College Awarding IIP Degrees
Tab 27: Resolution, Program Review – Lancaster Campus Medical Assisting Technology
Tab 28: Resolution, Program Review – CHSP Applied Health Sciences & Wellness
Tab 29: Resolution, Program Review – Patton College Department of Counseling and Higher Education
Tab 30: Resolution, Program Review – Patton College Department of Education Studies
Tab 31: Resolution, Program Review – Patton College Department of Teacher Education
Tab 35: Resolution, Election of President
Tab 36: Resolution, Election of Treasurer
Tab 37: Resolution, Election of Secretary
Tab 38: Resolutions, Honorary Degrees

Unfinished Business

New Business

Communications, Petitions, and Memorials

Announcement of Next Stated Meeting Date

Adjournment
AGENDA
Joint Committee Meeting: Academics and Resources
Margaret M. Walter Hall, Governance Room 104
10:30 a.m. – Thursday, June 20, 2013

3. FY 2014 RCM Budget, Implementation, Preparedness and SAI
4. Guaranteed Tuition Program Update
5. Future Six Year Capital Improvement Plan and Update on Debt Capacity
AGENDA
University Resources Committee
Margaret M. Walter Hall, Room 125/127
1:30 p.m. – Thursday, June 20, 2013

6. Sources & Uses Report – April Interim
7. Resolution, FY 2014 Budget Approval
8. Consent Agenda, eLearning & Off-Campus Graduate Rate Changes
9. Consent Agenda, OPERS and STRS Retirement System Rates
10. Consent Agenda, Guaranteed Tuition Program
11. Resolution, FY 2014 Capital Improvement Plan
12. Lausche Heating Plant Replacement Plan
13. Consent Agenda, Construction Projects
14. Series 2013 Bond Issuance Update
15. Consent Agenda, Dublin Extension Campus Naming
16. University Dashboard
17. Capital Campaign Update

EXECUTIVE SESSION
18. Academic Quality – Student Success  
19. Core Values

**Standing Reports & Updates**

20. Consent Agenda, Regional Higher Education Coordinating Council Appointments
21. Promotion & Tenure Update
22. Enrollment Update

**Academic Quality Initiatives**

23. Scholarship Task Force Update
24. AQIP Update
25. University Dashboard Update

26. Consent Agenda, Graduate College Awarding IIP Degree
27. Consent Agenda, Program Review – Lancaster Campus Medical Assisting Technology
28. Consent Agenda, Program Review – CHSP Applied Health Sciences & Wellness
29. Consent Agenda, Program Review – Patton College Department of Counseling and Higher Education
30. Consent Agenda, Program Review – Patton College Department of Education Studies
31. Consent Agenda, Program Review – Patton College Department of Teacher Education
AGENDA
Governance Committee
Margaret M. Walter Hall, Room 125
3:30 p.m. – Thursday, June 20, 2013

- National Trustee Update
- New Trustee Orientation
- Board Retreat
AGENDA
Audit Committee
Margaret M. Walter Hall, Room 127
3:30 p.m. – Thursday, June 20, 2013

32. OIT Information Security Presentation

• External Audit Update – Plante Moran
33. Chief Audit Executive FY13 Audit Update
34. Resolution, Internal Audit Annual Audit Plan
AGENDA
Executive Committee
Wilson Room, Ohio University Inn
7:30 a.m. – Friday, June 21, 2013

35. Consent Agenda, Election of President
36. Consent Agenda, Election of Treasurer
37. Consent Agenda, Election of Secretary
38. Consent Agenda, Honorary Degrees

• AGB Conference Report

EXECUTIVE SESSION
By-Laws of the Ohio University Board of Trustees

Revised April 19, 2013
Revised September 6, 2012
Revised April 24, 2011
Revised February 10, 2010
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. The Board of Trustees of the Ohio University, a body corporate and politic, hereby adopts these Bylaws for the purpose of governing its activities in accordance with Chapter 3337 of the Ohio Revised Code.

Section 2. No By-Laws shall be enacted, amended, or repealed, except by a vote of a majority of the members (5 votes) of the Board authorized to vote, and then only after thirty (30) days notice of a proposed change has been given to all members.

Section 3. The Board shall be comprised of nine Trustees and two student Trustees, all appointed by the governor of the State of Ohio in accordance with Section 3337.01 of the Ohio Revised Code. The Board shall also 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 4. The nine Trustees appointed by the Governor shall hold voting privileges. The two student trustees, the two national trustees and the chair of the Ohio University Alumni Association Board of Directors 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 customary to the office or assigned 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, management of investments, coordination of audits with auditors, including federal and state auditors, overseeing relationships with financial reporting agencies, and all other financial responsibilities generally or specifically assigned by the Board or the President.

Article III. Election of Officers

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) consecutive years. The Secretary and the Treasurer shall be eligible for annual election to these offices without a yearly limitation.

Section 3. In the event of a vacancy in an Officer position, the Board shall elect a successor from among its members to serve the remainder of the vacant term.
**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 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, 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. 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 and Voting. Five Trustees appointed by the Governor, (the “Voting Trustees”) shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of the ordinary business of the Board. An affirmative vote of six Voting Trustees shall be necessary to elect or remove a President and an affirmative vote of five Voting Trustees shall be necessary to adopt any other resolution or action of the Board.
Section 6. Agenda. 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 University 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 Revised Code Section 3345.05.

(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 receipt 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 as the Board may deem necessary.

**Section 4.** The Chairperson of the Board and the President shall be ex-officio non-voting members of all Standing Committees and Special Committees.

**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.
Statement of Expectations for Members of the Board of Trustees of Ohio University

Adopted by the Board of Trustees on April 24, 2009
Amended on June 22, 2012

This Statement of Expectations is intended to provide guidelines and information to assist members of the Board of Trustees in fulfilling their roles and responsibilities in service to Ohio University and the citizens of the State of Ohio.

1. The Role of the Board

   a. The Board of Trustees is the governing body of Ohio University. It is a body politic and corporate under Ohio law and has the right to sue and be sued. The General Assembly has conferred upon the Board the authority to: adopt rules for the governance of the institution; hire and supervise the President, faculty and staff; oversee university finances; and control university property and facilities.

   b. The Board serves the citizens of the State of Ohio. It is responsible for ensuring that the university offers students an educational experience of the highest quality and produces research that provides economic and cultural benefits to the citizens of Ohio. It is also responsible for making efficient and effective use of state resources by working with the Governor, the Board of Regents and the other state universities through the University System of Ohio.

   c. The Board’s primary concerns are strategic governance and accountability. It should adopt a strategic plan designed to ensure the long-term fulfillment of the university’s teaching, research and service mission, monitor progress in achieving the plan’s goals and update the plan as necessary. It should provide oversight to protect the university’s fiscal integrity and make sure that the President, faculty and staff comply with all applicable laws and perform their responsibilities ethically and competently.

   d. The Board should adopt a procedure governing the creation and monitoring of corporate entities affiliated with the university.

   e. The Board should govern through the President and should refrain from becoming involved in day-to-day operations.

   f. The Board should recognize the important role that the principle of shared governance plays in institutions of higher education. It should seek input from faculty, staff and students and whenever possible incorporate their views into its decisions.
2. **The Role of Individual Trustees**

a. Members of the Board of Trustees are stewards of the public trust. They have a fiduciary obligation to act in the best interests of the university and the State of Ohio. They must adhere to the highest ethical standards and perform their university duties without regard to any personal interests they may have. Trustees should understand and comply with state ethics laws and keep themselves informed of developments in these laws. They should avoid situations that may give rise to even the appearance of a conflict of interest and promptly disclose any conflicts of interest that may occur.

b. Trustees should understand that they serve the institution as a whole and are not advocates for any particular unit or constituency of the university.

c. Student Trustees have a unique responsibility to ensure that the views of students are heard in Board deliberations. They should also share with other students the Board’s perspectives on University issues. In performing both of these functions, they should keep in mind the needs of all constituencies within the university.

d. The Chair of the Ohio University Alumni Association Board of Directors is responsible for ensuring that the views of alumni are presented to the Board and for communicating to alumni the Board’s perspectives on university issues.

e. Service on the Board is a time consuming professional commitment. Trustees should attend all meetings of the Board and committees and should give notice to the Chair when they are unable to do so. Trustees should also make an effort to participate in conferences and other programs designed to educate and update Trustees and to attend commencements, convocations and other special events on campus.

f. Trustees should be attentive during meetings and refrain from multitasking. They should treat the opinions of their colleagues on the Board as well as others participating in Board discussions with civility and respect and should be open to alternative points of view. They should respect and protect the confidentiality of matters discussed in executive sessions and should refrain from publicly or privately criticizing other Trustees or impugning their motives.

g. Trustees should strive to make informed decisions based on an analysis of objective data. In their deliberations they should rely on the application of sound management principles and prudent business judgment. To ensure thorough consideration of Board decisions, they should review briefing materials and be prepared to actively participate in discussions.

h. In order to make good decisions, Trustees need to engage in robust and thorough discussions of university issues in public meetings. Disagreements will occur and Trustees should seek productive ways to resolve them. Once a consensus is reached on an issue, all Trustees should respect the final decision of the Board.
i. Trustees should keep themselves informed about issues and events at the local, state and national level that may affect the university and higher education in general.

j. Trustees are encouraged to offer financial support to the university in accordance with their means.

k. Trustees should understand and comply with the Ohio Public Records and Open Meetings Laws and should keep themselves informed of developments in these laws.

3. The Board’s Relationship with the President

a. The Board delegates responsibility for all aspects of institutional management to the President. The Board and individual Trustees should refrain from involvement in operational matters except as necessary to fulfill their fiduciary duties.

b. The Board and the President should agree on clearly defined institutional goals and strategies for achieving them.

c. The Board should hold the President accountable for achieving institutional goals. Evaluation of the President should be an ongoing process with the Board offering candid and constructive feedback as necessary. In accordance with Board policy, formal evaluations should be conducted on a regular basis.

d. The President reports to the Board as a whole and not to individual Trustees. Trustees who have concerns about the President’s performance should convey them to the Board Chair who will take appropriate action to address the concern. The Chair will report back to the Trustee who raised the concern in a timely manner.

e. Individual Trustees should develop a comfortable working relationship with the President. They are encouraged to interact with the President one-on-one as needed to share information, concerns or advice but they should remember that when they do so they are not speaking for the entire Board.

4. The Board’s Relationship with Internal Constituencies

a. Trustees are encouraged to interact informally with administrators, faculty and students, bearing in mind that they do so as individual members of the Board. They should avoid any statements that would give rise to the perception that they speak for the entire Board.

b. When interacting with faculty, staff and students, Trustees should not disclose matters deemed confidential by the Board in executive session, advocate for their personal position on university issues or criticize other members of the university community.
c. Trustees should submit requests for information about institutional issues to the Board Secretary who will facilitate a response from the appropriate university official.

d. Consistent with the principle of shared governance, the faculty, through the Faculty Senate, plays an active advisory role to the administration and the Board of Trustees on all academic matters, including but not limited to academic standards, research, admissions, curriculum and the granting of degrees. The Faculty Senate initiates policies relating to university-wide academic matters, the rights and responsibilities of faculty and faculty grievances. The Board should respect the role of the Senate in these areas and should also consider advice from the Senate on matters of general concern to the university community.

e. The Board should encourage the President and administrators to involve individual faculty and students in the development of institutional goals and priorities. The active participation of faculty and students in these matters will give them a broader understanding of institutional governance and will enrich the Board’s understanding of faculty and student views on university issues.

5. Relationships with External Entities

a. The Board Chair is the only Trustee authorized to make public statements on behalf of the entire Board.

b. When asked to comment on Board actions or deliberations, Trustees may defer to the Chair or the President. If Trustees choose to speak publicly on issues relating to the university or higher education in general they should make it clear that they are stating their personal views and are not expressing the formal position of the Board or the university.

c. When individual Trustees communicate with federal, state or local officials on issues relating to higher education, they should take care not to create the perception that they speak for the Board or the university unless they have been authorized by the Chair or the Board to do so.

d. When individual Trustees are presented with concerns about university operations, these matters should be communicated to the President and/or the Chair.

e. While Trustees should seek information and ask questions of others, they should refrain from publicly criticizing the President or other members of the University Community. Criticisms or concerns that Trustees may have about the President or other members of the University Community should be conveyed to the Chair who will determine the appropriate method for the Board to address the issue.
Board of Trustees

Minutes

April 19, 2013
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF OHIO UNIVERSITY

April 19, 2013
Ohio University – Main Campus
Athens, Ohio
CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Sandra J. Anderson called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m. and asked Board Secretary Peter C. Mather to call the roll.

ROLL CALL

Present — Vice Chair Sandra J. Anderson, Trustees David Wolfort, David Brightbill, Janetta King, Kevin B. Lake, N. Victor Goodman, and Dave Scholl.

Also in attendance were Student Trustees Allison Arnold and Amanda Roden, National Trustees Henry Heilbrunn and J. Patrick Campbell, Alumni Association Representative William Hilyard, President Roderick J. McDavis, and Board Secretary Peter C. Mather.

Absent — Chair Gene T. Harris.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND THE MINUTES

Vice Chair Anderson moved to approve the meeting agenda. Trustee Scholl seconded. All approved and the motion carried.

Vice Chair Anderson then asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting held on February 8, 2013. Trustee Wolfort moved to approve the minutes, Trustee King seconded. All approved and the motion carried.

REPORTS

Report of the Chair

In Chair Harris’ absence, Vice Chair Anderson served as chair for the meeting. Vice Chair Anderson thanked those in the room for attending and reminded those in attendance of the decorum expected of attendees.

Vice Chair Anderson then began her report on the Trustees’ Thursday activities. She noted that the Board toured the University’s Central Food Facility. The tour was led by Gwyn Scott, Associate Vice President for Auxiliaries, and Mary Jones, Associate Director for the Culinary Support Center. Chair Anderson noted that Ms. Jones had worked at the University for 27 years. Vice Chair Anderson stated that the Trustees learned that 1500 students are employed in Culinary Services throughout the OU campus. She expressed how impressed she was with the organization, cleanliness and efficiency of the Central Food Facility and noted that the Trustees learned that efficiency can be nutritious and delicious. Vice Chair Anderson also mentioned that the Board was able to see the results of the work being done during their morning tour of the Central Food Facility when they ate lunch later in the day at Shively Dining Hall.

Trusted Brightbill said he was impressed by Culinary Services’ clear, purposeful approach to providing quality food items to the University’s student body, while at the same time looking for ways to do so more efficiently and affordably. Trustee Scholl added that the Trustees learned
about Culinary Services’ efforts to buy produce locally, leading to a healthier local economy as well as fresher food.

**Report of the President**
President McDavis began his report by citing Ohio University’s vision: to be the nation’s best transformative learning community. He highlighted the four fundamentals: inspired teaching and research, innovative academic programs, exemplary student support services, and integrative co-curricular activities. He also pointed out the four supporting strategic priorities: effective total compensation, short-term and long-term enrollment goals, improved financial health, and complete capital campaign.

**Legislative Update**
President McDavis stated that on Thursday the Ohio House passed Substitute House Bill (HB) 59, reflecting bipartisan support for higher education issues. The legislation includes permissive language providing for an undergraduate tuition guarantee program. However, President McDavis indicated that more work remains in the legislature pertaining to guaranteed tuition. In addition, Sub. HB 59 removes language on faculty workloads, and incorporates a new State Share of Instruction (SSI) formula. Under that formula, no university will receive less SSI funding than it did in Fiscal Year 2013. Ohio University is projected to receive an additional $2.5 million in SSI funding in Fiscal Year 2014. Fiscal Year 2015 allocations would be based on a series of weights and the three-year average of an institution’s enrollment, retention and graduation rates. President McDavis commented that he felt good about what was included in this version of the budget, but cautioned that the process is not yet complete. Under Ohio law, the budget must be approved by the General Assembly and signed by the Governor on or before July 1.

President McDavis also noted that Rep. Cliff Rosenberger, Chairman of the House Finance Higher Education Subcommittee, has recommended that a Higher Education Task Force be established. The purpose of the task force would be to study issues such as the Ohio College Opportunity Grant, co-op and internship programs, research and development capture, and affordability and student debt.

**Interlink Alliance**
President McDavis mentioned that Interlink Alliance members gathered April 2 at the University of Maryland Baltimore County for a roundtable discussion on “African-American Males in Higher Education.” The Alliance members discussed potential federal and state policies that could help prepare African-American males to be competitive and successful in an educated and diverse workplace. President McDavis noted that this was the Alliance’s fifth conference and that it was well attended and featured dynamic discussions. He announced that the Alliance is preparing for a national conference in 2014.

**Behavior Reduction**
President McDavis shared with the Trustees the results of a 2013 survey conducted by the University’s Division of Students Affairs. The survey showed that over the past six years Ohio University has seen a reduction of 15 percent in high-risk drinking behavior. He also highlighted some of the surveys other findings, including two findings he said he would like to see grow: that 14% of students choose not to drink and that 70% of students do not use tobacco products. President McDavis said he was pleased with the trends the survey’s data suggest.
The Promise Lives: Capital Campaign
President McDavis announced that as of March 21, 2013, the Capital Campaign had raised about $419.5 million of its $450 million goal. Of that total, more than $223 million had come from alumni; more than $18 million came from other individuals; more than $9 million came from corporations; nearly $150 million came from foundations; and more than $18 million came from other organizations. President McDavis noted the overwhelming support the campaign has received from foundations, including the Osteopathic Heritage Foundations. He stated the University is working hard to reach and exceed the campaign’s goal by June 2015. Since the last Board meeting, President McDavis has taken advancement trips to Columbus, Ironton and Cleveland, Ohio; New York City, N.Y.; and Chicago, Ill.

Points of Pride
President McDavis presented the University’s points of pride:

- Ohio University’s Master of Fine Arts in Ceramics program was ranked fifth in the nation by U.S. News & World Report, a ranking the President noted that has been consistent.
- Ohio University’s first “Women of Vision” Award was given in honor of the late OU-Lancaster professor Dr. Jane Johnsen at the Celebrate Women event in Pickerington.
- Ohio University alumna and producer/director Chelsea Peters’ first film, “Retro,” was purchased by Lionsgate with other firms handling foreign sales.
- OHIO Men’s Basketball was selected to play in the National Invitation Tournament (NIT). D.J. Cooper was named MAC Player of the Year as well as to the All-MAC first team. Reggie Keely and Walter Offutt were named to the All-MAC third team.
- Bob Boldon was appointed head coach of the OHIO Women’s Basketball Program.
- Ohio University is working with Afghanistan to share engineering information and resources to assist the country in rebuilding its infrastructure. President McDavis noted that the Afghanistan government approached Ohio University about this partnership, which is being undertaken by the Russ College of Engineering and Technology.
- Ohio University honored eight entrepreneurs during its first annual Innovation Awards Gala, which President McDavis described as one of the great events of this spring. He noted that the University has been engaged in promoting innovation in Southeast Ohio and that this event was put together by the Office of the Vice President for Research and Creative Activity in conjunction with the Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs and others. The gala honored eight entrepreneurs for their regional work in innovation and for their efforts to help create jobs. President McDavis also announced that during the gala Trustee Scholl and Dr. John Kopchick, the University’s newest distinguished professor, were honored as the inaugural recipients of the Konneker Medal for Commercialization and Entrepreneurship.
- National Trustee J. Patrick Campbell was recently named the 2013 University College Outstanding Alumnus.

Program Spotlight
President McDavis explained that the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards was started by an 1804 grant from the Ohio University Foundation. The purpose of the office at the outset was
to help Ohio University students achieve national and international awards. He noted that hundreds of Ohio University students had received awards since the office’s founding. President McDavis introduced Dr. Jeremy W. Webster, Dean of the Honors Tutorial College (HTC) and his colleagues to report on the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards.

Dean Webster thanked the Board for the invitation to present on the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards. As Dean of HTC, Dr. Webster explained that he oversees 32 tutorial programs and oversees the administration of a small number of research and award programs, including the Provost’s Undergraduate Research Fund and the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards. Dean Webster described the office as one of the first of its kind at a university when the office was founded 12 years ago. He then introduced Beth Clodfelter, Director of the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards.

Ms. Clodfelter thanked the Board for the opportunity to present. She noted that the office helps many Ohio University students receive life-changing and career-enhancing awards. She noted that the office works with undergraduates across campus as well as some graduate students. Ms. Clodfelter also personally works with faculty members on applications for the Fulbright Scholar program. She discussed the variation in student awards. Freshmen, for example, can apply to study abroad on a scholarship while sophomores and juniors have more opportunities, including opportunities to conduct research domestically or to be recognized for their community service contributions. She noted that graduating seniors who have strong undergraduate records have even more options.

Ms. Clodfelter mentioned that one of the goals of the office is to make the process of applying for awards itself beneficial to students. She added that feedback from students suggests that the application process helps them to clarify their academic, career and personal goals and to identify how they want to contribute to the world. She provided a recent example: a student who had been unsuccessful in his application for a Marshall Scholarship nevertheless recently learned that he had gained acceptance to a competitive graduate program. The student credited this success to the Marshall Scholarship application process.

According to Ms. Clodfelter, Ohio University’s Office of Nationally Competitive Awards was founded 12 years ago, making OU a pioneer among public universities. Traditionally, she noted, such offices were offered only at Ivy League schools. She said since then the field has become much more professionalized, and she commented that many universities are investing in creating such offices and strengthening them. She mentioned that the office is continuously monitoring possible looming challenges of programs funded by the U.S. government and how those challenges could impact publicly funded awards. She noted that the office is monitoring certain scholarships to see what, if any, impact sequestration will have on them. She added that the office is planning to conduct an analysis to see if it should expand its focus to privately funded awards from foundations and may have to adapt to a changing funding landscape.

Ms. Clodfelter highlighted the partners the office has on campus, including faculty in the Modern Languages Department who help students apply for opportunities in other countries. She also recognized Roxanne Malé-Brune in the Office of the Vice President for Research and Creative
Activity who works with graduate students on their award applications and helps undergraduates with their Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) applications.

Ms. Clodfelter also spoke about how the office historically, and particularly in the past two years, has proven to be a touchstone for the University’s donors. She noted a significant gift last year from an Ohio University graduate and mentioned that the University has made the office a focus of its telemarketing outreach to donors.

Ms. Clodfelter then introduced two students who have received awards through the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards: Ashley Enyeart, a senior double major in German and English who is the recipient of a Fulbright U.S. Student Award to go to Germany next year to teach English, and Keith Hawkins, a senior HTC astrophysics major who has been awarded a Marshall Scholarship that will fund his doctoral research at the University of Cambridge’s Institute for Astronomy.

Ashley Enyeart thanked the Board for the opportunity to address it and for spotlighting the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards. She noted that she had received a Fulbright grant to go to Germany next year to teach English. She credited her success in procuring the grant to her involvement in the University’s German Department, which she described as a tight-knit community; her professors who made her aware of the grant and helped her apply for it; and the opportunity to study abroad, which she said led to her realization that she needed to spend more time in a German-speaking country after graduation. She said she spoke about the Fulbright grant with Ms. Clodfelter who suggested she complete the Teaching English in a Foreign Language (TEFL) certificate, which Ashley said she believes made her application for the Fulbright grant stand out. Ashley expressed that working with the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards was a wonderful experience that taught her how to prepare for the grant application process, provided her with a conversation partner, instructed her on how to make her application stand out, prepared her for her interview, and simply encouraged her throughout the process. She added that she expects the application process to help her with future endeavors, including applying for graduate school as well as more awards. She credited her success to the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards and told the Board that she looks forward to representing Ohio University and the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards in Germany next year.

Keith Hawkins thanked the Board for the opportunity to present and explained that he was approached by the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards as a freshman to apply for the Barry M. Goldwater Scholarship, which supports STEM students. With the help of the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards, Keith said he was awarded the Goldwater scholarship his sophomore year and that the process of applying for the scholarship has helped him win future awards. He explained that Cary Frith of the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards approached him his junior year to work on the Truman Scholarship, which is generally an award of interest to students pursuing public service. And while he did not receive the Truman Scholarship, Keith stated that pursuing it made him more competitive, prompting him to apply for several awards, including the National Science Foundation Fellowship and the Marshall Scholarship, which he was awarded and which will allow him to pursue his PhD in astrophysics at Cambridge University. He said he was also admitted to King’s College in Cambridge and
mentioned that he could not have done any of this without the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards. Keith also noted that applying for the Truman Scholarship made him realize his innate desire to encourage minority students to get involved in STEM programs. He stated that he hopes to become a professor and to focus on research and that he plans to give back to the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards.

Vice Chair Anderson congratulated Ashley and Keith for their phenomenal work as well as the University’s faculty and staff who work with these students, calling them points of pride for the Bobcats.

Trustee Scholl noted that the lateral learning offered through the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards is priceless. He said that these students have matured through this challenging process and he referred to the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards as a powerful educational agent. He also commented that he has written recommendations for those involved in the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards.

Trustee Wolfort commented that he is excited that Ashley and Keith will be representing Ohio University and indicated that they have brought a spotlight to Athens, Ohio. He wished both of them the best of luck.

Alumni Representative William Hilyard noted that Ashley and Keith will have opportunities to begin alumni chapters wherever they go. Student Trustee Allison Arnold commented that Keith has been incredibly involved in the Students Teaching About Racism in Society (STARS) organization on the Athens campus. She noted that these students, in addition to their academic successes, are some of the best servants to the Ohio University community and that she is proud to call Keith her peer.

President McDavis asked how many awards students have received through the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards since its founding 12 years ago. Ms. Clodfelter responded that she didn’t have a total number but commented that it has averaged about 80 per year over the past few years. She noted that nearly 50 students are still waiting to hear about awards they’ve applied for this year. President McDavis commented that Ohio University leads the state in awards earned and thanked Ms. Clodfelter and Dean Webster for their leadership. Trustee Goodman noted that he co-chairs the capital fund drive for the 1804 Fund and that the Office of Nationally Competitive Awards is one of the important programs the fund features. He expressed hope that the 1804 Fund can bring the office some additional funding.

**University Joint Academics/Resources Committee Report**

Vice Chair Anderson reported that the full board, through a joint session of the Academics Committee and the Resources Committee, met for a nearly three-hour presentation and discussion Thursday morning. The Trustees focused on the information and materials contained in Tabs 31 and 32 of the Board book – entitled, “Fiscal Year 2014 Operating Budget” and “Guaranteed Tuition.” The Fiscal Year 2014 Operating Budget discussion was led by Vice President for Finance and Administration Stephen Golding while the Guaranteed Tuition proposal discussion was led by Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit.
**Fiscal Year 2014 Operating Budget**

During the budget discussion, Vice Chair Anderson said VP Golding led the Trustees through the budget’s guiding principles, which include sustaining academic excellence, maintaining affordability, focusing on strategic priorities, attending to the needs of the University workforce, addressing critical infrastructure needs, and contributing to the wellbeing of the region and state. The Board also heard about the extensive planning process and how that planning process relates to the University’s strategic priorities. VP Golding noted that the Fiscal Year 2014 operating budget will be presented in an all-funds budget model – a first for Ohio University – consistent with the RCM approach. He is slated to meet with bonding agencies in New York next week to discuss the University’s credit status.

Vice Chair Anderson said the Trustees were presented graphs and data related to the budget challenges concerning faculty compensation, health care, and capital improvements. She described next year’s operating budget as a critical balancing act and noted that the University has lost ground on faculty compensation relative to its peers, an area she said is crucial to the academic success of Ohio University.

Vice Chair Anderson mentioned that the Trustees discussed capital projects currently underway as well as deferred maintenance challenges.

The Trustees also discussed scholarship approaches and financial aid, and Vice Chair Anderson stated that the University will be implementing an aggressive and strategic approach to scholarships. EVP Benoit updated the Trustees on the Student Scholarship Task Force and a more sophisticated scholarship program designed to maintain commitments to affordability and maximize net tuition while remaining competitive. Dr. Benoit noted that Ohio University does well in terms of student applications and admissions largely because of its strong academic reputation. The Trustees recognize a need to develop ways to attract students and note that targeted tuition assistance in the range of $1,000 to $3,500 above current scholarship awards can make a large difference in persuading individual students to attend OU.

Vice Chair Anderson noted that the Trustees stressed scholarships as a major priority in the University’s capital campaign. She stated that the University is committed to investing $100 million of campaign funding into a Matching Scholarship Program.

In respect to the Fiscal Year 2014 operating budget, the Trustees examined various tuition models presented by VP Golding, including models that called for a 0% increase in tuition, as well as those calling for a 1%, 1.6% and 2% increase, which is the tuition cap proposed under the state budget. Vice Chair Anderson noted the Board specifically asked VP Golding about a 0% increase in tuition, and that he addressed why that was not feasible. VP Golding informed the Trustees that under the proposed state budget Ohio University is expected to receive an additional nearly $2.5 million in SSI funding. VP Golding is recommending a 1.6% or $82 per semester increase in undergraduate instruction and general fees. That increase is expected to generate an additional $2.7 million in funding for Ohio University. The University is expected to use those additional funds for essential investments, including bolstering employee compensation, healthcare, capital improvements, and replacement of the Lausche heating plant.
The Trustees discussed how the current SSI formula focuses on completion and graduation rates, which is less than ideal for regional campuses where students often take classes for job training not degree completion.

Despite the increase in SSI funding and additional revenue from tuition increases, the University is still facing an operating deficit of slightly more than $3.4 million, which Vice Chair Anderson said will be covered by cash flow from the remainder of the operating budget, including adjustments, efficiencies and reductions. National Trustee Henry Heilbrunn asked about other sources of revenue. Vice Chair Anderson noted that other sources such as endowment and grant revenue are outside of the Trustees’ control.

Vice Chair Anderson said the Trustees also discussed debt financing and a proposal before the Board to issue up to $175 million in debt. She noted that interest rates are good and the University’s balances are strong. Because of these realities, the administration will reassess proposed levels of debt financing.

Vice Chair Anderson reported that the Trustees asked VP Golding to discuss the planning and consultation that went into the recommendations regarding tuition. According to VP Golding, the Budget Planning Council, which is comprised of various Ohio University constituencies, recommended the tuition and fees proposal. Faculty Senate issued a letter of support for the recommendations. She noted that President McDavis and VP Golding recently visited Student Senate to discuss the recommendations.

**Guaranteed Tuition**

In discussing the guaranteed tuition model, Vice Chair Anderson said the Trustees discussed arguments in favor of the approach as well as those against the approach. Arguments in favor include: helping students and their families with budget planning, improving revenue predictability for the University (which EVVP Benoit compared to a fixed vs. a variable mortgage rate), providing a financial incentive for students to complete their degrees in four years, and having the potential to reduce student debt. Arguments against the guaranteed tuition model include: an assumption that students will complete their degrees in four years, potential negative impacts to the University’s ability to compete, impacts to students and their families, and risks to the University, which include inflation and unknown economic environments.

According to Dr. Benoit, under the guaranteed tuition model, which would require a change in law, all first-time, first-year, full-time students pay a single tuition rate for four years. According to Vice Chair Anderson, the Trustees learned that this model is actually more flexible than it may seem and can be altered to meet student needs.

Vice Chair Anderson noted that 10 years ago tuition at Ohio University was increasing 12% to 13% per year. She explained that that number has dropped considerably in recent years in large part because of tuition caps imposed by the General Assembly and because of the Board’s focus on affordability. Historically, she noted, tuition has never gone down. According to Vice Chair Anderson, the consensus of the Trustees was that the administration should move forward in getting more information on the guaranteed tuition model and keep the Board informed of any new information.
Vice Chair Anderson noted that the reason the Board is discussing a guaranteed tuition model is because the Board wants a solution to rising tuition costs and wants the University’s Administration to focus on affordability, accessibility and sustainability.

**University Resources Committee Report**
Trustee Wolfort reported on the two-hour University Resources Committee meeting, led by VP Golding, as follows:

*Consent Agenda, Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) and Ohio Service Alignment Initiative (OSAI)*
Huron Consulting has presented information on RCM and OSAI to the Board in the past. Julie Allison, University Controller who is serving a two-year assignment as the OSAI project lead, provided the Trustees an update. She described the project and its progression. The project involves a significant investment – with costs, which would be incurred over a six-year period, estimated as high as $28.1 million – and is designed to repair and update the University’s administrative systems and to provide support to individual units as they embark on RCM. The OSAI will align centrally provided academic support functions of HR, IT, Facilities and Finance with the needs of the academic units in an effort to avoid duplicating functions while streamlining and finding savings.

Trustee Wolfort told the Board that Huron Consulting has made more than 200 recommendations regarding the University’s administrative systems, including creating a Project Management Office, upgrading the Oracle system, and modernizing financial and data reporting.

Trustee Wolfort explained that the project is being spread out over a six-year period in order for it to be completed in reasonable increments without overburdening the University’s resources or personnel. He noted that VP Golding is committed to reallocating administrative resources to cover the project’s costs.

The committee recommended keeping the RCM and OSAI Resolution (Tab 3 in the Board book) on the Consent Agenda for Board approval.

**Resolution, Fiscal Year 2014 Fees Approval**
The full Board had before it four tuition and fee resolutions, which were discussed in the Joint Academics/Resources Committee meeting.

Trustee Wolfort reported that the non-resident surcharge has not been increased in the recent past. For Fiscal Year 2014, a 0% increase is recommended, but the non-resident surcharge fee is being explored in relation to the increase in non-resident enrollments.

Trustee Wolfort informed the Board that there was an amendment to the Fiscal Year 2013-2014 College of Medicine and Regional Campuses Instructional Fee, General Fee and Non-Resident Surcharge Resolution on page A2 to the fifth WHEREAS, which was necessary to correct the upper division instructional fee increase from 1% to 0.08%. Board Secretary Mather distributed the amended resolution.
Trustee Wolfort announced that the committee was recommending moving the series of four tuition and fees resolutions to the full Board for approval. Trustee Lake moved to approve the resolution series, seconded by Trustee Goodman. All approved and the motion carried. Later in the meeting, Vice Chair Anderson determined that the Board should act on each of the resolutions separately. Therefore, this action taken to pass the resolutions was overridden by the later action. The resolutions are included later in these minutes.

**Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Update**

VP Golding provided a recap of the discussion from the joint session regarding the effort to decrease the six-year CIP and the amount of debt required. The 7% debt service to operations plateau has been hit due the University’s stance of front-loading debt service early in the repayment. The leadership went through an iterative process following the discussions at the last Board meeting to prioritize the six-year CIP projects and show a side-by-side CIP version reflecting $200+ million less in total projects requiring debt. Today’s discussion with the Board resulted in a request for further study of projects to bring back into the six-year CIP and show the additional debt possible to stay within the “sweet spot.”

**Resolution, Series 2013 Debt Issuance**

VP Golding introduced Beth Greene, Director of Debt Management, who described the Series 2013 Debt Issuance totaling $175 million. The issue will include $122 million for new projects, restructuring $15 million in Series 2001 bonds, and refinancing up to $38 million. Ms. Green discussed the issue characteristics being investigated, listed the projects, and reported that the current interest rate would be about 3.89%, which Trustee Wolfort noted is quite low. Impacts on the SB6 ratios have been projected for the Series 2013 issue, with and without the Lausche project, and it is expected that the composite ratio will be well over 4.0 even with the additional debt. Trustee Wolfort noted that VP Golding and Ms. Greene are slated to visit with the bonding agencies next week.

Outstanding debt levels are important to the rating agencies. An aggressive growth in debt and the resulting debt service to operations ratio can be viewed negatively. These same data points based on the additional debt investigation described in the CIP update will be brought before the Board at its June meeting. The committee cautioned that there are other considerations for building in additional projects, including disruption to campus and the stress on the project management and other staff.

The debt service associated with the Series 2013 issue has been analyzed by the impacted units. The units’ ability to pay and the sources for the debt service have been identified in budgets or pledged gift receipts. H-COM debt is being incurred to complete projects and the proceeds from the 15-year gift will service the debt.

Trustee Wolfort moved the Series 2013 Debt Issuance Resolution (Tab 6 in the Board book), seconded by Trustee Lake. All approved and the motion carried.
SERIES 2013 DEBT ISSUANCE
RESOLUTION 2013 - 3319

Providing for the authorization, issuance and sale of not to exceed $175,000,000 in aggregate principal amount of General Receipts Bonds of The Ohio University, authorizing a Supplemental Trust Agreement securing such bonds, and authorizing matters related thereto

WHEREAS, The Ohio University (herein called the “University”), a state university of the State of Ohio created and existing under Chapter 3337 of the Ohio Revised Code, by Resolution No. 2000-1744 adopted by its Board of Trustees (herein called the “Board”) on December 8, 2000 (herein called the “General Bond Resolution”) and by a Trust Agreement dated May 1, 2001 (together with amendments and supplements thereto, the “Trust Agreement”), comprised in part of the General Bond Resolution, has provided for the issuance from time to time of Obligations (as defined in the General Bond Resolution) of the University, each such issue to be authorized by a Series Resolution adopted by the Board pursuant to the Trust Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the General Bond Resolution was adopted and the Trust Agreement was authorized by the Board pursuant to Sections 3345.11 and 3345.12 of the Ohio Revised Code, enacted by the General Assembly of Ohio under authority of the Constitution of Ohio, particularly Section 2i of Article VIII thereof, which authorizes the University to issue its Obligations from time to time to pay costs of certain capital facilities, defined as “auxiliary facilities” or “education facilities” in Section 3345.12 of the Ohio Revised Code and called “University Facilities” in the General Bond Resolution and in this Series Resolution, and to refund, fund or retire such Obligations or other obligations previously issued for such purpose; and

WHEREAS, the University has heretofore authorized, issued or entered into the following Obligations under such Trust Agreement (collectively referred to herein as the “Prior Obligations”):

- $48,025,000 principal amount of Bonds (as defined in the General Bond Resolution) designated “Subordinated Variable Rate General Receipts Bonds, Series 2001” (the “Series 2001 Bonds”), pursuant to a First Supplemental Trust Agreement dated as of May 1, 2001 (the “First Supplemental Trust Agreement”) for the purpose of paying part of the cost of certain University Facilities;

- an Interest Rate Hedge (as defined in Section 9.98 of the Ohio Revised Code) for a portion of the Series 2001 Bonds in the form of an ISDA Master Agreement, dated December 1, 2001 (which, together with the schedule and confirmations related thereto, are collectively referred to as the “Series 2001 Swap Agreement”) in a maximum notional amount of $31,020,000 with Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of New York, under the Trust Agreement with respect to amounts payable by the University under the Series 2001 Swap Agreement (other than any
Early Termination Amount, as defined in the Series 2001 Swap Agreement, and any amounts payable pursuant to Section 11 of the Series 2001 Swap Agreement by the University);

- $47,860,000 principal amount of Bonds designated “Subordinated General Receipts Bonds, Series 2003” dated September 3, 2003 and maturing through December 1, 2023 (the “Series 2003 Bonds”), pursuant to a Second Supplemental Trust Agreement dated as of September 1, 2003 (the “Second Supplemental Trust Agreement”) for the purpose of retiring certain bond anticipation notes and refunding the University’s General Receipts Bonds, Series 1993 dated as of December 1, 1993, which were issued to finance the cost of certain University Facilities;

- Notes (as defined in the General Bond Resolution) from time to time and in varying principal amounts pursuant to a Third Supplemental Trust Agreement dated as of October 1, 2003 (the “Third Supplemental Trust Agreement”) for the purpose of paying part of the cost of certain University Facilities; however, there are no Notes presently outstanding under the Third Supplemental Trust Agreement;

- $52,885,000 principal amount of Bonds designated “Subordinated General Receipts Bonds, Series 2004” dated as of March 15, 2004 and maturing through December 1, 2031 (the “Series 2004 Bonds”), pursuant to a Fourth Supplemental Trust Agreement dated as of March 15, 2004 (the “Fourth Supplemental Trust Agreement”) for the purpose of retiring certain bond anticipation notes and paying part of the cost of certain University Facilities;

- $28,145,000 principal amount of Bonds designated “Subordinated General Receipts Refunding Bonds, Series 2006A” dated as of February 16, 2006 and maturing through December 1, 2024 (the “Series 2006A Bonds”), pursuant to a Fifth Supplemental Trust Agreement dated as of February 1, 2006 (the “Fifth Supplemental Trust Agreement”) for the purpose of refunding all or a portion of the University’s outstanding General Receipts Bonds, Series 1999 dated as of March 15, 1999 issued pursuant to the Prior Indenture, as defined in the General Bond Resolution, for the purpose of paying part of the cost of certain University Facilities; and

- $29,170,000 principal amount of Bonds designated “Subordinated General Receipts Bonds, Series 2006B” dated as of April 6, 2006 and maturing through December 1, 2036 (the “Series 2006B Bonds”) and $8,025,000 principal amount of Bonds designated “Subordinated Variable Rate General Receipts Bonds, Series 2006C” dated as of April 6, 2006 and maturing through December 1, 2016 (the “Series 2006C Bonds”), both pursuant to a Sixth Supplemental Trust Agreement dated as of April 1, 2006 (the “Sixth Supplemental Trust Agreement”) for the purpose of paying part of the cost of certain University Facilities; and

- $15,350,000 principal amount of Bonds comprised of $13,345,000 principal amount of Bonds designated “Tax Exempt General Receipts Bonds, Series 2008A” dated July 10, 2008 and maturing through December 1, 2033 (the “Series 2008A Bonds”) and $2,005,000 principal amount of Bonds designated “Taxable General Receipts Bonds, Series 2008B” dated July 10, 2008 and maturing through December 1, 2015 (the “Series 2008B Bonds”), both pursuant to a Seventh Supplemental Trust Agreement dated as of July 1, 2008 (the “Seventh Supplemental
Trust Agreement”) for the purpose of retiring certain bond anticipation notes and paying part of
the cost of certain University Facilities; and

- $26,645,000 principal amount of Bonds designated “General Receipts Bonds, Series 2009”
dated June 3, 2009 and maturing through December 1, 2019 (the “Series 2009 Bonds”), pursuant
to an Eighth Supplemental Trust Agreement dated as of May 1, 2009 (the “Eighth Supplemental
Trust Agreement”) for the purpose of paying part of the cost of certain University Facilities; and

- $76,470,000 principal amount of Bonds designated “General Receipts Bonds, Series 2012”
dated February 29, 2012 and maturing through December 1, 2042 (the “Series 2012 Bonds”),
pursuant to a Ninth Supplemental Trust Agreement dated as of February 1, 2012 (the “Ninth
Supplemental Trust Agreement”) for the purposes of paying part of the cost of certain University
Facilities and refunding certain of the Series 2003 Bonds and Series 2004 Bonds; and

- $28,640,370 principal amount of Bonds designated “General Receipts Notes, OAQDA Series
2012” dated July 31, 2012 and maturing through December 1, 2023 (the “Series 2012 OAQDA
Bonds”), pursuant to a Tenth Supplemental Trust Agreement dated as of July 1, 2012 (the “Tenth
Supplemental Trust Agreement”) for the purpose of paying part of the cost of certain University
Facilities constitutes “energy conservation measures” as defined in Section 3345.61 of the Ohio
Revised Code, through the Ohio Air Quality Development Authority (the “OAQDA”); and

- $27,204,750 principal amount of Bonds designated “General Receipts Bonds, Series 2011”
dated as of October 1, 2012 and maturing through June 1, 2032 (the “Housing For Ohio
Guaranty Bonds”), pursuant to an Eleventh Supplemental Trust Agreement dated as of October
1, 2012 (the “Eleventh Supplemental Trust Agreement”) for the purpose of providing security for
the letter of credit reimbursement obligations of Housing for Ohio, Inc., a non-profit corporation
which has developed a facility on real property owned by the University and located adjacent to
the University’s main campus in the City of Athens, Ohio providing housing for the use of the
University’s students, faculty members, officers, and employees, and their spouses and families
and known as “University Courtyard”; and

WHEREAS, the University has previously determined, and does hereby confirm, that it is
necessary to acquire, construct, equip, furnish, reconstruct, alter, enlarge, remodel, renovate,
rehabilitate or improve the following University Facilities at the respective currently estimated
amounts to be financed (being collectively referred to herein as the “2013 Projects”):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Currently Estimated Amount to be Financed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUHCOM-Dublin (Columbus)</td>
<td>Renovation and rehabilitation of an existing University-owned property with three buildings for use by the Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine as instructional space, providing the same program as on the main campus.</td>
<td>$9,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUHCOM-Cleveland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Renovation and rehabilitation of leased space in a building owned by the Cleveland Clinic for use by the Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine as instructional space, providing the same program as on the main campus.
$4,500,000

Indoor Multi-Purpose Facility and Other Recreational Athletic Facilities
Construction of a new 80,000 GSF building and other various facilities intended for instructional, athletic, and recreational uses, all in support of existing programs.
$10,500,000

Lindley Hall Upfit
Partial building renovation to upgrade this currently vacant building for use as academic swing space in support of upcoming major building renovation projects. Scope of work is limited to improved heating/cooling systems, plus life safety and accessibility improvements. Primary use will be as office space.
$2,500,000

Tupper Hall Upfit
Substantial building renovation to upgrade this currently vacant building for use as academic swing space in support of upcoming major building renovations projects. Primary use will be as classroom space.
$7,000,000

College of Communication Phase 2
Completion of the renovation of the former Baker Center, plus renovations to the adjacent RTVC building to provide a consolidated location for the Scripps College of Communication.
$12,000,000

McCracken Hall Renovation & Addition
Complete renovation and addition to McCracken Hall for use by the Patton College of Education
$4,126,800

OUHCOM Facility Programming & Schematic Design
Programming and preliminary design for facilities for the Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine’s Diabetes and Neuromuscular clinical research programs.
$3,000,000

Programming and Feasibility Studies
Programming study to investigate the feasibility and options for replacement of the existing Clippinger Hall. Programming study to assess the existing Seigfred Hall and develop programming and budget information for a planned renovation of that facility.
$350,000

Housing Development Phase I
Construction of new residential housing facility containing approximately 900 beds as well as student support spaces and Residential Housing Administration office space.
$67,199,510
WHEREAS, the University has determined to issue not to exceed $175,000,000 in aggregate principal amount of Bonds in one or more series under the Trust Agreement, to be designated “General Receipts Bonds, Series 2013,” or such other designation as authorized hereby (the “Series 2013 Bonds”), to

(i) refund all or part of one or more of the Series 2001 Bonds (including any costs associated with terminating the Series 2001 Swap Agreement), the Series 2004 Bonds and the Series 2006B Bonds; and

(ii) finance all or part of the costs of the 2013 Projects; and desires to provide therefor by this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, there are no Superior Obligations, or any other bonds, notes or other obligations, presently outstanding under the Prior Indenture, and the Prior Indenture and the lien grant thereby have been released, satisfied and discharged; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that all conditions precedent to the authorization and sale of the Series 2013 Bonds have been or will be met by the time the Series 2013 Bonds are issued;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE OHIO UNIVERSITY, as follows:

Section 1. Definitions and Interpretations. All words and terms defined in the General Bond Resolution and elsewhere in the Trust Agreement and all interpretations therein provided shall have the meanings, respectively, and be subject to the same interpretations as therein provided where used in this Resolution, unless the context or use indicates another or different meaning or intent, except that this Resolution is sometimes herein called and may be known as the “Series 2013 Resolution,” the Bonds authorized by this Resolution are referred to herein and in the Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement hereby authorized as the “Series 2013 Bonds,” and the terms “hereof,” “herein,” “hereby,” “hereto” and “hereunder,” and similar terms, mean this Resolution. All words and terms defined in the preambles hereto shall have the respective meanings provided in the preambles hereto.

In addition, when used in this Resolution and the Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement, the following words shall have the indicated meanings:

“Authorized Denominations” means with respect to each series of the Series 2013 Bonds, the denominations designated as such in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award.

“Beneficial Owner” means with respect to the each series of the Series 2013 Bonds, the Person owning the Beneficial Ownership Interest therein, as evidenced to the satisfaction of the Trustee.

“Beneficial Ownership Interest” means the right to receive payments and notices with respect to the Series 2013 Bonds held in a book entry system for which the Depository does not act on
behalf of a Beneficial Owner with respect to the optional or mandatory tender for purchase of the Series 2013 Bonds pursuant to the Trust Agreement.

“Book entry form” or “book entry system” means, with respect to the Series 2013 Bonds, a form or system, as applicable, under which (i) the ownership of beneficial interests in such Bonds and Debt Service Charges may be transferred only through a book entry and (ii) physical Series 2013 Bond certificates in fully registered form are registered only in the name of a Depository or its nominee as Bondholder, with the physical Series 2013 Bond certificates “immobilized” in the custody of the Depository. The book entry system maintained by and the responsibility of the Depository and not maintained by or the responsibility of the University or the Trustee is the record that identifies, and records the transfer of the interests of, the owners of beneficial (book entry) interests in such Series 2013 Bonds.

“Depository” means any securities depository that is a clearing agency under federal law operating and maintaining, with its participants or otherwise, a book entry system to record ownership of beneficial interest in the Series 2013 Bonds, and to effect transfers of book entry interests in such Bonds, and includes and means initially The Depository Trust Company (a limited purpose trust company), New York, New York.

“Federal Tax Documents” means the Certificate Under Sections 103(b)(2) and 148 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, As Amended, and the Certificate Regarding Issuance, Use of Proceeds and Arbitrage Compliance, both delivered by the University at the time of the issuance and delivery of each series of Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds, as the same may be amended or supplemented in accordance with their respective terms.

“Fixed Rate Bonds” means Series 2013 Bonds that are not “Variable Rate Obligations,” as defined in the General Bond Resolution.

“Interest Payment Date” means, as to each series of the Series 2013 Bonds, each of the dates set forth as such in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award.

“Mandatory Redemption Date” means, as to each series of the Series 2013 Bonds, each of the dates set forth in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award for the retirement of a portion of the principal of the Series 2013 Bonds pursuant to any Mandatory Sinking Fund Requirements set forth therein.

“Mandatory Sinking Fund Requirements” means, as to each series of the Series 2013 Bonds, the amounts required to be deposited in the Debt Service Fund for the purpose of redeeming related Series 2013 Bonds (less the amount of any credit as provided in Section 4(c) of this Resolution) on each Mandatory Redemption Date, as may be set forth in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award.

“Maximum Rate” means for each series of the Series 2013 Bonds, seven percent (7%) per annum or such lesser rate designated as such in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award.

“Original Purchaser” means, as to each series of the Series 2013 Bonds, the purchaser or purchasers of that series of the Series 2013 Bonds designated as such in the related Series 2013
Certificate of Award.

“Pledged Bonds” means Series 2013 Bonds or Beneficial Ownership Interests registered in the name of the Series 2013 Financial Institution and securing the obligations of the University to reimburse the Series 2013 Financial Institution for advances made pursuant to a Series 2013 Credit Support Instrument as may be provided in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award and Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement.


“Rebate Fund” means the fund by that name referred to in Section 10 hereof.

“Refunded Bonds” means the Series 2001 Bonds (including the Series 2001 Swap Agreement), the Series 2004 Bonds and the Series 2006B Bonds, or portions thereof, if any, refunded with a portion of the proceeds of the Series 2013 Bonds, as specified in a Series 2013 Certificate of Award, and deemed to be paid and discharged under the Trust Agreement.

“Refunded Bonds Defeasance Obligations” means the investments defined as such in a Refunded Bonds Escrow Agreement sufficient to cause the related Refunded Bonds to be no longer outstanding pursuant to the Trust Agreement.

“Refunded Bonds Escrow Agreement” means one or more Escrow Deposit Agreements between the University and the Refunded Bonds Escrow Trustee of even date with the related Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement, securing one or more series of the Refunded Bonds.

“Refunded Bonds Escrow Fund” means for any of the Refunded Bonds, the escrow fund created by the related Refunded Bonds Escrow Agreement in the custody of the Refunded Bonds Escrow Trustee as security for the related Refunded Bonds. A Refunded Bonds Escrow Fund may be a sub-account in the Debt Service Account of the Debt Service Fund.

“Refunded Bond Escrow Trustee” means the bank or trust company serving as Escrow Trustee under the Refunded Bonds Escrow Agreement, being initially designated in a Series 2013 Certificate of Award.

“Series 2013 Certificate of Award” means with respect to each series of Series 2013 Bonds, the certificate of the Fiscal Officer establishing certain terms of that series of the Series 2013 Bonds and authorized in Section 5 hereof, including any supplements thereto.

“Series 2013 Closing Date” means each date on which any series of the Series 2013 Bonds are delivered to the Original Purchaser thereof for payment.
“Series 2013 Credit Support Instrument” means any Credit Support Instruments relating to some or all of the Series 2013 Bonds described in a Series 2013 Certificate of Award and issued by a Series 2013 Financial Institution for the benefit of the holders of Series 2013 Bonds.


“Series 2013 Projects Account” means the account by that name created in the Facilities Fund pursuant to Section 6 hereof.

“Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement” means a Supplemental Trust Agreement styled and dated as determined in a Series 2013 Certificate of Award, by and between the University and the Trustee supplementing the Trust Agreement and securing one or more series of the Series 2013 Bonds, as the same may be supplemented and amended as provided herein and therein.


“Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds” means Series 2013 Bonds the interest on which is intended by the University at the time of initial issuance to be exempt from federal income taxation under the Code, such intent to be conclusively evidenced by a determination to that effect contained in a Series 2013 Certificate of Award.

Section 2. Determinations by Board. The Board hereby finds and determines that (a) the 2013 Projects will constitute “auxiliary facilities” or “education facilities” as defined in the Act; (b) the issuance of the Series 2013 Bonds and the refunding of the Refunded Bonds, if any, will be in the best interests of the University; and (c) this Resolution is adopted pursuant to the General Bond Resolution, the Trust Agreement, the Act and Section 2i of Article VIII of the Ohio Constitution.

The Board finds that the conditions stated in numbered subparagraphs (1) and (2) of Section 3(a) of the General Bond Resolution will be satisfied by the time of authentication of the Series 2013 Bonds. The Fiscal Officer shall confirm these findings by a certificate in form satisfactory to, and to be filed with, the Trustee prior to the authentication of the Series 2013 Bonds, and the Fiscal Officer may provide such other evidence with respect thereto as the Trustee may reasonably request.

Section 3. Authorization, Designation and Purpose of Series 2013 Bonds. It is hereby declared to be necessary and in the best interests of the University to, and the University shall, issue, sell and deliver, as provided and authorized herein, Bonds of the University, on a parity with all other outstanding Obligations from time to time, which shall be designated “General Receipts Bonds, Series 2013,” or such other designation as may be specified in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award (the “Series 2013 Bonds”), for the purposes of (i) paying Costs of University Facilities, as defined in the General Bond Resolution, related to the 2013 Projects, (ii) refunding the Refunded Bonds, if any, and (iii) paying Costs of University Facilities related to the Series 2013
Bonds and the refunding of the Refunded Bonds, all upon the terms set forth herein. For such purposes, the proceeds from the sale of the Series 2013 Bonds shall be allocated and deposited as provided in Section 6 hereof. Proceeds of the Series 2013 Bonds may be allocated among the 2013 Projects other than as shown in the preambles to this Resolution (even if doing so results in a reduction or elimination of one or more of the Series 2013 Projects), and deviations from the descriptions of particular Series 2013 Projects as shown in the preambles to this Resolution, or the scope thereof, may be made, if the Fiscal Officer determines that doing so is in the best interest of the University. The principal amount of each series of Series 2013 Bonds to be issued shall be determined by the Fiscal Officer and specified in a Series 2013 Certificate of Award, provided that the aggregate principal amount of all Series 2013 Bonds Outstanding at any time shall not exceed $175,000,000. The Series 2013 Bonds may be issued in one or more separate series of Fixed Rate Bonds, as the Fiscal Officer may determine in a Series 2013 Certificate of Award and as described herein and in the related Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement. Any series of the Series 2013 Bonds may be issued in separate series of Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds and Taxable Series 2013 Bonds as the Fiscal Officer may determine in a Series 2013 Certificate of Award.


(a) Forms, Denominations, Dates and Numbering. The Series 2013 Bonds shall be negotiable instruments in accordance with the Act, shall be issued only in fully registered form, without coupons, shall be substantially in the respective forms thereof set forth in the related Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement, shall be in Authorized Denominations and shall express upon their faces the purpose for which they are issued and that they are issued pursuant to the Act. Each Series 2013 Bond shall have only one principal maturity date, except for interim certificates, receipts or temporary Series 2013 Bonds which may be issued pending preparation of definitive Series 2013 Bonds. The Series 2013 Bonds shall be dated and numbered as set forth in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award.

Subject to the provisions of this Resolution for the use of a book entry system, the Series 2013 Bonds shall be exchangeable for other Series 2013 Bonds in the manner and upon the terms set forth in the Trust Agreement.

(b) Execution, Interest Rates and Maturities. (i) The Series 2013 Bonds shall be executed by any two of the Chairman of the Board, the President of the University, the Fiscal Officer or the Secretary of the Board, and may have the seal of the University affixed or printed thereon; provided that all of such signatures and such seal may be facsimiles.

(ii) Each series of the Series 2013 Bonds shall mature on the date or dates and in the amounts set forth in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award, provided that the final maturity of the Series 2013 Bonds shall be not later than December 1, 2043. Interest on each series of the Series 2013 Bonds shall be calculated and payable as provided in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award. The net interest cost payable by the University on any series of the Series 2013 Bonds over their stated terms shall not exceed the Maximum Rate except that Pledged Bonds (or the economic equivalent thereof) may be determined in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award.
Award) may bear interest at a rate greater than the Maximum Rate as provided in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award and Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement.

(c) Mandatory Sinking Fund Redemption. Each series of the Series 2013 Bonds shall be subject to mandatory sinking fund redemption in part on each Mandatory Redemption Date, in the manner provided in the Trust Agreement, at a redemption price of 100% of the principal amount thereof to be redeemed plus accrued interest to the redemption date in such amounts and in the manner as may be set forth in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award and the related Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement.

(d) Optional Redemption. The Series 2013 Bonds shall be callable for redemption at the option of the University, in the manner provided in the Trust Agreement, in whole or in part, at such price or prices and at such times and in the manner as may be set forth in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award and the related Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement.

(e) Method and Notice of Redemption. If less than all of the outstanding Series 2013 Bonds of one maturity are to be called, the selection of such Series 2013 Bonds of such maturity to be called shall be made in the manner provided in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award and the related Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement. Notice of call for redemption of Series 2013 Bonds shall be given at the times and in the manner provided in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award and the related Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement.

(f) Place of Payment; Record Dates. Debt Service Charges on each series of the Series 2013 Bonds when due shall be payable to the registered holders thereof at the places and in the manner provided in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award and the related Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement. The Fiscal Officer may establish a Regular Record Date and a Special Record Date for a series of the Series 2013 Bonds which shall be set forth in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award.

(g) Paying Agent and Registrar. The Trustee shall serve as Paying Agent and Registrar for the Series 2013 Bonds.

(h) Payment. Debt Service Charges with respect to any series of the Series 2013 Bonds shall be payable in lawful money of the United States of America without deduction for the services of the Trustee or the Paying Agent, in the manner provided in the related Trust Agreement.

(i) Book Entry System. If so specified in a Series 2013 Certificate of Award, any or all of the related Series 2013 Bonds shall only be originally issued to a Depository for use in a book entry system and: (i) such Series 2013 Bonds shall be registered in the name of the Depository or its nominee, as Bondholder, and immobilized in the custody of the Depository; (ii) there shall be a single Series 2013 Bond representing each maturity; and (iii) such Series 2013 Bonds shall not be transferable or exchangeable, except for transfer to another Depository or another nominee of a Depository or to the Series 2013 Financial Institution in order to obtain payment of principal of Series 2013 Bonds in accordance with the Trust Agreement and in exchange for any Series 2013 Bonds so transferred without further action by the University. The Beneficial Owners shall not have any right to receive Series 2013 Bonds in the form of physical certificates.
So long as a book entry system is in effect for any of the Series 2013 Bonds, the University and Trustee shall recognize and treat the Depository, or its nominee, as the Holder of such Series 2013 Bonds for all purposes, including payment of Debt Service Charges, giving of notices, and enforcement of remedies. The crediting of payments of Debt Service Charges on such Series 2013 Bonds and the transmittal of notices and other communications by the Depository to Beneficial Owners are the responsibility of the Depository and are not the responsibility of the University or the Trustee; provided, however, that the University and the Trustee understand that neither the Depository or its nominee shall provide any consent requested of Holders of such Series 2013 Bonds pursuant to the Trust Agreement, and that the Depository will mail an omnibus proxy (including a list identifying the owners of the book entry interests in such Series 2013 Bonds) to the University which assigns the Depository’s, or its nominee’s, voting rights to the owners of the book entry interests in such Series 2013 Bonds (as credited to their accounts at the Depository as of the record date for mailing of requests for such consents). Upon receipt of such omnibus proxy, the University shall promptly provide such omnibus proxy (including the list identifying the owners of the book entry interests in such Series 2013 Bonds attached thereto) to the Trustee, who shall then treat such owners as Holders of such Series 2013 Bonds for purposes of obtaining any consents pursuant to the terms of the Trust Agreement.

As long as any of the Series 2013 Bonds are registered in the name of a Depository, or its nominee, the University and the Trustee agree to comply with the terms and provisions of their agreement with the Depository including the provisions thereof with respect to any delivery of such Series 2013 Bonds to the Trustee which shall supersede the provisions of the Trust Agreement with respect thereto.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Resolution or any provision of the General Bond Resolution, the Trust Agreement, any Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement or any Series 2013 Bond to the contrary, with the approval of the Fiscal Officer, the Trustee may enter into an agreement with a Depository, or the nominee of a Depository, that is the registered owner of a Series 2013 Bond providing for making all payments to that registered owner of principal of and interest and any premium on that Series 2013 Bond or any portion of that Series 2013 Bond at a place and in a manner (including wire transfer of federal funds) other than as provided above in this Resolution, without prior presentation or surrender of that Series 2013 Bond, upon any conditions which shall be satisfactory to the Trustee and the Fiscal Officer. That payment in any event shall be made to the person who is the registered owner of that Series 2013 Bond on the date that principal and premium is due, or, with respect to the payment of interest, as of the applicable Regular Record Date or Special Record Date or other date agreed upon, as the case may be. The Trustee will furnish a copy of each of those agreements, certified to be correct by an officer of the Trustee, to other Authenticating Agents and Paying Agents for Series 2013 Bonds, if any, and to the University. Any payment of principal, premium, or interest pursuant to such an agreement shall constitute payment thereof pursuant to, and for all purposes of, this Resolution and Trust Agreement.

(j) Change of Depository and Replacement Series 2013 Bonds. If any Depository determines not to continue to act as a Depository for any Series 2013 Bonds for use in a book entry system, the
University may attempt to have established a securities depository/book entry system relationship with another qualified Depository under the Trust Agreement. If the University does not or is unable to do so, the University and the Trustee, after the Trustee has made provision for notification of the owners of book entry interests in such Series 2013 Bonds by appropriate notice to the then Depository, shall permit withdrawal of such Series 2013 Bonds from the Depository, and authenticate and deliver Series 2013 Bond certificates in fully registered form to the assignees of the Depository or its nominee. If the event is not the result of University action or inaction, such withdrawal, authentication and delivery shall be at the cost and expense (including costs of printing or otherwise preparing, and delivering, such replacement Series 2013 Bonds), of those persons requesting that authentication and delivery unless University action or inaction shall have been the cause of the termination of the book entry system in which event such cost and expense shall be borne by the University. Such replacement Series 2013 Bonds shall be in Authorized Denominations.

Section 5. Sale of the Series 2013 Bonds; Series 2013 Certificate of Award. Each series of the Series 2013 Bonds shall be awarded and sold to the Original Purchaser at the price set forth in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award; such price for any maturity of such Series 2013 Bonds shall be not less than 95% of the principal amount thereof, plus accrued interest on the aggregate principal amount of such Series 2013 Bonds from their dates to the date of delivery to and payment by the Original Purchaser for such Series 2013 Bonds, all in accordance with, and subject to the terms and conditions of, an Original Purchaser’s proposal contained in a hereinafter described Series 2013 Bond Purchase Agreement. Such award and sale shall be evidenced by the execution of a Series 2013 Certificate of Award by the Fiscal Officer setting forth such award and sale, the other matters to be set forth therein referred to in this Resolution, and such other matters as the Fiscal Officer determines are consistent with this Resolution, the Trust Agreement and the related Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement. That the matters contained in a Series 2013 Certificate of Award are consistent with this Resolution, the Trust Agreement and the related Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement shall be conclusively evidenced by the execution of such Series 2013 Certificate of Award by such officer. Each Series 2013 Certificate of Award shall be and hereby is incorporated into this Resolution and the related Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement.

The Fiscal Officer is hereby further authorized and directed to execute and deliver, in the name and on behalf of the University, a bond purchase agreement with the Original Purchaser for a series of Series 2013 Bonds (a “Series 2013 Bond Purchase Agreement”) upon such terms as approved by such officer not inconsistent with this Bond Legislation and not substantially adverse to the University. The approval of such officer, and that a Series 2013 Bond Purchase Agreement is consistent with this Resolution and not substantially adverse to the University, shall be conclusively evidenced by the execution of such Series 2013 Bond Purchase Agreement by such officer. Subject to receiving any necessary appointment by the attorney general of the State, the Fiscal Officer is hereby authorized to make arrangements with Peck, Shaffer & Williams LLP to serve as bond counsel for the Series 2013 Bonds, and such firm is hereby appointed to serve in such capacities.

The Fiscal Officer, and any other appropriate officer of the University, are each hereby separately authorized to make arrangements for the delivery of each series of the Series 2013 Bonds; Series 2013 Certificate of Award.
Bonds to, and payment therefore by, the related Original Purchaser. It is hereby determined that the prices for and the terms of the Series 2013 Bonds, and the sale thereof, all as provided in this Resolution, each Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement and each Series 2013 Certificate of Award are in the best interest of the University and in compliance with all legal requirements.

Section 6. Allocation of Proceeds of Series 2013 Bonds. (a) All of the proceeds received by on behalf of the University from the sale of the Series 2013 Bonds shall be received and receipted for by the Fiscal Officer or the Trustee, and shall be deposited and allocated as follows:

(i) To the Debt Service Account of the Debt Service Fund, the portion of such proceeds representing accrued interest and any capitalized interest directed to be deposited in the Debt Service Account by the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award; and

(ii) To a Refunded Bonds Escrow Fund such amount as set forth in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award as is necessary to provide for cash and the purchase of Refunded Bonds Defeasance Obligations sufficient to refund the related Refunded Bonds as set forth in the related Refunded Bonds Escrow Agreement; and

(iii) To the Series 2013 Projects Account which is hereby created as a separate deposit account within the Facilities Fund (except when invested as hereinafter provided) in the custody of the University or the Trustee or other entity, as the Fiscal Officer shall determine, such portion of such proceeds as may be specified in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award.

(b) Any such capitalized interest may be deposited in a separate sub-account of the Debt Service Account of the Debt Service Fund as the Fiscal Officer may determine. Upon a determination by the Fiscal Officer that any portion of such amount designated to be used for capitalized interest is not needed for such purpose, such portion may be transferred to a Refunded Bonds Escrow Fund or the Series 2013 Projects Account as the Fiscal Officer may direct.

(c) Such proceeds are hereby appropriated for the purposes of the respective funds and accounts into which such proceeds are deposited.

(d) No provision shall be made for a Debt Service Reserve Account with respect to the Series 2013 Bonds, and there shall be no Required Reserve for the Series 2013 Bonds. The Series 2013 Bonds shall not be payable from, and the Series 2013 Bonds shall not be secured by, any moneys in or investments credited to the Debt Service Reserve Account, and therefore, Debt Service Charges on the Series 2013 Bonds shall not have access to or claims upon the Debt Service Reserve Account.

Section 7. Series 2013 Projects Account; Refunded Bonds Escrow Fund; Recordkeeping; Application of Moneys. A record of each deposit into and disbursement from the Series 2013 Projects Account and the Refunded Bonds Escrow Fund shall be made and maintained by the party having custody of such account.
Moneys in a Refunded Bonds Escrow Fund shall be applied to payment of the principal of, and interest and any redemption premium on, the related Refunded Bonds and invested, and any investment earnings credited, as provided in the related Refunded Bonds Escrow Agreement. Moneys in the Series 2013 Projects Account shall be used to pay Costs of University Facilities related to the 2013 Projects, capitalized interest to a date as may be set forth in a Series 2013 Certificate of Award and any Costs of University Facilities associated with the issuance of the Series 2013 Bonds and the refunding of the Refunded Bonds to the extent not paid from moneys in a Refunded Bonds Escrow Fund, and shall be disbursed upon the written request of the Fiscal Officer on behalf of the University. The University covenants that it will proceed with due diligence to pay such costs and complete the 2013 Projects. Upon the final payment of such costs, the University shall deliver to the Trustee a certificate of the Fiscal Officer on behalf of the University stating that fact and setting forth the amount, if any, then remaining in the Series 2013 Projects Account which shall be transferred to the Debt Service Account of the Debt Service Fund pursuant to this Section.

Upon such certification, any moneys remaining in the Series 2013 Projects Account and certified pursuant to the preceding paragraph shall be transferred by the party having custody of such Account to the Debt Service Account of the Debt Service Fund as set forth in the immediately preceding paragraph.

Moneys in the Series 2013 Projects Account may be invested in any lawful University investments in amounts maturing not later than the times when such amounts in the Series 2013 Projects Account are required to pay any costs payable from such Fund. Any investment made by the Trustee shall be at the written or oral (and, if oral, promptly confirmed in writing) direction of the Fiscal Officer. The term “lawful University investments” shall mean those investments made in accordance with the Statement of Objectives and Policies for Non-Endowment Invested Funds, approved by the Board on September 21, 2005, as the same may be amended or supplemented from time to time. Such investments may include qualifying money market mutual funds for which the Trustee or any of its affiliates provide services for a fee, whether as an investment advisor, custodian, transfer agent, registrar, sponsor, distributor, manager or otherwise.

Any investment of moneys in the Series 2013 Projects Account shall constitute a part of the Series 2013 Projects Account and the Series 2013 Projects Account shall be credited with all proceeds of sale, and gain or loss, from such investment. Interest earnings on moneys in the Series 2013 Projects Account shall be credited when received to the Series 2013 Projects Account. For investment purposes only, moneys in the Series 2013 Projects Account may be commingled with moneys from one or more funds held by the Trustee pursuant to the Trust Agreement; provided that separate records are maintained for each such fund, the investments made therefrom, and the interest earnings credited thereto.

Section 8. Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement; Refunded Bonds Escrow Agreement. The Chairman of the Board, the President of the University, the Secretary of the Board and the Fiscal Officer, or any one or more of them, are each authorized and directed to execute, acknowledge and deliver, in the name of and on behalf of the University, a Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement pursuant to the Trust Agreement in connection with the issuance of each series of the
Series 2013 Bonds and, if applicable, a related Refunded Bonds Escrow Agreement, in such forms not substantially adverse to the University as may be permitted by the Act and the Trust Agreement and approved by the officer or officers executing the same on behalf of the University. The approval of such forms by the Board and such officer or officers, and the fact that such forms are not substantially adverse to the University, shall be conclusively evidenced by the execution of each Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement and Refunded Bonds Escrow Agreement by such officer or officers.

Consistent with Section 8.02 of the Original Trust Agreement, the University and the Trustee, without the consent of or notice to any of the Bondholders, may enter into agreements supplemental to the Trust Agreement and the Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreements to the extent necessary or desirable to permit (i) the transfer of Series 2013 Bonds from one Depository to another, and the succession of Depositories or (ii) the withdrawal of Series 2013 Bonds issued to a Depository for use of a book entry system and the issuance of replacement Series 2013 Bonds in fully registered form to others than a Depository.

The Chairman of the Board, the President of the University, the Secretary of the Board and the Fiscal Officer are each separately authorized to execute and deliver, on behalf of the University, such other certificates, documents and instruments as are necessary in connection with the transactions authorized in this Resolution, and to do all other things required of them or the University pursuant to the Trust Agreement, this Resolution and any Refunded Bonds Escrow Agreement.

The appropriate officers of the University shall do all things necessary or proper to implement and carry out the orders and agreements set forth in or approved in this Resolution for the proper fulfillment of the purposes of the General Bond Resolution and this Resolution. The Secretary of the Board shall furnish to the Original Purchaser a true and certified transcript of all proceedings taken with reference to the authorization and issuance of the Series 2013 Bonds along with other information as is necessary or proper with respect to the Series 2013 Bonds.

The Refunded Bonds shall be and hereby are ordered called for optional redemption according to their terms on the first optional redemption date following the issuance of the related Series 2013 Bonds at the redemption prices set forth therein. The Fiscal Officer and other appropriate officers and employees of the University are each hereby separately authorized to engage a firm of certified public accountants to verify the sufficiency of the moneys and investments in a Refunded Bonds Escrow Fund and to subscribe for and purchase such United States Treasury obligations, including such obligations of the State and Local Government Series, as shall be required by such Refunded Bonds Escrow Agreement, and to pay for the services of such accountants and for such obligations with the proceeds of the related Series 2013 Bonds, and any such actions heretofore taken by such officers or the Original Purchaser of the related Series 2013 Bonds or bond counsel in connection with such subscription and purchase are hereby approved, ratified and confirmed.

Section 9. Tax Matters. The University hereby covenants that it will not take any action, or fail to take any action, if any such action or failure to take action would adversely affect the exclusion from gross income of the interest on the Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds under Section 103(a) of
the Code. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the University hereby covenants as follows:

(a) The University will not directly or indirectly use or permit the use of any proceeds of the Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds or any other funds of the University, or take or omit to take any action that would cause the Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds to be “arbitrage bonds” within the meaning of Sections 103(b)(2) and 148 of the Code. To that end, the University will comply with all requirements of Sections 103(b)(2) and 148 of the Code to the extent applicable to the Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds. In the event that at any time the University is of the opinion that for purposes of this sub-section (a) it is necessary to restrict or limit the yield on the investment of any moneys held by the Trustee under the Trust Agreement, the Fiscal Officer shall so instruct the Trustee in writing, and the Trustee shall take such action as may be necessary in accordance with such instructions. The Fiscal Officer, or any other officer having responsibility with respect to the issuance of the Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds, is authorized and directed to give an appropriate certificate on behalf of the University, on the date of delivery of the Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds for inclusion in the transcript of proceedings, setting forth the facts, estimates and circumstances and reasonable expectations pertaining to the use of the proceeds thereof and the provisions of such Sections 103(b)(2) and 148, and to execute and deliver on behalf of the University an IRS Form 8038G in connection with the issuance of the Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds.

Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the University agrees that there shall be paid from time to time all amounts required to be rebated to the United States pursuant to Section 148(f) of the Code. This covenant shall survive payment in full or defeasance of the Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds. The University specifically covenants to pay or cause to be paid to the United States at the times and in the amounts determined under Section 10 hereof the Rebate Amounts, as described in the Federal Tax Documents. The Trustee agrees to perform all tasks required of it in the Federal Tax Documents.

Notwithstanding any provision of this sub-section (a), if the University shall provide to the Trustee an opinion of nationally recognized bond counsel to the effect that any action required under this Section and Section 10 of this Resolution is no longer required, or to the effect that some further action is required, to maintain the exclusion from gross income of the interest on the Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds pursuant to Section 103(a) of the Code, the University and the Trustee may rely conclusively on such opinion in complying with the provisions hereof.

(b) So long as any of the Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds, or any obligations issued to refund the Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds, remain unpaid, the University will not operate or use, or permit the operation or use of, the 2013 Projects, the improvements financed with the Refunded Bonds, or any part thereof in any trade or business carried on by any person within the meaning of the Code which would (i) cause the Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds to be “private activity bonds” within the meaning of Section 141 of the Code, and (ii) result in the interest payable on the Tax-Exempt Series 2013 Bonds to be not exempt from federal income taxation under the Code.

Section 10. Rebate Fund.
(a) There has previously been created and ordered maintained in the custody of the Trustee (except when invested as herein provided), the Rebate Fund, which shall not constitute a Special Fund or Account securing the Series 2013 Bonds or other Obligations. There shall be deposited in the Rebate Fund such amounts as are required to be deposited therein pursuant to the Federal Tax Documents. Subject to the transfer provisions provided in paragraph (d) below, all money at any time deposited in the Rebate Fund shall be held by the Trustee in trust, to the extent required to satisfy the Rebate Amount (as defined in the Federal Tax Documents), for payment to the United States of America, and neither the University nor the owner of any Bonds shall have any rights in or claim to such money. All amounts deposited into or on deposit in the Rebate Fund shall be governed by this Section, by Section 9 of this Resolution and by the Federal Tax Documents (which is incorporated herein by reference).

(b) The Trustee shall have no obligations to rebate any amounts required to be rebated pursuant to this Section, other than from moneys held in the funds created under the Trust Agreement or from other moneys provided to it by the University upon its request for said moneys from the University as set forth in the Federal Tax Documents.

(c) The Trustee shall, at the direction of the University, invest amounts held in the Rebate Fund and deposit all earnings on such amounts as provided in the Federal Tax Documents.

(d) The Trustee shall remit moneys in the Rebate Fund to the United States, as directed in the Federal Tax Documents. Any funds remaining in the Rebate Fund after redemption and payment of all of the Bonds and payment and satisfaction of any Rebate Amount, or provision made therefor satisfactory to the Trustee shall be withdrawn and remitted to the University.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Resolution or the Trust Agreement, the obligation to remit the Rebate Amounts to the United States and to comply with all other requirements of this Section, Section 9 of this Resolution and the Federal Tax Documents shall survive the defeasance or payment in full of the Bonds.

Section 11. Official Statement. The Fiscal Officer is hereby authorized to execute and deliver preliminary and final official statements on behalf of the University for any or all series of the Series 2013 Bonds, in such forms as such officer may approve, and to deem such official statements to be “final” for purposes of Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 15c2-12, such officer’s execution thereof on behalf of the University to be conclusive evidence of such authorization, approval and deeming, and copies thereof are hereby authorized to be prepared and furnished to the Original Purchaser for distribution to prospective purchasers of the Series 2013 Bonds and other interested persons.

The Fiscal Officer on behalf of the University is hereby authorized to execute and deliver continuing disclosure certificates or agreements dated as set forth in a Series 2013 Certificate of Award (a “Continuing Disclosure Certificate”) in connection with the issuance of the related Series 2013 Bonds in such forms as such officer may approve. The University hereby covenants and agrees that it will execute, comply with and carry out all of the provisions of each Continuing Disclosure Certificate. Failure to comply with any such provisions of a Continuing
Disclosure Certificate shall not constitute a default on the Series 2013 Bonds; however, any holder or owner of the Series 2013 Bonds may take such action as may be necessary and appropriate, including seeking specific performance, to cause the University to comply with its obligations under this paragraph and such Continuing Disclosure Certificate.

The Fiscal Officer on behalf of the University is hereby authorized to furnish such information, to execute such instruments and to take such other actions in cooperation with the Original Purchaser as may be reasonably requested to qualify the Series 2013 Bonds for offer and sale under the Blue Sky or other securities laws and regulations and to determine their eligibility for investment under the laws and regulations of such states and other jurisdictions of the United States of America as may be designated by the Original Purchaser; provided however, that the University shall not be required to register as a dealer or broker in any such state or jurisdiction or become subject to the service of process in any jurisdiction in which the University is not now subject to such service.

Section 12. Series 2013 Credit Support Instrument. The Fiscal Officer is hereby authorized, but shall not be required, to apply for one or more Series 2013 Credit Support Instruments. The Fiscal Officer is hereby authorized to select one or more Financial Institutions having qualifications and duties as may be set forth in a Series 2013 Certificate of Award and a Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement to serve as a Series 2013 Financial Institution and to provide a Series 2013 Credit Support Instrument, and to accept the commitment of a Series 2013 Financial Institution therefor, and the payment of the fees, premiums and expenses relating to any Series 2013 Credit Support Instrument from sources as may be described in the related Series 2013 Certificate of Award and the related Series 2013 Supplemental Trust Agreement is hereby authorized. The Chairman of the Board, the President of the University, the Secretary of the Board and the Fiscal Officer, or any one or more of them, are each authorized and directed to execute, acknowledge and deliver, in the name of and on behalf of the University, an reimbursement agreement or other agreement with each Series 2013 Financial Institution providing for the payment of the fees and expenses of such Series 2013 Financial Institution and the reimbursement, and security for the reimbursement, of such Series 2013 Financial Institution for advances made pursuant to any Series 2013 Credit Support Instrument, in such form as may be permitted by the Act and approved by the officer or officers executing the same on behalf of the University. The approval of such form by the Board and such officer or officers shall be conclusively evidenced by the execution of such agreement by such officer or officers.

Section 13. Temporary Series 2013 Bonds. Pending the preparation of definitive Series 2013 Bonds the University may execute and the Trustee shall authenticate and deliver temporary Series 2013 Bonds in printed or typewritten form. Temporary Series 2013 Bonds shall be issuable in fully registered form, of any denomination, and substantially in the form of the definitive Series 2013 Bonds but with such omissions, insertions and variations as may be appropriate for temporary Series 2013 Bonds, all as may be determined by the Fiscal Officer. Every temporary Series 2013 Bond shall be executed on behalf of the University, and be authenticated by the Trustee upon the same conditions and in substantially the same manner, and with like effect, as the definitive Series 2013 Bonds. If one or more temporary Series 2013 Bonds are issued, then without unnecessary delay the University shall execute and furnish to the
Trustee in exchange therefor without charge, and the Trustee shall authenticate and deliver in exchange for such temporary Series 2013 Bonds an equal aggregate principal amount of definitive Series 2013 Bonds. Until so exchanged the temporary Series 2013 Bonds shall be entitled to the same benefits under the Trust Agreement as definitive Series 2013 Bonds.

Section 14. Prior Actions Approved. All actions hereto taken by officers and employees of the Board and the University in connection with the approval, authorization, sale, execution, delivery and issuance of the Prior Obligations or the security therefor, or any Interest Rate Hedge or Credit Support Instrument related thereto or to the Series 2013 Bonds, are hereby approved, ratified and confirmed.

Section 15. Additional Special Funds and Accounts. The Fiscal Officer is hereby authorized to create such additional Special Funds and Special Accounts in connection with the Series 2013 Bonds and the security therefor and the remarketing thereof as the Fiscal Officer deems necessary. Any such Special Funds and Accounts and the permitted investment thereof shall be described in a Series 2013 Certificate of Award.

Section 16. Changes Related to the Series 2001 Bonds. The Chairman of the Board, the President of the University, the Secretary of the Board and the Fiscal Officer, or any one or more of them, are each authorized and directed to execute, acknowledge and deliver, in the name of and on behalf of the University, amendments to, or replacements or terminations of, either or both of the Credit Support Instruments for the Series 2001 Bonds (being a Standby Bond Purchase Agreement dated May 3, 2001 between the University and Dexia Credit Local and the Series 2001 Swap Agreement), and related amendments to or supplements of the First Supplemental Trust Agreement, in such forms and upon such terms that the official executing the same deems advantageous to the University as may be permitted by the Act. The approval of the form of any such document by the Board and such officer or officers and that the terms thereof are advantageous to the University, shall be conclusively evidenced by the execution of such document by such officer or officers.

Section 17. Changes Related to the Housing For Ohio Guaranty Bonds. The Chairman of the Board, the President of the University, the Secretary of the Board and the Fiscal Officer, or any one or more of them, are each authorized and directed to execute, acknowledge and deliver, in the name of and on behalf of the University, amendments to, or replacements or terminations of, the Housing For Ohio Guaranty Bonds, and related amendments to or supplements of the Eleventh Supplemental Trust Agreement and related documents, in such forms and upon such terms that the official executing the same deems advantageous to the University as may be permitted by the Act. The approval of the form of any such document by the Board and such officer or officers and that the terms thereof are advantageous to the University, shall be conclusively evidenced by the execution of such document by such officer or officers.

Section 18. Relationship of this Resolution to General Bond Resolution. It is understood and acknowledged by the University that the Series 2013 Bonds are being issued pursuant to the terms of the General Bond Resolution, as amended and supplemented by the terms of this Resolution; that the Series 2013 Bonds are subject to all of the terms and conditions of the
General Bond Resolution, as amended, except as otherwise provided herein; and that all of the
terms, conditions, covenants and warranties contained in the General Bond Resolution, as
amended, except as otherwise provided herein, shall apply with like force and effect to the Series
2013 Bonds as if originally made in connection therewith. The General Bond Resolution and the
Trust Agreement, as amended and supplemented to date including by this Resolution, and the
Obligations issued to date thereunder, including the Prior Obligations, are hereby approved,
ratified and confirmed.

Section 19. General. This Resolution is adopted pursuant to the General Bond Resolution and the
Trust Agreement. The appropriate officers of the University shall do all things necessary and
proper to implement and carry out the orders and agreements set forth in or approved in the
General Bond Resolution and this Resolution for the proper fulfillment of the purposes thereof.
Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Fiscal Officer and other appropriate officers
of the University are hereby authorized to apply to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents
for any required approvals with respect to the 2013 Projects or the Series 2013 Bonds. Should all
the Series 2013 Projects or the Series 2013 Bonds not receive such approvals by the time the
Series 2013 Bonds to fund the 2013 Projects are sold, the Fiscal Officer shall set forth in the
Series related 2012 Certificate of Award the 2013 Projects and the amount of such Series 2013
Bonds that have received such approvals. Thereupon, such Series 2013 Bonds shall be issued in
a principal amount not exceeding the amount approved by the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of
Regents and the 2013 Projects shall include only the projects approved by the Chancellor of the
Ohio Board of Regents.

Section 20. Inconsistencies. All orders, resolutions and other official actions, or parts thereof,
inconsistent herewith or with the documents hereby authorized, approved, ratified or confirmed
are hereby repealed, but only to the extent of such inconsistency. This Resolution shall not be
construed as otherwise revising any order, resolution or other official action, or part thereof.

Section 21. Open Meeting Determination. It is found and determined that all formal actions of
the Board concerning and relating to the adoption of this Resolution were adopted in an open
meeting of the Board, and that all deliberations of the Board and of any of its committees that
resulted in such formal actions were in meetings open to the public, in compliance with all legal
requirements, including Section 121.22 of the Revised Code of Ohio.

Section 22. Effective Date. This Resolution shall take effect and be in force immediately upon its
adoption.

Adopted: April 18, 2013

Consent Agenda Items
The following Consent Agenda items were moved to the full Board by the Resources
Committee:
- The Ridges Advisory Committee (Tab 7)
- Bid Limits (Tab 8)
- Construction Projects (Tab 9)
- Snyder Naming (Tab 10)
Annual HR Report
VP Golding told the Trustees that the report was included in their information. He noted the continued implementation of the Affordable Care Act and advised that following the COMP 2014 project more refined employee breakdowns for administrators, specifically those who are in academic units, will be available.

Capital Campaign Update
This update was provided by Vice President for Advancement Bryan Benchoff who announced that as of March 21, 2013, the campaign contributions totaled $419.5 million. The goal of the campaign is $450 million. Trustee Wolfort noted that Charles Stuckey, campaign chairman, has done a wonderful job.

VP Benchoff pointed out that the Planned Proposals value continues at a fairly consistent $18 million to $20 million, reflecting that as proposals are realized as pledged gifts, new proposals are taking their place, so the campaign continues to grow. College campaign attainment, the sources of gifts, and the areas supported by the gifts were reviewed.

VP Benchoff discussed the 2012 Foundation Annual Report, the first such report in several years. That report is expected in Trustees’ mailboxes soon.

VP Benchoff also discussed The Promise Within campaign targeting University faculty and staff. Objectives of this campaign include educating employees about private support, increasing employee participation, and creating a culture of philanthropy on campus. Trustee Wolfort noted that this campaign is in its infancy and is a campaign that he personally endorses. He commended what he called the great and record-breaking participation in this campaign and applauded the University’s faculty and staff.

Fiscal Year 2014 Fees Resolution Revisited
Near the end of Trustee Wolfort’s presentation on behalf of the Resources Committee, a group of Ohio University students walked to the front of the Board’s meeting room. Several of the students were holding a sign and one of the students began reading a statement.

Vice Chair Anderson issued a warning to the students, informing them that their behavior was disrupting a lawful meeting, advising them to cease their behavior immediately, and notifying them that failure to do so could result in their arrest and removal. Vice Chair Anderson issued three warnings before suspending the meeting at 11:34 a.m.

Vice Chair Anderson called the meeting back to order at 11:42 a.m.

Trustee Wolfort resumed his presentation on behalf of the Resources Committee and asked the Board to return its attention to Tab 4 in the Board book – namely, the four resolutions pertaining
to tuition and fees for Fiscal Year 2013-2014. He noted that earlier in the meeting the Board voted on these resolutions as a package but that in order to clarify the record the Board was going back and voting on the four resolutions individually.

Trustee Wolfort then introduced the Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Athens Campus Instructional Fee, General Fee and Non-Resident Surcharge Resolution. Trustee Goodman moved for approval of the Resolution, Trustee Lake seconded. All approved and the motion carried.

FISCAL YEAR 2013-2014

ATHENS CAMPUS

INSTRUCTIONAL FEE, GENERAL FEE AND NON-RESIDENT SURCHARGE

RESOLUTION 2013 -- 3320

WHEREAS, the Ohio University 2013-2014 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 for purposes of investments in identified strategic priorities, and

WHEREAS, House Bill 59 allows the combined instructional and general fees for undergraduate students to increase by 2.0%, and

WHEREAS, the planning and consultations within the University result in a recommendation of a combined 1.6% increase in instructional and general fees for undergraduate students on the Athens Campus, and

WHEREAS, the University desires to keep Athens campus graduate tuition and fees and non-resident surcharge fees at the Fiscal Year 2008-2009 rates.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees adopts the proposed fee schedules (Attachment A), effective Fall Semester 2013, unless otherwise noted.

Trustee Lake moved to approve the Fiscal Year 2013-2014 College of Medicine and Regional Campuses Instructional Fee, General Fee and Non-Resident Surcharge Resolution. This Resolution had been amended as noted earlier. Trustee Scholl seconded the motion. All approved and the motion carried.
FISCAL YEAR 2013-2014

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE AND REGIONAL CAMPUSES

INSTRUCTIONAL FEE, GENERAL FEE AND NON-RESIDENT SURCHARGE

RESOLUTION 2013 -- 3321

WHEREAS, the Ohio University 2013-2014 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 for purposes of investments in identified strategic priorities, and

WHEREAS, House Bill 59 allows the combined instructional and general fees for undergraduate students to increase by 2.0%, 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 Regional Campuses results in recommendations for an increase in instructional fees of 2% for lower division and 0.8% for upper division, and increase the non-resident surcharge for undergraduate students on the Chillicothe, Lancaster, Zanesville campuses to a rate equivalent to the fees assessed under the quarter system, and

WHEREAS, the planning within the Athens Campus resulted in specific recommendations for the Masters in Athletic Administration, Master in Electrical Engineering and Masters in Civil Engineering.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees adopts the proposed fee schedules (Attachments B, C, D & E), effective Fall Semester 2013, unless otherwise noted.

Trustee Wolfort moved to approve the Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Student Course, Technology and Miscellaneous Fees Resolution. Trustee King seconded the motion. All approved and the motion carried.
WHEREAS, the Ohio University 2013-2014 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 attached fee schedules (Attachments F and G) are consistent with House Bill 59.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees adopts the attached fee schedules, effective Fall Semester 2013, unless otherwise noted.

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.

Trustee Wolford moved to approve the Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Residence and Dining Hall Fee Rates Resolution. Trustee Scholl seconded the motion. All approved and the motion carried.

WHEREAS, sustained effort has been made to achieve financial stability for Ohio University’s Residence Hall and Dining Hall Auxiliaries while providing necessary services for students, and

WHEREAS, the Residence Hall and Dining Hall Auxiliaries have 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 planning within the Athens Campus results in a recommendation of a 3.5% increase in standard double room rates and a 0.5% increase in board rates, and

WHEREAS, the proposed fee schedules are consistent with Amended Substitute House Bill 59.
NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees adopts the attached schedule of fees (Attachment H), effective Fall Semester 2013.

Vice Chair Anderson noted that these four resolutions had been discussed extensively in both individual and joint committee meetings.

University Academics Committee Report
Trustee Brightbill reported on the University Academics Committee meeting as follows:

Academic Quality-Dashboard: Scripps College of Communication
Trustee Brightbill reported that Scott Titsworth, Dean of the Scripps College of Communication, presented the College’s academic dashboard to the committee. He noted that in 2010 the Ohio Board of Regents named the Scripps College of Communication a Center of Excellence in Societal and Cultural Transformation. Ohio University’s College of Communication is the only one in the state to receive this designation. Dean Titsworth also noted that the College’s first-year students average ACT scores that are over three points higher than their peers at other four-year public universities. Ohio University’s College of Communication also boasts a first-year retention rate of 89% and a six-year graduation rate of 84%. In 2011, the College granted more than 850 undergraduate and graduate degrees and saw an increase in the number of diverse and out-of-state students. Notable, too, is that the percentage of Scripps students employed following graduation has continually increased. Dean Titsworth also talked about the E.W. Scripps School of Journalism and highlighted that it is the only school in the College of Communication that is accredited. He also talked about the Schoonover Center, which is slated to come online this fall, and updated the committee about the College’s fundraising goals, which are close to being met.

Dean Titsworth’s presentation included two graduating Scripps seniors, Trevor Tomlinson and Allison Jordan, who discussed their internship experiences. Trustee Brightbill noted that the students’ presentations were very enlightening.

High-Risk Drinking Update
Vice President for Student Affair Ryan Lombardi provided an update on the programs and policies that have been implemented to combat high-risk drinking. This topic was also discussed during President McDavis’ report to the Board.

OIT Academic Update
Trustee Brightbill reported that the committee heard about Academic Technologies and how it applies to teaching on campus. Academic Technologies staff members are working with the University’s professors one-on-one to meet teaching and learning objectives by incorporating new technologies. The Trustees saw a three-minute video presentation on the flipped classroom concept, which provides lectures online and devotes classroom time to discussing and applying the concepts presented in the lecture.

Faculty Workload
Trustee Brightbill noted that the committee learned that language regarding increasing faculty workload had been removed from the Ohio House’s version of the state budget. Trustee Brightbill praised Dr. Benoit for delivering an excellent presentation on faculty workload and for
explaining that faculty responsibilities extend beyond teaching and include advising and working on committees.

**Faculty Compensation Update**
The committee also discussed faculty compensation and was given an update on the Faculty Compensation Task Force’s progress. Trustee Brightbill noted that calculating the impact of the healthcare reform legislation on the University’s healthcare costs is more complicated than originally thought, which has resulted in delays. Dr. Benoit estimated that a final report will be available next year, and Trustee Brightbill added that it is important for the University to get this right and to take the time to do just that.

**General Education Reform Update**
The committee heard an update on the General Education reform and will continue to discuss that. Trustee Brightbill noted that there are a number of new people on that task force.

**Regional Academic Program Reviews**
Trustee Brightbill noted that the Board discussed Regional Academic Program Reviews at its February meeting. The regional and executive deans have been tasked with looking at three areas and will return to the Board with a timeline as well as a commitment to look at all the degree programs on the regional campuses.

**Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) Update**
The committee was updated on the Academic Quality Improvement Program. Trustee Brightbill commented that this was another ongoing discussion as Ohio University prepares for its reaffirmation of accreditation, slated for 2015-16. He noted that it would be helpful for the Trustees if information regarding the reaccreditation process was available in one place.

**Search Updates**
The committee was updated on recent hires and several searches.

**Student Senate Tuition Survey**
The committee also heard from Zach George, president of Student Senate, who discussed a student survey on tuition. Approximately 2,100 students participated in the survey. Trustee Brightbill commended Mr. George for taking on this task in addition to his duties as a full-time student and told him the Board appreciated his efforts.

**Consent Agenda Items**
The following Consent Agenda items were approved:
- Faculty Fellowship Awards (Tab 17 in the Board book)
- Emerita/Emeritus Awards (Tab 18)
- Voinovich School Center for Public and Social Innovation (Tab 25)
- Kennedy Museum of Art Advisory Board Member (Tab 26)
University Governance Committee Report
Trustee Janetta King presented the report from the University Governance Committee meeting as follows:

Bylaws
The committee discussed the Board’s bylaws and agreed to language pertaining to vacancies in officer positions, quorum and voting. Those amendments (Tab 27 in the Board book) were brought to the full Board for approval.

Trustee King moved to accept the amended bylaws, Trustee Brightbill seconded. All approved and the motion carried.

The Ohio University Board of Trustees By-Laws as Amended
Revised September 6, 2012
Revised April 24, 2011
Revised February 10, 2010
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. The Board of Trustees of the Ohio University, a body corporate and politic, hereby adopts these Bylaws for the purpose of governing its activities in accordance with Chapter 3337 of the Ohio Revised Code.

Section 2. No By-Laws shall be enacted, amended, or repealed, except by a vote of a majority of the members (5 votes) of the Board authorized to vote, and then only after thirty (30) days notice of a proposed change has been given to all members.

Section 3. The Board shall be comprised of nine Trustees and two student Trustees, all appointed by the governor of the State of Ohio in accordance with Section 3337.01 of the Ohio Revised Code. The Board shall also 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 4. The nine Trustees appointed by the Governor shall hold voting privileges. The two student trustees, the two national trustees and the chair of the Ohio University Alumni Association Board of Directors 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 customary to the office or assigned 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, management of investments, coordination of audits with auditors, including federal and state auditors, overseeing relationships with financial reporting agencies, and all other financial responsibilities generally or specifically assigned by the Board or the President.

Article III. Election of Officers  
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) consecutive years. The Secretary and the Treasurer shall be eligible for annual election to these offices without a yearly limitation.

Section 3. In the event of a vacancy in an Officer position, the Board shall elect a successor from among its members to serve the remainder of the vacant term.

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 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, 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. 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 and Voting. Five Trustees appointed by the Governor, (the “Voting Trustees”) A majority (5 voting Trustees) of the Board membership shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of the ordinary business of the Board. An affirmative vote of six Voting Trustees two-thirds (6 votes) of the Trustees authorized to vote shall be necessary to elect or remove a President and an affirmative vote of five Voting Trustees a majority (5 votes) of the Trustees authorized to vote shall be necessary to authorize the sale or lease of a University building or the planned demolition of a University building adopt any other resolution or action of the Board.

Section 6. Agenda. 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 University 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 Revised Code Section 3345.05.

(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 receipt 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 as the Board may deem necessary.
Section 4. The Chairperson of the Board and the President shall be ex-officio non-voting members of all Standing Committees and Special Committees.

**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.

**Meeting Dates for 2014**
The committee reviewed meeting dates for 2014 and was recommending a calendar as part of the Consent Agenda (Tab 28 in the Board book).

**Nomination of National Trustee**
The committee discussed the process of nominating a National Trustee to fill an upcoming vacancy. The committee decided to discuss that process further, which Trustee King noted they did earlier today. The new National Trustee will be seated in early fall.

**Nomination for Chair and Vice Chair**
Trustee King informed the Board that Vice Chair Anderson had been nominated for the position of Board Chair and that Trustee Brightbill had been nominated for the position of Vice Chair. Trustee King moved to name Vice Chair Anderson to the position of Board Chair for the coming year. Trustee Wolford seconded. All approved and the motion carried.
Vice Chair Anderson moved to name Trustee Brightbill to the position of Board Vice Chair for the coming year. Trustee King seconded. All approved and the motion carried.
Vice Chair Anderson noted that she intended to follow the model of outgoing Chair Harris and to take Trustee Brightbill with her wherever she went. Vice Chair Anderson also stated her commitment to work as a two-person team and on the Executive Committee as a four-person team and that she looked forward to working with Trustee Brightbill.

**University Audit Committee Report**
Trustee Kevin Lake presented the report from the University Audit Committee meeting as follows:

**University Risk Management Initiative Update**
The committee heard an update on the University’s Risk Management Initiative from Joe Adams, Associate Vice President of Risk Management and Safety, and Jeffrey Davis, Chief Audit Executive. Mr. Adams also discussed the Heat Map developed by the University Risk Council in conjunction with the external audit consultant.

**Plante & Moran Upcoming FY13 Audit**
The Trustees welcomed Plante & Moran back to the committee. The agency was recently notified that it has been selected as the University’s external auditor for the next five years.

**Internal Audit Update**
Jeffrey Davis, Chief Audit Executive, updated the committee on internal audit office operations, which included the audit status update, the Fiscal Year 2013 audit schedule, the ongoing management initiatives, the service alignment initiative, and the Oracle R12 assessment. Mr. Davis updated the committee on completed audits for Fiscal Year 2013, which included final
Executive Committee Report

Vice Chair Sandra Anderson announced what she referred to as good news – that the Board had before it a resolution to ratify a labor agreement with Local 1699 and Ohio Council 8 of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME). The resolution is effective March 1, 2013, through March 1, 2016.

Vice Chair Anderson moved to ratify the labor agreement, Trustee Wolford seconded. All approved and the motion carried.

RATIFICATION OF LABOR AGREEMENT

RESOLUTION 2013 -- 3324

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, 2013 to 5:00 P.M. March 1, 2016, 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.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Vice Chair Anderson asked for a motion to approve all items on the Consent Agenda. Trustee Brightbill moved for approval, Trustee Scholl seconded. All approved and the motion carried.

CONSENT AGENDA
WHEREAS, the University has committed to a change in its budget and management practices to a Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) approach, and

WHEREAS, the University has completed the planning and assessment phase for the Ohio Service Alignment Initiative (OSAI) of the core administrative functions effectiveness both centrally and within the distributed units, their readiness to support a decentralized operating environment under RCM, and a gap analysis for attaining required levels of customer and system support for the transition to the new RCM budget-management environment, and

WHEREAS, the OSAI findings and recommendations represented to the Board at the June 2012 meeting focused on Finance, Human Resources, and Information Technology, and

WHEREAS, the University has developed a detailed work plan to achieve the required and recommended technological and operational enhancements; efforts to be overseen by the newly developed Project Management Office, and

WHEREAS, through continuous project analysis and prioritization by University leadership and customers, the estimated, not-to-exceed project budget has been determined to be $28,100,000 over a six year period.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Ohio University Board of Trustees hereby supports the continuation of the OSAI and authorizes President Roderick McDavis to approve spending up to the estimated project budget of $28,100,000.

THE PRESIDENT'S RIDGES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, Resolution number 1988-977 passed by The Ohio University Board of Trustees in 1988, established the Ohio University – Athens Mental Health Center Advisory Committee with appointments to the Committee made by the then Board Administration Committee; the Advisory Committee was authorized to assist the University in the development of a comprehensive land use plan, and

WHEREAS, in Resolution 1989-1029, at their April 8, 1989 meeting, the Ohio University Board of Trustees approved the Guidelines for Planning for the Ridges that included the plan that described comprehensive recommendations of future land and building usage, as well as provided for public input and a final public hearing before the recommendations were submitted to the Board of Trustees for review and action, and
WHEREAS, in Resolution 1989-1049, the Ohio University Board of Trustees approved the Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the Ridges, which concluded the work of the authorized committee.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Ohio University Board of Trustees hereby authorizes President Roderick McDavis to create another advisory committee to oversee the updating of the 1989 Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the Ridges.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that President Roderick McDavis is authorized to include members of the Athens City, Athens County and Athens Township, and as determined by him, other citizen representatives as he determines necessary to assist Ohio University in the development of an updated and new comprehensive land use plan for the Ridges, formally known as the Athens Mental Health Center, its land and buildings, and formally transferred by the General Assembly to Ohio University for the use and benefit of the University and the people of Ohio as determined by the Ohio University Board of Trustees.

BID LIMITS

RESOLUTION 2013 -- 3327

WHEREAS, the Ohio University Board of Trustees, pursuant to Ohio Construction Reform, signed into law in June, 2011, may establish the limits at which competitive bids are required to be solicited for all construction projects planned and completed by Ohio University, as well as bid limits for the services of Architects, Engineers and other consultants and bid limits for the purchases of other goods and equipment, and,

WHEREAS, the Ohio University Board of Trustees recognize the need to adjust these limits from time to time as good business practices dictates, and to further be in compliance with new Ohio statutory requirements, and

WHEREAS, the Ohio University Board of Trustees always reserves the right to authorize the University's President, or his designee/s to competitively bid construction, services and goods whatever the dollar amount, if it seems in their judgment to be in the best interest of the University.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ohio University Board of Trustees hereby authorizes the President or his designee/s to proceed with construction projects, the purchase of goods, supplies, equipment and consultant services that are within the statutory bid limits as amended by the State of Ohio from time to time, including the latest reforms made to Ohio Revised Code Section 153.01.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that previously adopted Resolution 2000-1709 is hereby rescinded and superseded by the this Resolution.
APPROVAL OF PROJECT AND AUTHORIZATION TO DEVELOP
CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS, RECEIVE BIDS AND AWARD
CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS FOR
HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PLAN PHASE 1 CONSTRUCTION
MANAGEMENT, UTILITY RELOCATIONS, AND PARKING
RELOCATIONS,
MULTI-PURPOSE PAVILION,
ATHENA CLASSROOM RENOVATION PHASE 2,
PRUITT FIELD & TRACK REPLACEMENT,
BROWN HALL ELECTRICAL & LIFE SAFETY UPGRADE,
NORTH PARKING LOT EXPANSION LANCASTER CAMPUS,
SHOEMAKER ROOF REPLACEMENT, CHILlicoTHE CAMPUS, and
CAMBRIDGE CLASSROOM CENTER

RESOLUTION 2013 -- 3327

WHEREAS, eight capital projects have been planned, developed and funded as follows:
- Housing Development Plan Phase 1 Construction Management, Utility Relocations, and Parking Relocations with a total project budget of $20 million to be funded from Residential Housing Reserves and FY2013 Bond Issuance, and
  - Multi-Purpose Pavilion with a total project budget of $12.5 million to be funded from University debt and gifts, and
  - Athena Classroom Renovation Phase 2 with a total project budget of $610,000 to be funded from University Reserves, and
  - Pruitt Field & Track Replacement with a total project budget of $1.75 million to be funded from State Appropriations, and
  - Brown Hall Electrical & Life Safety Upgrade with a total project budget of $900,000 to be funded from Residential Housing Reserves, and
  - North Parking Lot Expansion Lancaster Campus with a total project budget of $935,000 to be funded by $223,000 from state appropriations, $103,000 from OU Lancaster Reserves, and $609,000 from Regional Higher Education Reserves, and
  - Shoemaker Roof Replacement Chillicothe Campus with a total project budget of $620,000 to be funded from State Appropriations, and
  - Cambridge Classroom Center a total project budget of $700,000 to be funded from Regional Higher Education Reserves.
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.

C. DAVID SNYDER STUDENT COLLABORATION ROOM

RESOLUTION 2013 – 3328

WHEREAS, C. David Snyder has been a loyal alumnus to Ohio University, sharing his time and expertise in service on the Ohio University Board of Trustees 1999-2008 and The Ohio University Foundation Board 1998-2004, and generously giving to The Ohio University Foundation, and

WHEREAS, C. David Snyder has encouraged and promoted Ohio University’s ability to provide a transformational learning experience to its students and to serve as a catalyst for economic development in the Southeastern Ohio region, and

WHEREAS, C. David Snyder has agreed that his naming gift, previously designated in resolution 2000-1732, be more closely associated with student academic and research activities on campus.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic and Research Center student organization meeting room, Room 112, on the Ohio University Athens Campus shall be named the C. David Snyder Student Collaboration Room in his honor.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE GIFT OF REAL PROPERTIES TO SUPPORT THE OHIO UNIVERSITY SOUTHERN Campbell - PROCTORVILLE CENTER

RESOLUTION 2013 - 3329

WHEREAS, Ohio University Southern – Proctorville Center seeks to expand academic offerings in the area of Recreation and Sports Studies, and serve the recreational needs of students and community members, and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Ohio Revised Code, 3337.10, 3337.11, 3337.13, 3345.11 and other relevant statutory provisions, the Ohio University Board of Trustees is authorized to do all things necessary for the continuous and successful operation of the Regional campuses, and
WHEREAS, Ohio University has assembled a representative team of university leaders and staff which has performed a review of the sites near the Proctorville Center, and

WHEREAS, the team, through their site visits and parallel due diligence reviews of the sites offered as gifts from the Lawrence County Commissioners (19 lots), and individual Kathy Kratzenberg (1 lot), recommend to accept these real properties as additions to the Proctorville Center (See Attachment A).

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby authorize the President or his designee to proceed with the acceptance and transaction of the properties listed in Attachment A for the benefit of the Ohio University Southern Campus – Proctorville Center.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the President or his designee shall have the authority and power to negotiate, exchange, mortgage, buy, sell, deal with all real and any personal or tangible personal property associated with the aforementioned sites, to accept conveyance, record and transact funds for the completion of the gift, transfer and final disposition of the real and personal property attributed to the aforementioned sites.

FACULTY FELLOWSHIP AWARDS
RESOLUTION 2013 -- 3330

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

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the attached University Faculty Fellowships for 2013-2014 be approved, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Vice President and Provost can approve changes in the conditions of the fellowships but not the total number of fellowships granted for the academic year.

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE EMERITUS/EMERITA AWARDS
RESOLUTION 2013 -- 3331

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 these individuals upon their retirement.

VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH AND CREATIVITY

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE

CENTER FOR PUBLIC AND SOCIAL INNOVATION

RESOLUTION 2013 -- 3332

WHEREAS, the multidisciplinary academic mission of the Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs at Ohio University is to promote the application of research and knowledge to problem-solving and strategic solutions on a regional, state, national and increasingly global basis, and to serve as a model for innovation and leadership curriculum development and impact learning; and

WHEREAS, the establishment of this Center will put Ohio University in “a position to lead the emerging field of public/private social engagement and educate the next generation to bridge multiple sectors and develop innovative solutions to wickedly complex social problems,” according to Dr. Laurel McFarland, Executive Director of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration; and

WHEREAS, the Center for Public and Social Innovation (CPSI) will build on existing Voinovich School strengths, resources and collaborations to establish a multidisciplinary partnership for public and social innovation education, research, social investments and practice at Ohio University; and

WHEREAS, the proposed center has the support of the Director of the Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs, The Vice President for Research and Creative Activity, and the Executive Vice President and Provost.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a new center be established within the Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs, to be called the Center for Public and Social Innovation.

KENNEDY MUSEUM OF ART ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER

RESOLUTION 2013 -- 3333

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 Interim 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 appointment to the Advisory Board which will bring the number of members currently serving to eight members:

Three-Year Term
Bill Bias Nursing home consultant, Athens County Treasurer
Ohio University alumnus

MEETING DATES FOR SUCCEEDING YEAR

DESIGNATION OF STATED MEETING DATES FOR YEARS BEGINNING JULY 1, 2013 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2014

RESOLUTION 2013 -- 3334

RESOLVED that the following dates be designated the stated meeting dates for the year beginning July 1, 2013, and ending June 30, 2014.

August 29, 2013 (Meeting)           COMMENCEMENT
August 30, 2013 (Retreat)           May 10, 2014 - OUCOM
                                      May 2, 2014 - Graduate
October 31-November 1st, 2013       May 3, 2014 - Undergraduate

January 23-24, 2014

March 13-14, 2014

June 26-27, 2014 (Eastern Campus)

RESOLVED further that, if conditions dictate, the Executive Committee be authorized to change the date of the stated meetings.

COMMUNICATIONS, PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Student Senate Officers
President McDavis announced that Student Senate elections for the upcoming year had been held the previous day. He thanked outgoing Student Senate President Zach George for his service and introduced the winners of Thursday’s election: Nick Southall, president-elect; Anna Morton, vice
president-elect; and Austin LaForest, treasurer-elect. President McDavis asked Student Senate’s
current and incoming officers to stand and be recognized. He thanked each of them for what they
have done and what they will do in the future and noted that he wanted to state publicly that he
greatly respects what student senators do on campus.

Student Trustee Allison Arnold expressed that today’s meeting made clear the challenges student
leaders face. She commented that it’s important to recognize that student leaders represent their
peers who are their constituents. She stated that she was shaken by the student protests that
occurred earlier in the meeting and that she respects and cares about those students and that she
recognizes their passion. She added that she wanted everyone attending today’s meeting to know
that what the student protesters did today they did out of love and concern for Ohio University
and its students.

New Student Trustee
President McDavis introduced and welcomed Keith Wilbur, the Board’s incoming Student
Trustee. President McDavis noted that Mr. Wilbur is a member of the Marching 110 and serves
on Student Senate.

Certificates of Appreciation

Allison Arnold
President McDavis asked Student Trustee Allison Arnold to come forward and presented her
with a Certificate of Appreciation in recognition of her special service as a Student Trustee from
May 14, 2011, to May 13, 2013. President McDavis noted that Student Trustee Arnold was
appointed to the Board by Gov. John Kasich and that she came to the Board full of enthusiasm
and excitement. He described her as a dedicated and committed trustee and a staunch advocate of
students.

Chair Gene Harris
President McDavis announced the presentation of a Certificate of Appreciation to Chair Gene
Harris for her service to the Board as a trustee from 2004-2013 and as Board Chair from 2012-
2013. President McDavis noted that voting trustees make a nine-year committee to this
governing body and that Chair Harris served tirelessly and represented her constituents in a first-
class manner. He also took the opportunity to thank all of the trustees for their service.

Trustee Goodman noted that the Board looks to its student trustees to keep it informed of things
occurring on campus. He also noted that student trustees, who are not excluded from anything
happening on the Board, have obligations to their constituents, who include the citizens of this
state and the governors who appoint them. Trustee Goodman noted his appreciation for how
Student Trustees Roden and Arnold have treated that obligation and stated that he hoped
incoming Student Trustee Wilbur recognizes that the important roles and responsibilities of Ohio
University’s student trustees.
ADJOURNMENT
Vice Chair Anderson adjourned the meeting at 12:19 p.m.
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Strategic Priorities

Nation’s Best Transformative Learning Community

1. Inspired teaching and research
2. Innovative academic programs
3. Exemplary student support services
4. Integrative co-curricular activities

Four Fundamentals

1. Inspired teaching and research dedicated to students’ academic success and focused on the connections between student learning and the advancement of knowledge and creative activity
2. Innovative academic programs that draw on the best traditions and practices in liberal arts, professional, and interdisciplinary education
3. Exemplary student support services committed to helping students fulfill their academic promise
4. Integrative co-curricular activities that foster a diverse environment of respect and inclusivity and facilitate students’ development as citizens and leaders

The best student-centered learning experience in America
Office of the President
The Interlink Alliance

• On April 2nd, The Interlink Alliance members gathered at the University of Maryland Baltimore County for a roundtable discussion on "African American Males in Higher Education"

• Members discussed potential federal and state policies that could help to better prepare African American males to be competitive and successful in an educated and diverse workforce

• This conference supports the Alliance’s efforts to recruit, retain, and encourage talented individuals to achieve their full potential for the betterment of community and society
Behavior Reduction

Over the past six years, Ohio University has seen a consistent reduction in high risk drinking behavior by 15 percent, according to a 2013 survey conducted by the Division of Student Affairs.

Among the survey's findings:

- Binge drinking dropped 7% from 2011
- 53% of students have five or fewer drinks per week
- 14% of students choose not to drink
- 70% of students do not use tobacco products
- 99% of students are aware of the alcohol and drug judicial policies
The Promise Lives Capital Campaign

Total Attainment: $419.5 M

- Alumni: $223.54
- Other Individuals: $18.57
- Corporations: $9.38
- Foundations: $149.52
- Other Organizations: $18.47

*Current as of March 21, 2013

* In millions
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OHIO UNIVERSITY
The Promise Lives
Capital Campaign

Advancement Travel
Columbus, OH
Ironton, OH
New York City, NY
Cleveland, OH
Chicago, IL
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Ohio University
Points of Pride

Bob Boldon was named head coach of the OHIO Women’s Basketball Program

Photograph courtesy of OHIO Athletics
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Points of Pride

Ohio University's Master of Fine Arts in Ceramics was ranked fifth in the nation by U.S. News & World Report

Photograph courtesy of University Communications & Marketing
Points of Pride

Ohio University honored eight entrepreneurs during its first annual Innovation Awards Gala

Photograph courtesy of Gregory Bodwell
Points of Pride

Ohio University’s first “Women of Vision” award was given in honor of the late OU-Lancaster professor Dr. Jane Johnsen at the Celebrate Women event in Pickerington

Photograph courtesy of Emily Martin
Points of Pride

2012 Distinguished Professor John Kopchick entertained and educated during the 2013 Distinguished Professor Lecture and Portrait Unveiling in Athens

Photograph courtesy of Ben Siegel
Points of Pride

- OHIO Men’s Basketball was selected to play in the National Invitation Tournament (NIT)
- D.J. Cooper was named MAC Player of the Year
- D.J. named to All-MAC first team, Reggie Keely and Walter Offutt named to All-MAC third team

Photograph courtesy of OHIO Athletics
Points of Pride

Ohio University partnered with Afghanistan to share engineering information and resources as the country rebuilds its infrastructure.

Photograph courtesy of Russ College of Engineering
University Spotlight
Office of Nationally Competitive Awards
Dr. Jeremy W. Webster
Dean, Honors Tutorial College
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Joint Academics and Resources Committee Meeting  
April 18, 2013, 9:30 am

Board Vice Chair Sandra Anderson called the meeting to order at 8:30 am. Other Board members present were Kevin B. Lake, Henry Heilbrunn, David A. Wolfort, David Brightbill, N. Victor Goodman, J. Patrick Campbell, Janetta King, and David Scholl, Student Trustees Allison Arnold and Amanda Roden, and Alumni Association Representative Bill Hilyard. Also in attendance were Faculty Representatives David Thomas and Judith Lee, President Roderick J. McDavis and Board Secretary Peter C. Mather.

FY 2014 Operating Budget

Vice President Steve Golding presented FY 2014 operating budget information. The budget update was broken down into the following items: guiding principles, extensive planning, key University initiatives, FY 2013-14 budget challenges, FY 2013-14 budget sources and uses, $100 million institutional investments update, and proposed FY 2013-14 tuition and fee increases.

Vice President Golding discussed guiding principles for the FY 2014 operating budget, which include sustaining academic excellence, maintaining affordability, focusing on strategic priorities, attending to the needs of the University’s workforce, addressing critical infrastructure needs, and contributing to the well-being of our region and state.

The extensive planning process is a comprehensive environmental scan, which will inform the planning process around key University initiatives, including enrollment, the six-year capital plan, residential housing, the total compensation plan, sources and uses, and debt management.

VP Golding expressed the importance of the extensive planning process as it aids in attaining overarching University strategic priorities, including effective total compensation, the University’s capital improvement plan, its residential housing development plan, tuition affordability and financial aid, the service alignment initiative, responsibility centered management, and strengthening the University balance sheet.

VP Golding mentioned that this year’s operating budget will, for the first time, be presented in a Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) model. He also indicated that he will meet with bonding agencies in the near future to discuss the University’s credit status.

VP Golding displayed three graphs in the following order: FY 2013-14 Budget Challenges for Faculty Compensation; FY 2013-14 Budget Challenges for Healthcare; and FY 2013-14 Budget Challenges for Capital Improvements.

VP Golding noted that we have lost ground on faculty compensation relative to our IUC peers, going from the 75th percentile in 2008-2009 to our current position, which is the 25th percentile.
Mr. Golding recently met with Deans to discuss the healthcare costs in the context of the Affordable Care Act. He also noted that there will be a request for $120 million in debt for deferred maintenance costs. He highlighted the following capital projects: Baker Center Phase II, Lausche Power Plant Project, Tupper Hall, Lindley Hall, McCracken Hall, Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine, deferred maintenance and residential housing. He discussed some challenges with renovating Lindley, noting that there are serious financial consequences due to ADA requirements. He discussed the H-COM and McCracken commitments as well.

VP Golding pointed out that the Board had previously heard about the University’s plans for more strategic and aggressive scholarship approaches. He displayed a graph representing the FY 2013-14 budget challenges for scholarships and the probability of enrollment as a function of an average institutional grant. He noted that the Student Scholarship Task Force recommends the implementation of a more sophisticated and strategic scholarship program that will allow the University to maintain commitments to affordability, maximize net tuition and still remain competitive.

Vice Chair Anderson asked for more information pertaining to the chart, which illustrates the probability of enrollment. Executive Vice President and Provost Pam Benoit indicated that this shows a strategic approach involving complex factors into the scholarship plan. The preliminary analyses provided insight into future scholarship program needs. Students are price sensitive, but we do very well considering that and in comparison to other schools due to the strong academic reputation of Ohio University. Competitive pressures and a locked scholarship model do not allow us to be flexible enough to meet students on a student-by-student basis and make individual adjustments to meet enrollment goals. Students may be opting out of even applying to Ohio University for fear that there is not enough financial aid when looking at our current awarding structure. Targeted scholarship enhancements ranging from $1,000 - $3,500 above current scholarship awards can make a large difference in our student yields.

VP Golding stated that scholarships are a major priority in The Promise Lives: Capital Campaign. The campaign is investing $100 million into a Matching Scholarship Program. VP Golding explained that $25.4 million in matching funds will be spread out through the seven years for scholarships. The largest portion of the $100 million investment is the $75 in scholarship funds. Those funds are expected to increase accessibility and academic quality, improve our ability to retain and recruit students, leverage external fundraising revenues through fundraising opportunities, and improve our financial strength by growing the endowment. The program design is still in the development stage.

In response to a question posed by Trustee Heilbrunn on the effect on retention and graduation, Provost Benoit pointed out that this will be somewhat dependent on guaranteed tuition, which is expected to help our retention numbers.
Committee Chair David Wolfort called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm. Other board members present included Trustee David Scholl, Trustee Kevin B. Lake, Trustee Henry Heilbrunn, Student Trustee Allison Arnold, Faculty Representative Judith Lee, and President Roderick J. McDavis.

Vice President for Finance and Administration, Stephen Golding, reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

- **Consent Agenda, RCM and Ohio Service Alignment Initiative (OSAI)**

VP Golding reminded that representatives from Huron have presented to the board in the past regarding both RCM and the Service Alignment Initiative. VP Golding introduced Julie Allison, University Controller, who is serving a 2 year assignment as the OSAI project lead. Ms. Allison described how the project has progressed, its alignment with the University’s Strategic Priorities, and the critical and foundational nature of the project in building the information infrastructure necessary to support RCM and the academic units.

A large investment is being requested to overcome a decade of neglect pertaining to the university’s administrative systems and provide the administrative support to the academic units as they embark on RCM. The OSAI will deal with aligning the centrally provided academic support functions of HR, IT, Facilities and Finance with the needs of the academic units to avoid them creating duplicative administrative functions of their own.

Huron assessments of the academic support units and the administrative systems which support those functions resulted in 200+ recommendations. First, Ms. Allison emphasized the need for a Project Management Office (PMO) to ensure success for a project of this scope and duration. Secondly, technology and upgrading the current Oracle system to version 12 (R12) are large components of OSAI. Vendor support for the Oracle ERP, which has been in place since 2001, is scheduled to expire in 2014. The project to upgrade to R12 has been studied and determined to be the optimal solution to maintain support, provide enhanced capabilities, and enable evaluation of PeopleAdmin and Workforce as well as 70+ other third party applications systems that currently interface with Oracle. Third, modernizations of financial and data reporting and the university’s business processes are required to support our academic units efficiently and cost effectively.

The total ‘worst-case’ project cost estimate for the OSAI project is $28.1 million spread over 6 years. Gaining efficiencies and reinvesting the savings and redeploying the human resources back into the central administration operation are goals of the project. The commitment that has
been made is that the ‘administrative center’ will be squeezed to reprioritize resources and cover costs for the project. The six year time horizon is to allow the projects to be taken in reasonable chunks so that the resources and available personnel can accomplish the goals. As a responsive business support environment is built centrally, the academic units should be able to ‘avoid’ costs of duplicating those services in their own units. Through partnering with the academic units and addressing their priority needs first, it is hoped those units will have confidence in the center’s ability to deliver. The total cost of $28.1 million includes costs of training the campus community and VP Golding committed to reallocation of administrative resources as the prime funding mechanism over the six years.

Yesterday in their meeting, the campus IT Governance Council, the primary IT oversight body on campus, recommended that going forward with this project makes OU an ‘Oracle shop’. That provides direction and stability for the foreseeable future regarding the systems operating platform.

What kinds of savings are projected for the project?

How does this compare to and what were the lessons learned from SIS? What are the “personnel bandwidths” and are they sufficient to accomplish a project of this scope? Ms. Allison commented that the structure for this project was modeled after the SIS project. There will be backfill for some of the impacted operations positions so that the human capital is not overburdened. The other lesson learned by both the SIS project and OSAI, through looking back to the 2001 Oracle ERP implementation, is that an investment in continuing operations is required, past the ‘go live’ date, to maintain the systems and exploit additional functionality.

How will consultant costs be controlled? This is a different consulting group then was used on the SIS project – we have partnered with a group experienced in the Oracle R12 conversion. The use of consultants is necessary for certain aspects, but the desire is that the university administration owns the processes that will result. Training up of our staff is a priority to make sure that when the consultants are finished, the University is capable of supporting the system and that there is redundancy in our knowledge base.

Have software and hardware costs been fully considered toward the most efficient solutions? Third party systems are being mapped to Oracle solutions to determine if the fit is appropriate and at what cost. Business processes may need altered to fit the software solutions that are most practical and easily integrated. Hardware costs to upgrade to R12 have been incorporated into the budget that was shared.

How stable is the leadership to support this initiative? The Senior Associate VP search is ongoing and the successful candidate will be a partner with Ms. Allison and IT to achieve the OSAI initiative. The SAVP will also have the requisite skill set to succeed VP Golding. Following the hiring of the new SAVP, a search will commence for a Foundation CFO to cover the growing needs of the Foundation.

The trustees thanked Ms. Allison for an excellent presentation.
● Resolution, FY14 Fees Approval

VP Golding reminded that the details of the four fees resolutions attached for board approval were discussed during the morning’s Joint Session.

The non-resident surcharge has not been increased in the recent past. For FY2014, a 0% increase is recommended, but increasing non-resident surcharge is being explored in relation to the increase in non-resident enrollments.

An amendment to the resolution on page A.2 to the fifth WHEREAS is necessary to correct the upper division instructional fee increase from 1% to 0.8%. Secretary Mather will have the new resolution for tomorrow’s full board meeting.

The committee recommended moving the four tuition and fee resolutions to the full Board for approval. Dave Scholl moved; KB Lake provided the second; unanimously approved.

● Six Year Capital Improvement Planning (CIP) Update

VP Golding provided a recap of the discussion from the Joint Session regarding the effort to decrease the 6 Year CIP and the amount of debt required. The 7% debt service to operations plateau has been hit due to the university’s stance of front-loading debt service early in the repayment. The leadership went through an iterative process following the discussions at the last board meeting to prioritize the 6 Year CIP projects and show a side-by-side CIP version reflecting $200+ million less in total projects requiring debt. Today’s discussion with the board resulted in a request for further study of the projects to bring back into the 6 Year CIP and show the additional debt possible to stay within the ‘sweet spot’.

● Resolution, Series 2013 Debt Issuance

VP Golding introduced Beth Greene, Director of Debt Management, who described the Series 2013 Debt Issuance totaling $175 million. The issue will include $122 million for new projects, restructuring $15 million in Series 2001 bonds, and refinancing up to $38 million. Ms. Greene discussed the issue characteristics being investigated, listed the projects, and reported that the current interest rate would be approximately 3.89%. Impacts on the SB6 ratios have been projected for the Series 2013 issue, with and without the Lausche project, and it is expected that the composite ratio will be well over 4.0.

Outstanding debt levels are important to the rating agencies. An aggressive growth in debt and the resultant debt service to operations ratio can be viewed negatively. The same data points based on the additional debt investigation described in the 6 Year CIP update will be brought to the board in June. The committee cautioned that there are other considerations for factoring in more projects, including disruption to campus and stress on the project management and other staffs.
The debt service associated with the Series 2013 issue has been analyzed by impacted unit. The unit’s ability to pay and the sources for the debt service have been identified in budgets or pledged gift receipts. HCOM debt is being incurred to complete the project and the proceeds from the 15 year gift will service the debt.

The committee recommended moving the Series 2013 Debt Issuance resolution to the full Board for approval. KB Lake moved; Dave Scholl provided the second; unanimously approved.

- **Consent Agenda, Ridges Advisory Committee**

VP Golding advised on the original statute when the land was gifted to the university. The committee established by that statute performed its work and disbanded. A group of area officials met with the University leadership and the resolution included for action is a request to reestablish a committee to update the Ridges Master Plan.

- **Consent Agenda, Bid Limits**

VP Golding shared that due to construction reform there are new methods of handling construction projects. This resolution authorizes the President or his designee to comply with the current statute.

- **Consent Agenda, Construction Projects**

Associate Vice President Harry Wyatt discussed the eight projects being presented for board approval: Housing Development Plan Phase I Construction Management, Utility Relocations, and Material Purchases, Multi-Purpose Pavilion, Athena Classroom Renovation Phase 2, Pruitt Field and Track Replacement, Brown Hall Electrical & Life Safety Upgrade, North Parking Lot Expansion Lancaster Campus, Shoemaker Roof Replacement Chillicothe Campus, and Cambridge Classroom Center.

- **Consent Agenda, Snyder Naming**

VP Golding described the resolution providing for the naming of room 112 in the Academic and Research Center.

- **Consent Agenda, Proctorville Properties**

VP Golding discussed the land transactions for the Proctorville location – the parcels detailed in the resolution were originally to be gifted to the Foundation, but since the Proctorville site is University property, these parcels must be gifted to the University.

KB Lake made a motion to keep the six Resource Committee Consent resolutions on the Consent Agenda for Board approval; Dave Scholl provided a second; the Committee unanimously approved.

  - **Ohio Service Alignment Initiative**
• **Ridges Advisory Committee**
• **Bid Limits**
• **Construction Projects**
• **Snyder Naming**
• **Proctorville Properties**

**Annual HR Report**

VP Golding informed the committee that the Annual HR Report was included for their information. He emphasized that a significant Human Resource effort will be involved in the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. VP Golding also advised that following the COMP2014 project, more refined employee breakdowns for administrators, specifically those that are in academic units, will be available.

**Capital Campaign Update**

Vice President for Advancement, Bryan Benchoff, provided an update for the Capital Campaign noting campaign contributions totaling $419.5 million toward the $450 million goal as of March 21, 2013 with today’s total at nearly $420 million. VP Benchoff pointed out that the Planned Proposals value continues at a fairly constant $18 - $20 million, reflecting that as proposals are successfully transitioned to pledged gifts, new proposals are taking their place so the campaign continues to grow. College campaign attainment, the sources of gifts, and the areas supported by the gifts were reviewed.

VP Benchoff discussed the 2012 Foundation Annual Report. This is the first Foundation Annual report in several years and will be arriving in trustee’s mailboxes shortly.

VP Benchoff described *The Promise Within* campaign targeting university faculty and staff. Educating employees about private support, increasing employee participation, and creating a campus culture of philanthropy are all objectives of the campaign. This phase of the campaign was launched in March, 2013. VP Benchoff shared his enthusiasm over the faculty and staff history of giving and percentage participation.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.
The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m. by Trustee David Brightbill, committee chair.

Attendance:
   David Brightbill, committee chair
   J. Patrick Campbell, national trustee
   N. Victor Goodman, trustee
   William Hilyard, alumni representative
   Janetta King, trustee
   Amanda Roden, student trustee
   David Thomas, faculty representative
   Sandra J. Anderson, vice chair

Academic Quality-Dashboard: Scripps College of Communication
Scott Titsworth, Dean of the Scripps College of Communication, informed the committee of the college’s structure, historic reputation, and its current achievements and accolades.

In 2010, the Ohio Board of Regents named the Scripps College a Center of Excellence in Societal and Cultural Transformation. The college was the only communication program highlighted as a Center of Excellence in the State.

First-year students in the college have average ACT scores that are over three points higher than the average among four-year public institutions in the state and have a retention rate of 89% (comparable to institutions such as Tulane, Syracuse, and Virginia Tech). The Scripps College’s 84% six-year graduation rate is higher than that of Ohio State, Syracuse, and other well-known institutions. The number of degrees granted has increased over time. Over 850 degrees (undergraduate, masters, and doctoral) were granted in 2011. Also in 2011, the college saw an increase in the number of diverse and out-of-state students, and the percent of students employed after graduation.

The presentation highlighted the college’s schools and their accomplishments and attributes with particular emphasis on the E.W. Scripps School of Journalism and its accreditation; the college’s efforts to define more robust instruments for assessing student success; and the emphasis on four five-year priorities designed to enhance the college’s success and its strategic position
internationally.

The college will partially occupy space in the Schoonover Center this coming fall. As it moves to this state-of-the-art facility, the college will modernize its curriculum to take advantage of the new classrooms and laboratories.

The college’s current fund-raising goals are close to being met. Dean Titsworth announced that Larry Patrick, a Scripps alumnus, will provide a $2 million dollar gift to support the Schoonover Center; a graduate student fellows program; and partial support to elevate the Joseph Berman Professorship.

Two graduating Scripps seniors, Trevor Tomlinson and Allison Jordan, shared their internship experiences. Ms. Jordan said that her internships were obtained through alumni contacts and noted that she has received very valuable and effective mentoring from college faculty. Mr. Tomlinson described his interest in the ITS program which led him to apply to Ohio University, the alumni network that facilitated his internships and his current employment, as well as the mentorship that he received.

**High Risk Drinking Update:**
Vice President for Student Affairs, Ryan Lombardi, provided an update on the programs and policies that have been implemented to combat high-risk drinking. While the rate of high-risk drinking at Ohio is above the national average, the university has experienced a 15% decline in this behavior since 2007. In addition, Student Affairs has seen a decrease in the “college effect” (students exhibiting an increase in high-risk drinking after entering college). Measures will continue to be implemented to address this important concern.

**Standing Reports and Updates:**

**OIT Academic Update**
Chief Information Officer, Brice Bible, and Sam Girton, Interim Director of Academic Technologies and Associate Professor in the School of Visual Communication, reported that Academic Technologies (AT) staff are working one-on-one with faculty to meet teaching/learning objectives through the incorporation of new technologies.

A video presentation outlined the flipped classroom concept. This teaching concept moves lectures online and uses classroom time to apply the concepts presented in the lecture. This approach allows for more classroom discussion and team projects as well as one-on-one instruction. Associate Professor Girton indicated that flipped classrooms are labor intensive for faculty but that resources exist at Ohio University to help interested instructors produce effective results. He also noted that some faculty are using a modified form of the flipped classroom by putting classroom lectures online so students can view the lecture as many times as necessary.

Upcoming AT activities include collaborating with the Executive Vice President and Provost, faculty, and others to develop a strategic plan; partnering with colleges to develop innovative academic practices; and recruiting and hiring a national AT leader to fill the temporary position currently held by Associate Professor Girton.
Academic Quality Initiatives

Faculty Workload
Executive Vice President and Provost (EVPP), Pam Benoit, provided a brief overview of the nature of faculty workload. EVPP Benoit pointed out that faculty workload does not consist only of time spent in the classroom. For the committee’s information, EVPP Benoit provided a document developed by the IUC Provost’s Group. This document outlines the many elements beyond the classroom that make up faculty workloads.

EVPP Benoit brought the document to the trustees’ attention as proposals have been made at the state level that would give boards of trustees the ability to modify faculty workload policies by requiring all full-time faculty members to teach one additional course in one of the next two academic years. She hoped that by sharing it with trustees that they would recognize that faculty already have significant workloads and that mandates to increase those workloads would be counterproductive.

Faculty Compensation Update
EVPP Benoit provided the Faculty Compensation Task Force membership, charge, discussion questions, and data sets. She noted that benefits will be included in compensation discussions as well as an examination of how the Affordable Care Act will impact university health care costs. This project will require additional research, review, and study. A final report is not expected to be ready until after the end of spring semester.

General Education Reform Update
Robert Frank, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and co-chair of the New General Education Task Force provided the update. The task force is beginning its work with the 2012 report from the 1804 General Education Task Force. Dean Frank discussed the task force’s membership and goals, along with a brief overview of how Ohio University’s approach fits into common ways of providing general education. Dean Frank also presented the guiding principles developed by the 1804 General Education Task Force and a projected timeline for developing and implementing a new general education curriculum. In doing so, he noted that given the magnitude of the task, the timeline might be optimistic.

Regional Academic Program Reviews – February Follow-up
EVPP Benoit presented an action plan, developed by Executive Dean of Regional Campuses, Jim Fonseca, Dean of the Chillicothe Campus, Marty Tuck and others, in response to a request by the Academics Committee to address the committee’s concerns regarding student learning outcomes at regional campuses. A timetable for developing student learning outcomes assessment procedures for degrees offered at Ohio University’s regional campuses has been developed. Information was provided about the criteria to be used for measuring teaching and learning, which included quality, resources, support, evaluation and improvement.

AQIP Update
Michael Williford, Associate Provost for Institutional Accreditation, described Ohio University’s
accreditation process under the Higher Learning Commission’s Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP). Associate Provost Williford reported that preparation for Ohio University’s reaffirmation of accreditation in 2015-16 is underway. Key changes to AQIP include revisions to processes and criteria for accreditation. Associate Provost Williford’s presentation included a general overview of the reaccreditation timeline along with AQIP accreditation criteria and core components. Updates will continue to be provided to the committee at future meetings.

Since trustees will be involved in some way during the reaccreditation process, Trustee Brightbill noted that online information needs to be provided so the trustees can prepare.

Search Updates
Hires
Dr. Margaret Kennedy-Kygas, Dean of the College of Fine Arts
Start date: May 20, 2013

Dean & Executive Searches
Regional Campuses:
   Executive Dean for Regional Higher Education
   Dean, Ohio University-Eastern
   Dean, Ohio University-Zanesville
Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost:
   Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion
   Associate Provost for Faculty and Academic Planning
   Vice Provost for Global Affairs
   Associate Provost for Institutional Research and Effectiveness

Student Senate Tuition Survey
Student Senate President, Mr. Zach George, discussed a survey of approximately 20% of the student population regarding tuition issues. The breadth of survey responders reflected the broader student population. He asked the trustees to consider the survey as they deliberate tuition increases.

Consent Items

Faculty Fellowship Awards – moved forward to full Board
Emerita/Emeritus Awards – moved forward to full Board
Voinovich School Center for Public and Social Innovation – moved forward to full Board
Kennedy Museum of Art Advisory Board Member – moved forward to full Board

The meeting was adjourned at 3:49 pm by Trustee Brightbill.
Governance Committee  
Ohio University, Athens Campus 
Margaret M. Walter Hall, Room 125 
4:00 p.m. – Thursday, April 18, 2013 

In attendance were Chair Janetta King, Trustees Goodman, Wolfort, Heilbrunn, Student Trustee Arnold, Secretary to the Board Peter Mather and General Counsel John Biancamano.

Chair King called the meeting to order at 4:15.

1. **Amendments to Bylaws**

   The Committee reviewed proposed amendments to the Board Bylaws dealing with vacancies in officer positions, quorum and voting. Trustee Goodman made a motion to recommend adoption of the amended bylaws. Trustee Wolfort seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

2. **Meeting Dates for 2014**

   The Committee reviewed the Board meeting calendar for 2013–14. The Committee agreed to recommend the calendar to the full Board.

3. **Nomination of National Trustee**

   Chair King discussed the process for selecting a national trustee. Previously, an email was sent to the Trustees asking for recommendations for this position. Recommendations were also solicited from members of the university community. The recommendations received will be discussed by the full Board at the Executive Committee meeting.

4. **Nomination of Chair and Vice Chair**

   Trustee Wolfort made a motion to nominate Trustee Anderson for the position of Board Chair for the coming year. Trustee Goodman seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

   Trustee Goodman made a motion to nominate Trustee Brightbill for the position of Vice Chair. Trustee Wolfort seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

The Committee adjourned at 4:25.
Trustee Kevin Lake, called the meeting to order at 4:15 p.m. Other committee members present were Trustee David Brightbill, Trustee Dave Scholl, National Trustee J. Patrick Campbell and Student Trustee Amanda Roden. President Roderick McDavis and Trustee Sandra Anderson were also present.

**University Risk Management Initiative Update**

Joe Adams, Associate Vice President, Risk Management and Safety, and Jeffrey Davis, Chief Audit Executive, presented an update of the university risk management initiative. Mr. Adams’ presentation included a description of enterprise risk management and the progress on the implementation plan since his previous presentation to the Audit Committee in April 2012. Mr. Adams discussed the Heat Map which was developed by the University Risk Council in conjunction with the external consultant, Bickmore Risk Services (BRS). The current status of the identified risks and remediation process was described by Mr. Adams. Mr. Davis presented on the role of the Internal Audit Office in the risk management process and addressing these risks in future audits. Trustees discussed the risk review process on campus related to specific incidents.

**Plante and Moran Upcoming FY13 Audit**

Plante and Moran, the external auditor, made a presentation to the Board on the upcoming FY13 Audit. Robert Shenton and Keith Martinez of Plante and Moran discussed material related to the engagement team, reports/letters to be issued and the responsibilities of both Plante and Moran and the University. Timing and key dates for the FY13 audit were also presented to the committee. Discussion ensued regarding which individuals within the University and the Board of Trustees should sign the audit engagement letter.

**Internal Audit Update**

Chief Audit Executive, Jeffrey Davis, provided an update on the Internal Audit Office operations which included:

- Audit Status Update
- FY13 Audit Schedule
- Ongoing Management Initiatives
  - Service Alignment Initiative
  - Oracle R12 Assessment
- GASB 68
Mr. Davis updated the Audit Committee on the completed audits for FY13 which included final reports being issued for eight audits and two follow-up audits. In addition, Internal Audit (IA) is currently working on audits of E-Learning Ohio Graduate College.

Mr. Davis discussed Ongoing Management Initiatives at the University which included the Service Alignment Initiative and the Oracle R12 Assessment. The Service Alignment Initiative relates to the University movement to a new budgeting model called Responsibility Centered Management (RCM). The Oracle R12 Assessment involves the upgrade of the Oracle E-Business Suite (EBS) used by the University. Internal Audit has been involved in the Ongoing Management Initiatives through attending Oracle EBS R12 meetings, participating in the RFP process and receiving/reviewing Service Alignment Initiative documents. IA will continue to be available as a resource.

The Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement Number 68, Accounting and Financial Reporting for Pensions (GASB 68) will be effective for financial statements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2015. The University will be required to recognize the unfunded pension benefit obligation as a liability for the first time and to more comprehensively and comparably measure the annuals costs of pension benefits. Discussion ensued regarding eligibility requirements, contributions/funding, and Senate Bill 6 Ratios.

There was no unfinished business.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.
Executive Committee
Ohio University Inn – Wilson Room
April 19, 2013

In attendance: Vice Chair Sandra Anderson, Trustees David Brightbill, David Wolfort, Janetta King, N. Victor Goodman, , Kevin B. Lake, David Scholl; National Trustees Henry Heilbrunn and Patrick Campbell, Student Trustees Allison Arnold and Amanda Roden, and Alumni Association Representative Bill Hilyard. Also present were President Roderick J. McDavis and Board Secretary Peter Mather.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Anderson at 7:38am

- National Trustee Discussion

  Trustee King led a discussion on National Trustee appointment progress. Prospects names were solicited from Trustees, President’s Council, and Deans. This list was cut to five for consideration by the whole Board. President McDavis discussed each of the candidates, and declared it a strong pool.

  The Board identified a short list for the President to speak with about their interest, with the goal of electing a new National Trustee at the June Board meeting.

- Peggy Pruitt letter

  Director Jim Schaus received a letter from former Senior Associate Athletic Director, Dr. Peggy Pruitt expressing concern about staffing of coaching positions. The President reported that AD Schaus has responded to Dr. Pruitt in writing. The President provided more context on the search for the women’s basketball coach.

  Chair Anderson asked President McDavis to respond to Dr. Pruitt, acknowledging that the Board has addressed this and is sensitive to her concerns.

- Student Trustee Voting Rights

  John Biancamano gave an update on the legislative process for student trustee voting rights. Mr. Biancamano discussed implications for student trustee involvement given ethics rules. He noted that there are still questions about specific applications, but he noted there are some clear issues related to prohibition with receiving gifts, etc. If the bill passes, it would be important to go to the Ethics Commission to explore implementation.
Mr. Biancamano noted that questions such as student employment and scholarship eligibility are among the questions that will need to be explored.

- Ethics Commission Filing

Trustee King reminded Trustees that the Ethics Commission’s filings are due on May 15th.

- Executive Session

Secretary Mather called the role to enter executive session for a collective bargaining unit discussion, pursuant to the provisions of R.C. 121.22 (G) (4) and for a personnel matter, pursuant to the provisions of R.C. 121.22 (G) (1) at 8:35am.

Secretary Mather called the role to exit executive session, and Vice Chair Anderson adjourned the meeting at 9:43am.
PRESIDENT’S REPORT

presented to Ohio University Board of Trustees

June 21, 2013
Overview

- Strategic Priorities & Core Values
- State Legislative Update
- Academic Quality Improvement Program Update
- The Promise Lives Capital Campaign Update
- Points of Pride
- Program Spotlight: Summer Institute for Diversity Education
Strategic Priorities

Four Fundamentals

1. Inspired teaching and research dedicated to students’ academic success and focused on the connections between student learning and the advancement of knowledge and creative activity.

2. Innovative academic programs that draw on the best traditions and practices in liberal arts, professional, and interdisciplinary education.

3. Exemplary student support services committed to helping students fulfill their academic promise.

4. Integrative co-curricular activities that foster a diverse environment of respect and inclusivity and facilitate students’ development as citizens and leaders.
• Excellence is our hallmark
  Outstanding people, ideas, and programs
  drive our educational mission.

• Integrity, civility, and diversity
define our community
  These values guide our leadership in a global society.

• Stewardship enhances our legacy
  As Ohio’s first institution of public higher education, we are mindful of our accountability to the public trust.
State Legislative Update

• The Senate Finance Committee introduced and accepted Substitute House Bill 59 (the state operating budget bill) on May 28th

• The amended bill includes:
  ✓ Ohio University’s guaranteed tuition plan
  ✓ A provision to update The Ridges Advisory Committee

• The bill removes:
  ✓ The provision that will allow out-of-state students to qualify for in-state tuition, if the university issues the student a letter and/or zero sum utility bill for the purposes of registering to vote
Governor John Kasich named Ohio University alumnus and former Ohio State Representative and State Senator John Carey as Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents
The Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) provides an alternative process for well-established institutions to maintain accreditation through the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

- Under the AQIP approach, Ohio University maintains continuous accreditation, which is reaffirmed every seven years.

- The AQIP process recently was discussed at the Higher Learning Commission Annual Conference on April 7th.
AQIP Update

• The university is set to undergo reaffirmation in 2015-16. This process will involve:
  
  – The preparation of a portfolio documenting the university's academic activities and outcomes
  
  – A comprehensive site visit to determine if the university is meeting the criteria for accreditation
  
  – Other university and Higher Learning Commission documents

• Associate Provost for Institutional Accreditation Michael Williford will oversee activities related to institutional accreditation
The Promise Lives
Capital Campaign

Total Attainment: $424.46 M

- Alumni: $223.54
- Other Individuals: $19.59
- Corporations: $13.02
- Foundations: $149.72
- Other Organizations: $18.59

* In millions

*Current as of May 30, 2013
The Promise Lives
Capital Campaign

Advancement Travel

- Columbus, OH
- Ironton, OH
- New York City, NY
- Cleveland, OH
- Chicago, IL
- Washington, D.C.

- St. Louis, MO
- San Francisco, CA
- Los Angeles, CA
- Charlotte, NC
- Cincinnati, OH
Points of Pride: Academic Achievement

More than 600 Ohio University students participated in the 11th annual Student Research and Creative Activity Expo in April.

Photograph courtesy of University Communications and Marketing
Points of Pride: Academic Achievement

Nearly 5,000 Bobcats became Ohio University alumni at OHIO’s 2013 undergraduate, graduate, and Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine’s commencement ceremonies.

Photograph courtesy of Samantha Owens
Points of Pride: Community Partnerships

More than 1,400 volunteers, including many Ohio University students, participated in Athens Beautification Day.

Photograph courtesy of Chris Franz

Nation’s Best Transformative Learning Community
Ohio University and community members raised more than $73,000 for charity at the O’Bleness Health System Race for a Reason.

Photograph courtesy of Samantha Owens
Points of Pride: Community Partnerships

International Week at Ohio University concluded with the International Street Fair

Photograph courtesy of UCM
Points of Pride: Athletic Accomplishments

OHIO runner Melissa Thompson shattered the school record in the 1,500-meter run at the MAC Outdoor Championships.

Photograph courtesy of OHIO Athletics
Points of Pride:
Athletic Accomplishments

The New York Giants drafted OHIO offensive lineman Eric Herman

Photograph courtesy of OHIO Athletics
Ohio University named Dr. Jenny Hall-Jones its new Dean of Students.
OHIO’s Jesse Adams was recognized as the 2012–13 National Student Employee of the Year by the National Association of College and University Food Services – the highest honor for students in the collegiate food services industry.

Photograph courtesy of Culinary Services
More than 150 alumni attended OHIO’s 30th Annual State Government Alumni Luncheon, honoring former Speaker Jo Ann Davidson and Adjunct Assistant Professor of Journalism Tom Suddes.
Points of Pride: New Horizons

The Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine was approved by the Commission on Osteopathic College Accreditation for a Northeast Ohio campus with Cleveland Clinic

Photograph courtesy of OU-HCOM
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: President McDavis and Board of Trustees

From: Pam Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost
      Stephen T. Golding, Vice President for Finance and Administration, CFO and Treasurer

Re: FY 2014 RCM Budget, Implementation, Preparedness and SAI

Overview of Joint Session Presentation

We are presenting for approval the FY’14 Ohio University budget, which will be the first University budget developed using Responsibility Centered Management (“RCM”) principles. This comprehensive, all-funds, transparent approach to budgeting will allow the Board of Trustees to better understand future financial performance, long-term planning efforts, and the decision-making processes used by the University and its academic planning units.

In addition to implementing RCM, the FY’14 budget reflects a clear set of institutional priorities tied to our 4x4 strategic planning grid:

- To ensure that Ohio University remains affordable and accessible to Ohio students and their families. To that end, we have limited our tuition increase to 1.6% versus the proposed legislatively authorized cap of 2.0%. In concert with the smaller tuition increase, the University implemented a new targeted financial aid initiative intended to help recruit students and facilitate attendance for those with documented financial need.
- To provide for a 2% salary increase for our faculty and staff and an additional 1% mid-year merit increase for faculty if the University achieves target enrollment goals based on new student matriculation and retention.
- To fund our debt service for the $120 million FY’13 debt issuance for high priority capital construction projects across the University.

Part of our presentation regarding the FY’14 budget will involve a review of the steps taken to prepare the University for RCM implementation. The review will focus on:

- Key differences between our historical incremental budget approach and the new RCM practices.
- The collaborative work that went into building the FY’14 operating budget.
- The importance of reengineering the University’s administrative business processes in order to ensure that they support the RCM needs in colleges and academic units.

Finally, time will be devoted to the FY’14 All Funds Budget Schedule (Exhibit A) that the trustees will be asked to adopt as a part of the FY’14 Budget Resolution. This All Funds Budget Schedule will form the basis of future budget reconciliations.
Preparing for an RCM Budgeting Approach—AY 2012-2013

The Board of Trustees most recently discussed RCM at the April 2012 meeting. Leadership from the Huron Consulting Group and from several universities that operate under an RCM system shared their experiences.

Our guests provided Board members with insights into the strengths and challenges of operating an institution of higher education through an RCM approach. Chief among their observations was that excellence must drive RCM, that a robust shared governance approach was a necessity, and that transparency in financial and operational activities must always be in place.

Aligning financial incentives and accountability with decision-making at the academic planning unit level is the primary principle of RCM. Colleges and other academic planning units are able to better understand and manage the internal economics of their activities, thereby becoming empowered to build academic excellence through sound resource decisions. One of RCM’s greatest strengths is that it encourages and rewards strategic planning and entrepreneurship.

According to the Huron representatives and our colleagues from other universities, university boards provide the same type of oversight in an RCM environment as in a traditional incremental budgeting environment. However, boards typically have greater opportunities to learn about institutional and college based priorities, academic planning processes and resource allocation patterns.

Over the past thirteen months, the University has laid the groundwork, which will enable its academic planning units to realize the benefits of an RCM system. We have focused on a number of key areas and now have strategies to ensure the institution is prepared to implement RCM post-July 1, 2013. Key areas of focus have included:

- **Governance Elements**
  - Devolution of Budgetary Authority Tied to Preservation of Academic Quality
  - Development and/or Incorporation of Shared Governance Elements to Monitor, Assess, and Address Academic Impact of RCM
- **Technology and Data**
  - Maintenance of Revenue & Expense Allocations
  - Analytical Support & Forecasting
  - Updated Chart-of-Accounts
- **Culture & Change Management**
  - Incentives and Rewards
- **Central Administration Services**
  - Service Levels Supporting Overhead Cost Allocation
  - Empowering Colleges for Success
  - Reengineering Administrative Business Processes
- **Skill Sets**
  - Analytical Support
  - College and University Financial Leadership
RCM Accomplishments To-Date

In preparing the FY’14 budget in an RCM format and laying the appropriate groundwork for RCM’s implementation, university faculty, staff, and leadership engaged in a number of projects. While the following is not an exhaustive list of the work performed, it provides an insight into the level of institutional effort required to move to a new planning and budgeting approach.

Stabilizing the Model

As a starting point, university leadership determined that an all-funds approach was appropriate for Ohio University. An all-funds approach presents gift, grant and endowment spending activity that has not previously been a part of the university budgeting process. This approach not only provides a more comprehensive view of the financial activity of our colleges, it better positions the university leadership to discuss the institution’s overall financial position with internal and external constituents.

Below is a summary of key allocation methodologies:

- State Subsidy: Will mirror the state subsidy methodology (degree completions, course completions, doctoral subsidy) and will be distributed to colleges on a three-year rolling average and the allocation will be guaranteed for the year in which it is budgeted.
- Undergraduate Tuition: 85% will be allocated to colleges based on their share of credit hours taught (weighted according to the state course cost methodology); 15% will be allocated based on their share of enrolled majors on a three-year rolling average and the allocation will be guaranteed for the year in which it is budgeted.
- Tax: 12.5% of unrestricted revenues will be taxed to support the subvention and strategic investment pool – appropriations are based on institutional priorities and support for mission critical academic units whose expenditure models are not supported by the revenues earned.
- Indirect Cost Allocation Methodology:
  - Please see Exhibit H for a summary of our indirect cost pools and allocators.
  - The internal deliberation of methodology focused initially on internal equity of allocation but eventually returned to a methodology which balanced equity with simplicity and stability

Equipping Colleges and Other Academic Planning Units for Success

One of the lessons learned in the transition to RCM was the need to ensure that colleges and other academic planning units have appropriate financial expertise in place to support a decentralized decision-making environment. To address this issue, the University, in consultation with the deans and other academic leaders, created the position of Chief Finance & Administrative Officer (CFAO) within each unit. As a member of the college’s leadership team, the CFAO will direct and provide accountability for all administrative resources and associated procedures and policies (financial, human resources, administrative information technology, facilities and space management) to maximize achievement of the college’s goals and objectives. A CFAO has been identified for most of the colleges and academic planning units.

The University leadership further engaged the Huron Consulting Group to assist academic leadership in two key areas of the RCM transition: management leadership in an RCM environment and building an all-funds budget for FY’14. Leadership training was attended by
college Deans and CFAOs. It took the form of presentations and discussions on topics identified by University financial and administrative leadership and Huron. Building an all-funds budget for FY’14 required hands-on training to ensure that academic planning units had the information they needed to develop their budgets and to begin positioning their units for the future.

Ensuring that data and analytical capabilities are in place to facilitate proper planning and decision making is a key RCM requirement. To make improvements in these areas, we have:

- Streamlined our chart of accounts
- Enhanced financial reporting
- Centrally hired financial analysts to support colleges decision-making

**Service Alignment Initiative**

The Vice President for Finance and Administration, in consultation with the Executive Vice President/Provost, undertook a comprehensive self-assessment of all administrative support functions – the Ohio Service Alignment Initiative (“OSAI”) – to identify critical service and technology improvements. Experiences at other institutions indicate that if the central administration cannot provide essential services at a reasonable cost, academic units will go outside the university.

As we discussed at the last board meeting, over the next two years, OSAI will upgrade technology and business processes and fill gaps in necessary services. In preparation for this initiative, much has been accomplished over the past year, including:

- Administrative unit assessments & strategic plans
- Monthly CFAO meetings
- A technology assessment & upgrade roadmap
- Project Management Office (PMO)

Next steps for OSAI include:

- Evaluating service levels
  - Alignment of administrative service levels with institutional needs
  - Evaluating central vs. decentralized services delivery mechanisms
- Financial & analytical capabilities
  - Training
  - Enhanced budgeting & forecasting process
  - Rationalization of data
- Communication & training

**FY’14 Budget Discussion**

**College Budget Process**

Building the FY’14 Budget involved moving away from the historical incremental budgeting approach employed by our colleges and other academic planning units. However, a fundamental early assumption was that each academic planning unit would be held harmless in the first year of RCM, and thus their budgets would be built with their current trend of staffing levels and operating expenses.
Even with this hold harmless provision, colleges and other academic planning units prepared multi-year investment plans that aligned their available resources with their academic plans. These investments plans were discussed by each unit at budget hearings with the university leadership. These budget hearings allowed each academic leader to highlight their goals and objectives of their college’s academic plans; the assumptions upon which their financial plans were built; opportunities to identify new revenue growth; and investments they wanted to make in their colleges – both with revenues they proposed to create through program expansion and through strategic investments from the center.

The all-funds budgeting process makes these discussions much more transparent as all of a unit’s available resources are known and subject to review. Future budgeting processes will put greater emphasis on understanding a college’s resources generation capabilities from sources such as the foundation endowments, graduate professional programs, 2-year undergraduate completion programs, and royalty income.

University Financial Assumptions

Revenue:

- **State Subsidy:**
  - The April projection from Ohio Board of Regents represents ~2% growth
  - First year of two year implementation of new funding model
- **Tuition**
  - Undergraduate rate growth of 1.6%
  - Medical tuition growth of 5%
  - Enrollment growth in eLearning and professional graduate programs
  - No assumed enrollment growth in on-campus headcount
- **Grants & Contracts**
  - Spending constraints may affect federal grant awards
  - Units have developed plans to offset potential loss of funding
- **Endowment Distributions**
  - Foundation endowment contributions are 21% higher
  - Benefits of Capital Campaign
  - Growing fund balances from market gains

Expenses

- **Compensation:**
  - 2% salary and wage pool for faculty and staff and potentially an additional 1% mid-year merit increase for faculty—tied to enrollment and retention outcomes
  - .9% increase in health benefits - savings in FY’13 is helping to offset 6% trend line
- **Capital Improvements & Utilities**
  - $2.1M to support Scripps Phase II, swing space strategy
  - $1.5M for Lausche plant replacement.
- **Other Commitments**
  - $764K - Investments to University priorities through repurposing of lower-priority funding.
Financial Statements

- Exhibit A: Proposed University Budget (All Funds)
- Exhibit B: Proposed University Budget (Operating Funds)
- Exhibit C: Proposed University Budget (Grant Funds)
- Exhibit D: Proposed University Budget (Foundation Funds)
- Exhibit E: University Revenue & Expense Statement
- Exhibit F: Budgeted Revenue Source Details
- Exhibit G: Budgeted Expense Details
- Exhibit H: Indirect Cost Allocations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Revenue/Expenditure</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 State Share of Instruction/Appropriations</td>
<td>Athens Colleges &amp; Schools</td>
<td>$102,026,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tuition &amp; Educational Fees (net of financial aid)</td>
<td>College of Osteopathic Medicine</td>
<td>$227,836,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Room &amp; Board</td>
<td>Regional Campuses</td>
<td>$3,012,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>Subvention Investment Pool</td>
<td>$367,817,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Facilities &amp; Admin Costs Recovery</td>
<td>Auxiliaries</td>
<td>$3,012,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Gifts</td>
<td>Academic Support Units</td>
<td>$3,012,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Endowment Distributions</td>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>$3,012,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Other External Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Subvention/Strategic Pool Allocation (12.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Total Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td>$348,195,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Total Salaries, Wages, &amp; Other Payroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Total Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Salaries, Wages, &amp; Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Supplies, Services, &amp; Capitalized Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Internal Allocations &amp; Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Academic Indirect Costs Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Administrative Indirect Costs Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 General Fee Indirect Costs Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Total Expenses, Allocations &amp; Indirect Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Results of Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Provisions for Facility Renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Provisions for Non-facility Renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Transfers to (from) Plant Fund – Project Related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Provisions for Replacement &amp; Depreciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Debt Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Non-Mandatory Transfers to (from) Operating Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Transfers to (from) Strategic Investment Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Total Funding Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Total Expenses &amp; Funding Transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Net Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## OPERATING FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATHENS COLLEGES &amp; SCHOOLS</th>
<th>COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE</th>
<th>REGIONAL CAMPUSES</th>
<th>SUBVENTION INVESTMENT POOL</th>
<th>AUXILIARIES</th>
<th>ACADEMIC SUPPORT UNITS</th>
<th>OHIO UNIVERSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 State Share of Instruction/Appropriations</td>
<td>102,026,197</td>
<td>11,655,235</td>
<td>23,928,380</td>
<td>1,842,299</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>139,452,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tuition &amp; Educational Fees (net of financial aid)</td>
<td>231,099,871</td>
<td>19,325,987</td>
<td>35,452,753</td>
<td>2,521,134</td>
<td>(534,659)</td>
<td>3,882,602</td>
<td>291,747,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Room &amp; Board</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80,149,148</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80,149,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,129,716</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,131,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Facilities &amp; Admin Costs Recovery</td>
<td>6,567,868</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Gifts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Endowment Distributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Investment Income</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Other External Sales</td>
<td>4,037,100</td>
<td>1,962,845</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,163,377</td>
<td>22,406,932</td>
<td>44,670,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Subvention/Strategic Pool Allocation (12.5%)</td>
<td>(38,288,132)</td>
<td>(3,747,484)</td>
<td>(7,398,099)</td>
<td>49,433,714</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Total Salaries, Wages, &amp; Other Payroll</td>
<td>129,663,227</td>
<td>18,237,951</td>
<td>34,728,740</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,109,354</td>
<td>75,408,807</td>
<td>280,148,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Total Benefits</td>
<td>33,927,640</td>
<td>5,648,521</td>
<td>9,746,897</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,641,166</td>
<td>27,450,370</td>
<td>85,414,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Salaries, Wages, &amp; Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>163,590,867</td>
<td>23,886,472</td>
<td>44,475,637</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,750,520</td>
<td>102,859,177</td>
<td>365,562,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Internal Allocations &amp; Sales</td>
<td>(552,232)</td>
<td>(178,514)</td>
<td>177,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5,901,763)</td>
<td>3,327,287</td>
<td>(3,128,222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Academic Indirect Costs Allocations</td>
<td>16,549,725</td>
<td>663,276</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>168,678</td>
<td>(17,381,679)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Administrative Indirect Costs Allocations</td>
<td>74,842,297</td>
<td>5,496,239</td>
<td>12,688,657</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,074,066</td>
<td>(105,101,259)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 General Fee Indirect Costs Allocations</td>
<td>30,567,813</td>
<td>738,438</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3,329,139)</td>
<td>(27,977,112)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses, Allocations &amp; Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td>328,406,671</td>
<td>35,876,543</td>
<td>67,549,044</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65,922,469</td>
<td>4,116,007</td>
<td>501,870,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESULTS OF OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td>(22,713,767)</td>
<td>(6,304,959)</td>
<td>(13,329,294)</td>
<td>58,297,147</td>
<td>28,855,397</td>
<td>22,491,112</td>
<td>67,295,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET RESULTS</strong></td>
<td>1,262,852</td>
<td>(97,334)</td>
<td>(175,955)</td>
<td>11,863,433</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,286,155</td>
<td>14,139,152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Exhibit C: Proposed University Budget (Grant Funds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GRANT FUNDS</strong></th>
<th>ATHENS COLLEGES &amp; SCHOOLS</th>
<th>COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE</th>
<th>REGIONAL CAMPUSES</th>
<th>SUBVENTION INVESTMENT POOL</th>
<th>AUXILIARIES</th>
<th>ACADEMIC SUPPORT UNITS</th>
<th>OHIO UNIVERSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. State Share of Instruction/Appropriations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tuition &amp; Educational Fees (net of financial aid)</td>
<td>(1,690,802)</td>
<td>(721,735)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(48,008,608) (50,421,145)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Room &amp; Board</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>33,499,805</td>
<td>17,352,093</td>
<td>56,250</td>
<td>85,960</td>
<td>52,614,776</td>
<td>103,608,884</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Facilities &amp; Admin Costs Recovery</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gifts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Endowment Distributions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Investment Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Transfers, Sales and Other Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Subvention/Strategic Pool Allocation (12.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>31,860,003</td>
<td>16,630,358</td>
<td>56,250</td>
<td>85,960</td>
<td>4,606,168</td>
<td>53,238,740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES &amp; INDIRECT COST ALLOCATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Total Salaries, Wages, &amp; Other Payroll</td>
<td>17,452,073</td>
<td>7,919,977</td>
<td>108,614</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,960</td>
<td>2,342,264 (27,826,888)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Supplies, Services, &amp; Capitalized Costs</td>
<td>10,630,299</td>
<td>5,406,874</td>
<td>19,704</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>1,898,699 (18,029,304)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Internal Allocations &amp; Sales</td>
<td>(11,389)</td>
<td>11,080</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(309)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Academic Indirect Costs Allocations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Administrative Indirect Costs Allocations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. General Fee Indirect Costs Allocations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses, Allocations &amp; Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td>31,743,114</td>
<td>15,721,269</td>
<td>139,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85,960</td>
<td>4,676,568 (52,366,662)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results of Operations</strong></td>
<td>116,889</td>
<td>909,089 (83,500)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(70,400) (872,078)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Provisions for Replacement &amp; Depreciation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Debt Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>908,956</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>908,956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Non-Mandatory Transfers to (from) Operating Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(70,400) (70,400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Non-Mandatory Transfers to (from) Foundation Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(70,400) (70,400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Transfers to (from) Strategic Investment Pool</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Transfers to (from) Operations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(70,400) (70,400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding Transfers</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>908,956</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(70,400) (838,556)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses &amp; Funding Transfers</strong></td>
<td>31,743,114</td>
<td>16,630,225</td>
<td>139,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85,960</td>
<td>4,606,168 (53,205,218)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Results</strong></td>
<td>116,889</td>
<td>133 (83,500)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33,522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### FOUNDATION FUNDS

#### REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>legen</th>
<th>ATHENS COLLEGES &amp; SCHOOLS</th>
<th>COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE</th>
<th>REGIONAL CAMPUSES</th>
<th>SUBVENTION INVESTMENT POOL</th>
<th>AUXILIARIES</th>
<th>ACADEMIC SUPPORT UNITS</th>
<th>OHIO UNIVERSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 State Share of Instruction/Appropriations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tuition &amp; Educational Fees (net of financial aid)</td>
<td>(1,572,961)</td>
<td>(418,000)</td>
<td>(322,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(91,199)</td>
<td>(1,640,985)</td>
<td>(4,045,145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Room &amp; Board</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Facilities &amp; Admin Costs Recovery</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Gifts</td>
<td>3,875,976</td>
<td>605,000</td>
<td>193,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,701,000</td>
<td>1,499,110</td>
<td>7,874,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Endowment Distributions</td>
<td>8,339,894</td>
<td>392,955</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>139,449</td>
<td>9,847,298</td>
<td>18,719,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Investment Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Transfers, Sales and Other Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subvention/Strategic Pool Allocation (12.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Total Revenues</td>
<td>10,642,909</td>
<td>187,000</td>
<td>264,455</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,749,250</td>
<td>9,705,433</td>
<td>22,549,047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXPENSES & INDIRECT COST ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>legen</th>
<th>ATHENS COLLEGES &amp; SCHOOLS</th>
<th>COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE</th>
<th>REGIONAL CAMPUSES</th>
<th>SUBVENTION INVESTMENT POOL</th>
<th>AUXILIARIES</th>
<th>ACADEMIC SUPPORT UNITS</th>
<th>OHIO UNIVERSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Total Salaries, Wages, &amp; Other Payroll</td>
<td>4,250,742</td>
<td>94,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56,750</td>
<td>2,550,773</td>
<td>6,952,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Total Benefits</td>
<td>767,514</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>718,256</td>
<td>1,485,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Salaries, Wages, &amp; Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>5,018,256</td>
<td>94,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56,750</td>
<td>3,269,029</td>
<td>8,438,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Supplies, Services, &amp; Capitalized Costs</td>
<td>2,649,091</td>
<td>228,100</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>731,500</td>
<td>6,158,337</td>
<td>9,772,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Academic Indirect Costs Allocations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(232,800)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>143,500</td>
<td>(89,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Administrative Indirect Costs Allocations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 General Fee Indirect Costs Allocations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Total Expenses &amp; Allocations &amp; Indirect Costs</td>
<td>7,667,347</td>
<td>89,800</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>788,250</td>
<td>9,570,866</td>
<td>18,121,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Results of Operations</td>
<td>2,975,562</td>
<td>97,200</td>
<td>259,455</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>961,000</td>
<td>134,567</td>
<td>4,427,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Provisions for Replacement &amp; Depreciation</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>2,025,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Debt Service</td>
<td>372,756</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>372,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Non-Mandatory Transfers to (from) Operating Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Non-Mandatory Transfers to (from) Foundation Funds</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(40,000)</td>
<td>(94,455)</td>
<td>(164,455)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Transfers to (from) Strategic Investment Pool</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Transfers to (from) Operations</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(40,000)</td>
<td>(94,455)</td>
<td>(164,455)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Total Funding Transfers</td>
<td>1,342,756</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>960,000</td>
<td>69,455</td>
<td>2,233,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Total Expenses &amp; Funding Transfers</td>
<td>9,010,103</td>
<td>89,800</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,748,250</td>
<td>9,501,411</td>
<td>20,354,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Net Results</td>
<td>1,632,806</td>
<td>97,200</td>
<td>259,455</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>204,022</td>
<td>2,194,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All funds (operating, grant, &amp; foundation)</td>
<td>OHIO UNIVERSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues(^{(1)})</td>
<td>$  644.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses(^{(2)})</td>
<td>$   572.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of Operations</td>
<td>$    72.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Transfers(^{(3)})</td>
<td>$    56.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Results</strong></td>
<td><strong>$  16.3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(1)}\) Revenues net of financial aid (including employee fee waivers)  
\(^{(2)}\) Direct expenses for salaries, wages, fringe benefits, supplies, services & capitalized costs  
\(^{(3)}\) Includes debt service, renewal and replacement, and transfers to (from) reserves
Exhibit F: Budgeted Revenue Source Details

In millions

- SSI Subsidy: $139.4 (22%)
- Tuition & Fees (net): $265 (40%)
- All Funds: $644.9 (1)

- F&A Recovery: $7.1 (1%)
- Gifts: $7.9 (2%)
- Investment: $4.8 (<1%)
- Endowment (net): $14.9 (2%)
- Other External Revenue & Sales: $44.7 (7%)
- Gov't Grants (net): $36.2 (5%)
- Private Grants: $18 (3%)
- Room & Board: $80.1 (12%)
- General Fee: $26.8 (4%)
Exhibit G: Budgeted Expense Details (rounding)

All Funds in millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Operating</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens Colleges &amp; Schools</td>
<td>$43.4</td>
<td>$10.6</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Osteopathic Medicine</td>
<td>$5.3</td>
<td>$5.4</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Campuses</td>
<td>$10.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliaries</td>
<td>$32.1</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Units</td>
<td>$48.4</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td>$6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$139.4</td>
<td>$18.0</td>
<td>$9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Provisions for facility renewal | $13.7 |
| Provisions for non-facility renewal | $0.9 |
| Transfers to (from) plant fund – project related | $15.1 |

| Salaries, wages & benefits | $278.2 |
| Supplies, srvcs, & capital costs | $93.4 |
| Provisions for replacement & depreciation | $29.6 |
| Debt service (principal & interest) | $26.3 |
| Transfers to reserves | $0.3 |
| Internal allocations & sales | $(3.2) |

Faculty salaries $128.5
Administrative staff salaries $103.3
Classified staff wages $45.4
Benefits $49.8
Healthcare $43.6
Grad asst. wages $20.3
Student wages $16.4

% of total expenditures
- Faculty and staff salaries & wages: 43%
- Grad asst. & student wages: 6%
- Supplies, srvcs, & capital costs: 14%
- Salaries, wages & benefits: 65%

$408.3
# Exhibit H – Indirect Cost Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Pool</th>
<th>Allocator</th>
<th>Allocator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Indirect Costs Allocations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>FTE-T</td>
<td>FTE-T</td>
<td>FTE Total (Employees &amp; Students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Museum</td>
<td>FTE-T</td>
<td>FTE-E</td>
<td>FTE Employees (Faculty &amp; Staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOUB</td>
<td>FTE-T</td>
<td>FTE-UG</td>
<td>FTE Undergraduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athena</td>
<td>FTE-T</td>
<td>FTE-G</td>
<td>FTE Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development Center</td>
<td>FTE-E</td>
<td>EXP-GR</td>
<td>Grant Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellworks</td>
<td>FTE-E</td>
<td>DEG-T</td>
<td>Total Degrees Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NASF</td>
<td>NetAssignable Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Admin &amp; Services Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>FTE-T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management</td>
<td>FTE-UG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate College</td>
<td>FTE-G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Research</td>
<td>EXP-GR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Admin &amp; Services Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>FTE-T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
<td>FTE-T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Advancement</td>
<td>DEG-T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Information Technology</td>
<td>FTE-T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Finance &amp; Administration</td>
<td>FTE-T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>FTE-E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Support</td>
<td>FTE-E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Pool</td>
<td>FTE-E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities Admin &amp; Services Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>NASF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Management</td>
<td>NASF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>NASF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>NASF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td>FTE-T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement</td>
<td>NASF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution Included for Resources Committee Action

FISCAL YEAR 2013-2014
OPERATING BUDGET

RESOLUTION 2013 --

WHEREAS, the appropriate planning and consultation has been completed within the University, resulting in recommendations for budget priorities, and

WHEREAS, the University has adopted a new all-funds budgeting approach that shows a more comprehensive view of resource generation and allocation, and

WHEREAS, the University has developed a balanced budget consistent with the provisions of the state budget.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Fiscal Year 2013-2014 budgets of the expected resources and expenditures for the Athens Campus, Auxiliary Operations, Regional Campuses, and the Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine as presented on the attached schedule are hereby approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The Vice President of Finance and Administration, in conjunction with the Executive Vice President and Provost and with approval of the President, is authorized to make adjustments in instructional and general operating expense allocations during the fiscal year to ensure the total does not exceed available unrestricted resources;
2. Expenditures for restricted funds shall be limited to the resources generated.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees authorizes the President, with the approval of the Chair of the Board, to make adjustments to the budget as presented to reflect any changes in state appropriations.
FY 2104 RCM Budget Implementation, Preparedness and SAI

Joint Session

FY 2014 RCM Budget Agenda

- Overview
- Preparing for RCM
- RCM Accomplishments-to-Date
- FY 2014 RCM Budget
FY 2014 RCM Budget Overview

- FY 2014 budget reflects
  - Institutional priorities tied to the 4x4 strategic planning grid
  - Restrained tuition increases and targeted financial aid to address affordability concerns
  - Modest salary increases with the opportunity for an additional 1% mid-year merit increase for faculty if enrollment and retention targets are attained
  - Debt service for high priority capital construction

Preparing for RCM April 2012 Board Presentation

- Leadership from Huron Consulting and several universities shared their experiences with RCM and their insights on its strengths and challenges
- Chief observations:
  - Excellence must drive RCM
  - Robust shared governance is a necessity
  - Must have transparency in financial and operational activities
- Primary principal of RCM
  *Aligning financial incentives and accountability with decision-making at the planning unit level*
RCM Accomplishments-to-Date
Stabilizing the Model

- All-funds budget – Operating, Grant, and Foundation funds
- Revenue allocation methods
  - State Subsidy
  - Undergraduate Tuition
- Subvention and strategic investment pool
- Indirect cost allocation methods
  - Balance between equity and simplicity

RCM Accomplishments-to-Date
Equipping Units for Success

- Creation of College and academic unit Chief Finance and Administration Officers - CFAOs
- Huron support
  - Operating and management in an RCM environment
  - Budget development
- Data and analytics - enhancing access and capabilities
  - Chart of accounts
  - Financial reporting
  - Centrally hired financial analysts to support colleges
Central administrative services must provide essential services at a reasonable cost in support of the academic units.

Comprehensive administrative support function self-assessment has occurred during the past year.

Must align services with academic needs to avoid costly duplication within colleges.

Completed to Date:
- Unit assessments & strategic plans complete for Finance, Facilities, Human Resources, IT
- Monthly CFAO meetings are occurring
- Technology assessment & upgrade roadmap in place
- Project Management Office established
RCM Accomplishments-to-Date

SAI Next Steps

- Evaluating service levels
  - Alignment of services with institutional needs
  - Evaluating central vs. decentralized delivery mechanisms
- Financial & analytical capabilities
  - Training
  - Enhanced budgeting & forecasting process
  - Rationalization of data
- Communication & training

FY 2014 RCM Budget

College Budget Process

- Colleges and academic units will be ‘held harmless’ in first year of RCM
- College budget hearings were conducted with the EVPP and VPFA
  - Units prepared multi-year investment plans that aligned available resources with their academic plans
- The all-funds, RCM budget process
  - Provides transparency to all available resources
  - Allows for greater understanding of a college’s resource generation capabilities
FY 2014 RCM Budget
Key Financial Assumptions

- Moderate revenue growth from core sources
  - State Subsidy: 2%
  - Undergraduate Tuition: 1.6%
- Revenue conservatism to support investment capital
  - Retaining 2% of tuition & subsidy revenues
  - Retaining investment income
- Salary Increases: 2%
  - Faculty mid-year 1% merit increase if enrollment goals met
- Debt Service high priority capital construction has been funded
The Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Operating Budget Resolution is on the Resources Committee agenda for recommendation for board approval.
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Pamela J. Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost
       Stephen T. Golding, Vice President for Finance and Administration, CFO and Treasurer

Re: Guaranteed Tuition Program Update

At the September 2012 board retreat there was an animated discussion about the economic realities of facing Ohio University and the smart growth strategies the university had used to constructively approach the critical challenges. One of the central questions posed at this retreat was how the tripartite model (state, university, and parents/students) could be modified to best serve the needs of our students, our institution, our region, and the state?

The Board directed senior leadership to explore alternative tuition pricing models that would end the annual tuition increases while preserving the academic quality of Ohio University. At the November, 2012 meeting differential tuition and guaranteed tuition were presented as alternative approaches and the board directed senior leadership to elaborate on the guaranteed tuition approach.

Additional research was completed and discussions began within the university community, through Senate meetings and an open forum, about the framework and parameters of these types of programs. We continued to refine this possible approach and presented additional information, including sensitivity analyses and the impact on financial aid, to the board in the February, 2013 and April, 2013 meetings. During this process, senior leadership worked closely with Ohio House and Senate leadership to describe legislative language that would be necessary for a tuition guarantee program. That language is now in Sub. H.B. 59 and is in your board materials for review. Senior leadership also consulted with the Board of Regents, representatives from the Governor’s Office, and the Office of Budget and Management in constructing the details of the program.

We will present the general parameters and guidelines of the program at the joint meeting of the Academics and Resources Committees. At this meeting we are asking that the Board of Trustees adopt the OHIO tuition guarantee program as outlined in Sub. H.B. 59 with the condition that it is approved by the Ohio Legislature and signed into law by Governor Kasich. A resolution is included for discussion by the Joint committee, with action being requested by the Resources committee.
The OHIO Tuition Guarantee

Presentation Overview

- Why Provide a Tuition Guarantee Program?
- The Basic Concept
- Who is eligible?
- What is included?
- What happens if a student does not graduate before the guarantee expires?
- Are there special circumstances that can extend the guarantee?
- How does financial aid work in a tuition guarantee program?
- How are the cohort rates set?
- What approvals are necessary?
- What implementation issues must be considered?
- Discussion
Why Provide a Tuition Guarantee Program?

- Budget planning for students and parents
- Predictability of tuition revenues
- Financial incentive for timely graduation
- Financial incentives for targeted groups (e.g., combined BA/MA, transfer students, etc.)
- Potential to reduce student debt upon graduation
- Enhancing student recruitment

The Basic Concept

- An Ohio University guarantee tuition program would be structured as follows:
  - A constant tuition rate, as set by the Ohio University Board of Trustees, for four continuous years (120 semester hours) beginning with the term of a qualifying student’s initial enrollment on the Athens campus.
  - Four continuous years means any sequential combination of four fall semesters, four spring semesters, and four summer sessions commencing with the semester of initial enrollment.
  - The period is extended for undergraduate degree programs approved by the University for completion in more than four years. The extension is limited to the minimum number of additional semester(s) to complete the program as approved by the University.
Who is eligible?

When the program is implemented, all incoming students who meet the following criteria will be on the tuition guarantee.

- In-state full-time undergraduate students admitted to the Athens campus in a degree or licensure-seeking program
- Transfer students

The following will not be covered by the tuition guarantee:

- Graduate level tuition, Continuing Education and eLearning tuition, and study abroad tuition would not be covered by the guarantee
- Continuing students. Continuing in-state undergraduate students will pay the tuition and fees and other rates approved by the Board of Trustees on an annual basis until the program is implemented

What is included in the tuition guarantee program?

- Tuition and general fee
- Room and board
- Most course fees *
- Required fees
  - Orientation Fee
  - Technology Fees
  - Graduation Fee

*Unique programs may require fees to cover costs of offering instruction
What if the guarantee expires before a student graduates?

- If a student does not graduate within the four continuous years (120 semester hours) and is not enrolled in an approved program requiring more time to complete, the student will be placed in the next cohort. Their new tuition rate will be the price that was in effect the year after their initial enrollment.

Are there special circumstances that can extend the guarantee?

- Students called to active military duty, a student who withdraws for medical reasons, or students who can demonstrate that disabilities impede their progress toward degree completion may be eligible for an extension of their plan.
- The Student-Tuition appeals committee will be charged with developing policy and procedures to consider requests for plan extensions.
How does financial aid work in the tuition guarantee program?

- Fixed price is before the application of gifts, grants, loans
- Financial aid holds value
- Commitment to increased financial aid

How are the cohort rates set?

- One-time base budget adjustment in year one-no higher than the proposed 2% tuition cap compounded (5.88%)
- Going forward cohort increases no greater than CPI plus legislatively mandated tuition cap
- If tuition falls significantly below other state universities, the institution may current “relative” position based on 4-year rolling average, institution may submit a request for a specific percentage for approval from the Chancellor
- Each year by June 30th the Board of trustees would set a new (Tuition and general fee, room and board, and course fees table). The new rates may be published as tentative before June 30th, at the Bursar’s tuition and fee web-site
## Fixed-Price Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Model</th>
<th>FY13 Base</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>10,216</td>
<td>10,420</td>
<td>10,629</td>
<td>10,841</td>
<td>11,058</td>
<td>11,279</td>
<td>11,505</td>
<td>11,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>5,648</td>
<td>5,846</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>6,262</td>
<td>6,483</td>
<td>6,708</td>
<td>6,943</td>
<td>7,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>5,880</td>
<td>5,785</td>
<td>5,887</td>
<td>6,097</td>
<td>6,414</td>
<td>6,638</td>
<td>6,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,264</td>
<td>21,855</td>
<td>22,464</td>
<td>23,090</td>
<td>23,736</td>
<td>24,401</td>
<td>25,086</td>
<td>25,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Guarantee Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>FY14 Cohort</th>
<th>FY15 Cohort</th>
<th>FY16 Cohort</th>
<th>FY17 Cohort</th>
<th>FY18 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22,514</td>
<td>23,190</td>
<td>23,885</td>
<td>24,602</td>
<td>25,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90,056</td>
<td>95,540</td>
<td>90,428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What approvals are necessary?

- The legislature would delegate to an Ohio public institution’s Board of Trustees the authority to adopt an in-state undergraduate Tuition Guarantee Program for all Ohio students.
- The Ohio legislature would delegate to an Ohio public institutions’ Board of Trustees the authority to establish the parameters and guidelines by which an in-state undergraduate Tuition Program would operate.
- The legislature would require that an in-state undergraduate Tuition Guarantee Program adopted by its Board of Trustees must be approved by the Ohio Board of Regents prior to a program’s initial implementation.
What reporting will be required?

• The Ohio Board of Regents will publish a report five years from the effective date of the legislation identifying each Ohio public institution that has adopted a Tuition Guarantee Program, the characteristics of their specific plans, and benchmark data as to how an Ohio student’s tuition, fees, room and board, graduation and retention rates at these institutions compares with other public institutions that have not adopted a Tuition Guarantee Program.

What implementation issues must be considered?

• Identifying and approving programs requiring additional semester(s)
• Developing implementation policies and procedures for special circumstances
• Identifying course fees and program fees not covered by the guarantee
• Communication and marketing for students and parents for recruitment materials
• Significant infrastructure changes in the Bursar’s Office, Financial Aid, and the SIS System
• Developing and pursuing pricing schedule for the various components of the tuition guarantee program
• Developing a training resource for faculty, staff, and students
Guaranteed Tuition Implementation Team

The following individuals will be invited to serve on an implementation team to consider the policies, procedures, and process necessary to implement the program.

- Project Manager
- Deb Benton, Registrar
- Sherry Downs, Bursar
- Craig Cornell, Enrollment Management
- Valerie Miller, Financial Aid
- Peter Trentacoste, Residential Life
- Don Pendergast, OIT-SIS
- Liz Bennett, Institutional Research
- Renea Morris, University Communications
- Kris Sano, Controller
- Chad Mitchell, Budget
- John Day, Provost’s Office
- Ann Paulins, Patton College of Education
- Sean Osterman, Russ College of Engineering
- Austin LaForest, Student Senate Representative
- Beth Quitslund, Faculty Senate Representative
Sub.H.B.No. 59

Sec. 3345.48. (A) As used in this section:

(1) "Cohort" means a group of students who will complete their bachelor's degree requirements and graduate from a state university at the same time. A cohort may include transfer students and other selected undergraduate student academic programs as determined by the board of trustees of a state university.

(2) "Eligible student" means an undergraduate student who:

(a) Is enrolled full-time in a bachelor's degree program at a state university;

(b) Is a resident of this state, as defined by the chancellor of the Ohio board of regents under section 3333.31 of the Revised Code.

(3) "State university" has the same meaning as in section 3345.011 of the Revised Code.

(B) The board of trustees of a state university may establish an undergraduate tuition guarantee program that allows eligible students in the same cohort to pay a fixed rate for general and instructional fees for four years. A board of trustees may include room and board and any additional fees in the program.

If the board of trustees chooses to establish such a program, the board shall adopt rules for the program that include, but are not limited to, all of the following:

(1) The number of credit hours required to earn an undergraduate degree in each major;

(2) A guarantee that the general and instructional fees for each student in the cohort shall remain constant for four years so long as the student complies with the requirements of the program, except that, notwithstanding any law to the contrary, the board may increase the guaranteed amount by up to six per cent above what has been charged in the previous academic year one time for the first cohort enrolled under the tuition guarantee program. If the board of trustees determines that economic conditions or other circumstances require an increase for the first cohort of above six per cent, the board shall submit a request to increase the amount by a specified percentage to the chancellor. The chancellor, based on information the chancellor requires from the board of trustees, shall approve or disapprove such a request. Thereafter, the board of trustees may increase the guaranteed amount by up to the sum of the following above what has been charged in the previous academic year one time per subsequent cohort:

(a) The average rate of inflation, as measured by the consumer price index prepared by the bureau of labor statistics of the United States department of labor (all urban consumers, all items), for the previous sixty-month period; and

(b) The percentage amount the general assembly restrains increases on in-state undergraduate instructional and general fees for the applicable fiscal year. If the general assembly does not enact a limit on the increase of in-state undergraduate instructional and general fees, then no limit shall apply under this division for the cohort that first enrolls in any academic year for which the general assembly does not prescribe a limit.

If, beginning with the academic year that starts four years after the effective date of this section, the board of trustees determines that the general and instructional fees charged under the tuition guarantee have fallen significantly lower than those of other state universities, the board of trustees may submit a request to increase the amount charged to a cohort by a specified percentage to the chancellor, who shall approve or disapprove such a request.
(3) A benchmark by which the board sets annual increases in general and instructional fees. This benchmark and any subsequent change to the benchmark shall be subject to approval of the chancellor.

(4) Eligibility requirements for students to participate in the program;

(5) Student rights and privileges under the program;

(6) Consequences to the university for students unable to complete a degree program within four years, as follows:

(a) For a student who could not complete the program in four years due to a lack of available classes or space in classes provided by the university, the university shall provide the necessary course or courses for completion to the student free of charge.

(b) For a student who could not complete the program in four years due to military service or other circumstances beyond a student's control, as determined by the board of trustees, the university shall provide the necessary course or courses for completion to the student at the student's initial cohort rate.

(c) For a student who did not complete the program in four years for any other reason, as determined by the board of trustees, the university shall provide the necessary course or courses for completion to the student at a rate determined through a method established by the board under division (B)(7) of this section.

(7) Guidelines for adjusting a student's annual charges if the student, due to circumstances under the student's control, is unable to complete a degree program within four years;

(8) A requirement that the rules adopted under division (B) of this section be published or posted in the university handbook, course catalog, and web site.

(C) If a board of trustees implements a program under this section, the board shall submit the rules adopted under division (B) of this section to the chancellor for approval before beginning implementation of the program.

The chancellor shall not unreasonably withhold approval of a program if the program conforms in principle with the parameters and guidelines of this section.

(D) A board of trustees of a state university may establish an undergraduate tuition guarantee program for nonresident students.

(E) Within five years after the effective date of this section, the chancellor shall publish on the board of regents web site a report that includes all of the following:

1. The state universities that have adopted an undergraduate tuition guarantee program under this section;

2. The details of each undergraduate tuition guarantee program established under this section;

3. Comparative data, including general and instructional fees, room and board, graduation rates, and retention rates, from all state universities.
GUARANTEED TUITION

RESOLUTION 2013 --

WHEREAS, public universities have become increasingly tuition dependent as state support has declined in order to maintain their quality and cover their critical costs, and

WHEREAS, annual tuition increases are not a sustainable business model as student and family budgets are constrained and these increases represent a compounded impact; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees directed senior leadership to investigate alternative tuition models that would break the cycle of annual increases while maintaining the quality of the institution; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees and the university community have substantively engaged in a discussion of the merits of a guaranteed tuition model during the AY 2012-2013 year; and

WHEREAS, a guaranteed tuition model offers an opportunity for transparency in budget planning for students and parents, a financial incentive for timely graduation, the potential to reduce student debt upon graduation, and the opportunity to enhance student recruitment while providing predictability in tuition revenues.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees adopts the OHIO tuition guarantee program as outlined in Sub. H.B. No. 59 with the condition that it is approved by the Ohio Legislature and signed into law by Governor John Kasich. The Board of Trustees approves the general parameters and guidelines presented at this meeting and directs senior leadership to take all steps necessary for implementation of a tuition guarantee program including approval by the Board of Regents no later than the Fall of 2015 and earlier if possible. The Board also requests that senior leadership provide periodic updates as to the progress towards achieving this goal.
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Stephen T. Golding, Vice President for Finance and Administration, CFO and Treasurer
        Pamela J. Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost

Re: Future Six Year Capital Improvement Plan and Update on Debt Capacity

At the April board meeting a question was raised as to the impact of issuing $100 million in additional debt to more aggressively address the University’s accelerating deferred maintenance backlog. At that meeting, we committed to identifying how an additional $100 million in debt could be used to address institutional priorities and discussing the implications of issuing additional debt with the rating agencies. The attached PowerPoint presentation has been prepared with the explicit intent to answer these questions for the board.

The attached presentation highlights that the $100 million would be targeted to address high priority academic needs. It further points out that the issuance of this debt might lead to a downgrade in the University’s credit rating based on our conversations with the rating agencies and the negative impact on certain key debt ratios. The presentation also provides a cost benefit analysis which suggests that a rating downgrade could cost the university up to $6 million in additional interest expense over a thirty year period, while deferring the identified projects could lead to an additional $74 million in debt plus interest expense based upon increased deferred maintenance costs.

While our analysis does not suggest there is a right or wrong answer to the original Trustee’s question, the exercise has helped focus the trade-offs in addressing the most pressing capital needs of the university. We look forward to discussing the attached information in further detail at the June board meeting.
Future Six Year Capital Improvement Plan and Update on Debt Capacity

- A 6 year plan draft shared in April reduced use of debt to $485M
- Questions raised about impact of possible $585M debt scenario
- $585M debt scenario with academic/deferred maintenance focus:
  - Heavy teaching facilities rehabs & chilled water infrastructure for them
  - Accelerated phased library systems rehab
  - Some additional progress on shifting administrative functions to campus periphery
  - Some more deferred maintenance projects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CIP Debt Funded Projects</th>
<th>5 Year CIP Identified Bond Needs</th>
<th>Other bond sources</th>
<th>Proposed Bond Funding Levels for Six Year Plan</th>
<th>Included in FY13 Bond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY13 Annual Update GF Projects in Progress: $43,300,000</td>
<td>$40,600,000</td>
<td>$3,700,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OCHCOM Columbus (OMNI)</td>
<td>$9,600,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OCHCOM Cleveland</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Indoor Multi-Purpose Practice Facility</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lindsey Hall</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tupper Hall</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In Year CIP: General Fund Projects to consider:**

- College of Communications Phase 1: $12,000,000 ($8,400,000)
- OCHCOM Dinasty: $15,000,000 ($15,000,000) Yes
- McDevitt Hall Renovation and Add.: $21,500,000 ($8,700,000)
- McClurg Hall Replacement: $19,000,000 ($9,000,000)
- Auditorium Center Renovation: $11,000,000 ($11,000,000)
- West Union Street Office Center: $21,000,000 ($16,000,000)
- Academic R&D improvements: $2,000,000
- Historical Research Greenhouse Rep.: $5,000,000
- Ellis Hall HVAC and RfG Envelopes: $12,000,000
- Allen Library Major Renovation: $30,000,000
- Memorial Auditorium Improvements: $2,000,000
- McCullough Hall HVAC: $2,000,000
- Butler Infrastructure and HVAC: $6,000,000
- Softball Stadium: $1,000,000

**Infrastructure:**

- $144,700,000
- $252,000,000
- $271,400,000
- $270,600,000
- $270,600,000
- $267,000,000
- $267,000,000
- $250,000,000
- $247,000,000
- $249,000,000
- $249,000,000
- $249,000,000
- $249,000,000
- $249,000,000
- $249,000,000
- $249,000,000

**Residential Housing:**

- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000

**Total Project Totals:**

- $586,700,000
- $485,000,000

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>CIP Debt Funded Projects</th>
<th>5 Year CIP Identified Bond Needs</th>
<th>Other bond sources</th>
<th>Proposed Bond Funding Levels for Six Year Plan</th>
<th>Included in FY13 Bond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY13 Annual Update GF Projects in Progress: $87,300,000</td>
<td>$87,300,000</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OCHCOM Columbus Institute: $7,000,000 ($2,000,000)</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OCHCOM Cleveland: $2,000,000 ($9,000,000)</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Indoor Multi-Purpose Practice Facility: $12,000,000 ($2,000,000)</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lindsey Hall: $6,000,000 ($1,500,000)</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tupper Hall: $7,000,000 ($3,000,000)</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In Year CIP: General Fund Projects to consider:**

- College of Communications Phase 1: $12,000,000 ($8,400,000) Yes
- OCHCOM Dinasty: $19,000,000 ($19,000,000) Yes
- McDevitt Hall Renovation and Add.: $23,900,000 ($8,700,000) Yes
- McClurg Hall Replacement: $20,090,000 ($9,000,000) Yes
- Auditorium Center Renovation: $11,400,000 ($11,400,000) Yes
- West Union Street Office Center: $21,000,000 ($16,000,000) Yes
- Academic R&D improvements: $2,000,000
- Historical Research Greenhouse Rep.: $5,000,000
- Ellis Hall HVAC and RfG Envelopes: $12,000,000
- Allen Library Major Renovation: $30,000,000
- Memorial Auditorium Improvements: $2,000,000
- McCullough Hall HVAC: $2,000,000
- Butler Infrastructure and HVAC: $6,000,000
- Softball Stadium: $1,000,000

**Infrastructure:**

- $166,300,000
- $164,000,000
- $171,600,000
- $171,600,000
- $171,600,000
- $171,600,000
- $171,600,000
- $171,600,000
- $171,600,000
- $171,600,000
- $171,600,000
- $171,600,000
- $171,600,000
- $171,600,000
- $171,600,000

**Residential Housing:**

- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000
- $12,000,000

**Total Project Totals:**

- $721,600,000
- $585,000,000
Deferred Maintenance

- Deferred Maintenance constantly grows through aging & deterioration
- Challenge to make more progress with repairs than rate of deterioration
- Level of deferred maintenance at beginning of FY2013:
  - Athens General Fund Buildings only
  - Does not include vacant Ridges buildings
  - $82 per gross square foot
  - $436M Total
  - Reduction to $40 to $50 per gross square foot is goal target

Deferred Maintenance Impact

- Current level of Deferred Maintenance $82.1 pgsf or $435M Total (only slight change from last year)
- Level at completion of plan with $485M debt: $84 pgsf or $447M Total
- Level at completion of plan with $585M debt: $70 pgsf or $372M Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ per GSF</th>
<th>Deferred Maintenance Back-Log Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$485M Debt</td>
<td>$84</td>
<td>$447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$585M Debt</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deferred Maintenance Impact

Credit Ratings Overview

- The University’s credit ratings of “Aa3/A+” with a stable outlook were reaffirmed by Moody’s and Standard and Poor’s, respectively, in May 2013.

Selected Moody’s Report Highlights:
- “The ‘Aa3’ stable outlook reflects Ohio University’s strong balance sheet coverage of debt and operations, healthy cash flow and debt service coverage, and ample monthly liquidity.”
- “We consider it a credit positive that management and the board of trustees carefully reviewed the six-year capital plan in FY2013 before issuance of Series 2013 and reduced the overall plan and borrowing amount. Management indicated they will continue to review each capital phase and the university’s financial position carefully before proceeding to issue new debt.”

Selected Standard and Poor’s Report Highlights:
- “The stable outlook anticipates OU’s continued favorable enrollment and demand trend, positive financial results, and strong governance and management that we believe will prudently guide the institution through its CIP and successfully attend to other important university objectives under constrained resources without jeopardizing the credit rating by incurring excessive amounts of additional debt.”
- “While plans for new issues to support the CIP could become a credit risk, we consider the anticipated $185 mm of new debt* over the next two years reasonable at the current rating.”

*Note: Two-year “new debt” levels cited by S&P consist of $70 mm for Lausche and a $100-125 mm General Receipts issue in January/February 2015.
Peer Credit Comparison

- State of Ohio credit ratings Aa1 / AA+ / AA+ - all stable
- Ohio University maintains similar credit ratings to Kent State University, Miami University and the University of Cincinnati.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Moody's</th>
<th>S&amp;P</th>
<th>Fitch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>Aa3</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>Aa1</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>Aa3</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>Aa3</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>Aa3</td>
<td>AA-</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State University</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>AA-</td>
<td>AA-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toledo</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State University</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown State University</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Northeast Ohio Medical University</td>
<td>Baa1</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State University</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawnee State University</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NR = Not Rated

The University's currently projected pro-forma additional debt of $190 mm over the next year falls in line with outstanding debt levels of public Ohio peers of a similar size and credit profile. An additional $100 mm would make OU the third most highly leveraged institution in the State.

Peer Statistics and Debt Capacity

- The University’s currently projected pro-forma additional debt of $100 mm over the next year falls in line with outstanding debt levels of public Ohio peers of a similar size and credit profile. An additional $100 mm would make OU the third most highly leveraged institution in the State.

Total Debt ($ millions)

Notes:  Peer statistics based on fiscal year end 2012.
Ohio University plus $190 mm represents the new money portion of Series 2013 plus Lausche.
Ohio University plus $290 mm represents the above plus an additional $100 mm of debt.
Peer Statistics and Debt Capacity

While the University’s projected debt service to operations ratio falls in line with peers (albeit on the high end), another $100 mm of additional debt would make it the second highest in the State.

Notes: Peer statistics based on fiscal year end 2012. Operating base growth for OU pro-forma statistics estimated at 3%
Ohio University plus $190 mm represents the new money portion of Series 2013 plus Lausche.
Ohio University plus $290 mm represents the above plus an additional $100 mm of debt.

The University’s expendable financial resources are strong compared to its Ohio public institution peers.

Notes: Peer statistics based on fiscal year end 2012. Financial resource growth for OU pro-forma statistics estimated at 4%
Ohio University plus $190 mm represents the new money portion of Series 2013 plus Lausche.
Ohio University plus $290 mm represents the above plus an additional $100 mm of debt.
The University’s robust expendable financial resource base would enable its pro-forma ratio to remain strong relative to both peers and Moody’s medians despite an additional $100 mm of debt beyond the originally planned $190 mm.

Peer Statistics and Debt Capacity

- The University's robust expendable financial resource base would enable its pro-forma ratio to remain strong relative to both peers and Moody’s medians despite an additional $100 mm of debt beyond the originally planned $190 mm.

**Peer Statistics and Debt Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Statistics</th>
<th>Debt Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>239%</td>
<td>136%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107%</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488%</td>
<td>171%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300%</td>
<td>400%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500%</td>
<td>600%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moody’s “Aa3” Median (90%)
Moody’s “A1” Median (79%)

Notes: Peer statistics based on fiscal year end 2012. Financial resource growth for OU pro-forma statistics estimated at 4%. Ohio University plus $190 mm represents the new money portion of Series 2013 plus Lausche. Ohio University plus $290 mm represents the above plus an additional $100 mm of debt.

Additional note: While the University of Cincinnati’s expendable resources to debt statistic seems low relative to its rating category, the University’s overall financial resource base of $5.4 billion exceeds the “Aa3” median of $329 mm, enabling its “total financial resources to debt” ratio to be in line with peers. This compares to a $730 mm financial resource base for OU.

Pro-Forma Debt Service Comparison

An additional $100 mm beyond the current plan would increase the University’s projected debt service to operations ratio in FY18 to 9.2% and 8.6%, inclusive and exclusive of Lausche, respectively. This could potentially limit OU’s additional debt capacity beyond FY18, providing future administrations with less financing flexibility.
Debt Capacity Observations

- The rating agencies have expressed appreciation of the University’s measured and incremental approach to the utilization of additional debt.
  - As a result, an unprojected additional $100 mm of debt over the next fiscal year would most likely jeopardize the University’s current credit ratings of "Aa3/A+".
  - In today’s environment, a one notch credit rating downgrade would mean an additional 15-20 basis points of interest cost to OU. On a $100 mm issue, this translates into $6.0 mm of additional interest payments over 30 years.
  - By comparison, if we do not do the projects in the 6 Year CIP, deferred maintenance backlog will increase $14 sq ft or $74.2 mm.
- Since the University has historically been under-leveraged compared to peers, adding an additional $100 mm beyond the original projection would mean a 127% growth rate in debt since FY12.
- An additional $100 mm would also make OU the third most highly leveraged institution in the State of Ohio, behind Ohio State University and the University of Cincinnati.
- It is also important to consider that a new $100 mm issuance could potentially limit OU’s additional debt capacity beyond FY18.

Questions/Feedback?
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013
To: The President and Board of Trustees
From: Stephen T. Golding, Vice President for Finance and Administration, CFO and Treasurer
Re: Sources & Uses Report

Please find attached for your review a copy of the Sources & Uses Report for the period ending April 30, 2013. The following reports are included in these materials:

- Financial Highlights summary;
- Consolidated Sources & Uses Report – Total, Unrestricted, and Restricted;
  - Most recent 3 years audited financial results,
  - Current year-to-date actuals as of April 30, 2013,
  - Forecast for FY 2013.

The forecast for the current fiscal year, based on actual information through April 30, 2013, suggests a net from operations of approximately $59.5 million will be achieved. It is important to highlight the highest risks foreseen in this forecast:

1) Tuition & Fees
   a) April, 2013 year-to-date Tuition & Fees revenue of $381 million includes summer revenue. The portion pertaining to the second summer session will be deferred until the next fiscal year.
   b) The forecast of $368 million is based on summer enrollment numbers that are not yet finalized.

2) Investment Income is inherently risky to predict.

3) Undergraduate & Graduate Financial Aid
   a) The largest percentage of this category is Pell grants which are based on the number of eligible students and is sometimes difficult to predict.
   b) Students also receive financial aid from Foundation sources which are not factored into these calculations.

Although it is late in the fiscal year these are still estimates. I look forward to reviewing the actual results for FY 2013 at the November meeting. Should you have questions prior to the meeting please do not hesitate to contact me.
SOURCES & USES REPORT – APRIL, 2013 INTERIM
FINANCIAL HIGHLIGHTS

SOURCES

Tuition & Fees:
- There is an estimated total increase of $21 million over FY 2012 results.
- Athens is forecasted to be up $9 million from FY 2012. The increase in total tuition and fees is expected due to the 3.5% tuition and general fee increase put into effect for FY 2013.
- E-Learning is forecasted to be up $10.1 million from FY 2012. This increase is mainly due to large increases in enrollment and is offset by $9.4 million in additional Professional Services expense.
- RHE is projected to be up slightly compared to FY 2012 and is right on budget for FY 2013.
- The College of Medicine is up $1.7 million. This increase is attributable to the 5% tuition and general fee increase put into effect for FY 2013 along with enrollment increases.

Investment Income:
- The University’s investment income is comprised of interest, dividends, realized gains (losses), and unrealized gains (losses). Investment income stems from two primary sources. First, the university’s endowment assets, as well as a portion of its working capital, are invested in a long-term, broadly-diversified portfolio. This “diversified pool” achieved a return of 12.26% for the fiscal year to date through March 31, slightly underperforming its diversified benchmark of 12.36% for the same period. Additionally, a portion of the university’s working capital is invested in a pool of investment-grade fixed income securities. This “liquidity pool” achieved a return of 2.66% for the fiscal year to date through March 31, outperforming the Barclays U.S. Aggregate Bond Index, which returned 1.68% for the same period.
- YTD interest, dividends, realized gains (losses), and unrealized gains (losses) through March 30, 2013 were added to the forecasted interest for April-June to determine the anticipated amount for FY 2013.

Private Gifts, Grants and Contracts:
- This category is down $3.6 million overall from FY 2012 to FY 2013.
- During FY 2012 the City of Dublin made a one-time donation of $4.7 million. The remainder of the change from FY 2012 to FY 2013 is due to changes in scheduled payments from the Osteopathic Heritage Foundation.

State, Local, Other Government Grants and Contracts:
- A modest decrease of $0.8 million is forecasted for this category in FY 2013.
- Results are anticipated to be relatively consistent with that of the prior two years.

Sponsored Programs (Federal):
- Results for FY 2013 are projected to be down slightly as compared with prior year performance in this category.
• Pell awards of $43.4 million are included in this amount and are expected to be similar to the prior year awards.

Sponsored Programs (F&A):
• Results for FY 2013 are projected to be down from prior year performance due to a change in the mix of the types of grants and the associated F&A rates.

State Appropriations:
• There is an estimated $4.1 million increase over the prior year. The Board of Regents formula for state subsidy changed from FY 2012 to FY 2013. The most significant change has been the allocation formula shifting a higher weight to ‘degree attainment’ than ‘course completions.’ As a result of this change, Ohio University has earned more state subsidy. There were also changes to the medical school allocation related to caps, which increased the medical school distribution.
• State capital appropriations, not on the State Subsidy schedule, are included in this line item and are expected to be stable from FY 2012 to FY 2013 at $3.5 million.

Federal Appropriations:
• During FY 2010 & FY 2011, the University was a recipient of State Fiscal Stabilization Funds, which were appropriated under ARRA to the U.S. Department of Education. Funding was only available from this program through FY 2011.

Auxiliary Enterprise Sales & Services:
• This category is projected to be up $1.6 million from FY 2012 to FY 2013 based on higher than expected culinary retail sales, increased revenue for guest housing and the approved increases for room and board rates.
• Overall the number of students in campus housing decreased slightly from Fall 2012 to Fall 2013.

Sales & Services:
• Increased slightly due to additional OUHCOM rental revenue from the Central Ohio Extension Campus.

Ohio University Foundation:
• This category has leveled off in FY 2013 and is forecasted to be comparable to FY 2012.

Other Sources:
• This category is projected to be comparable to FY 2012.
• Royalty payments are the biggest component of this category.

**USES**

Salaries & Wages (including benefits):
• This category of expenditures is projected to increase $10.7 million which is a 3.0% increase from FY 2012 to FY 2013.
• The increase is due mainly to the 2.5% raise pool for faculty and staff and is also due to the filling of positions that were vacated as part of the early retirement incentive plan from prior years.
Undergraduate & Graduate Financial Aid:
  • University funded financial aid is projected to increase $7.9 million due in part to offset tuition and room and board increases.

General Expense:
  • This is expected to increase $2.2 million from FY2012 to FY 2013. Food costs, software and supplies are the biggest components of this category.

Professional Services:
  • Professional services are expected to increase $9.4 million due primarily to higher projected expenditures for the e-Learning courses which tie directly to their increased enrollment ($10.1 million in increased revenue). Increases in this category are also expected for consultant charges related to the Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) and Strategic Alignment Initiative (SAI) projects as well as increases in other professional services charged on grants.

Travel and Entertainment:
  • This category is expected to decrease $.6 million from FY 2012 to FY 2013 based on decreased budgeted amounts from the planning units.

Operations and Maintenance:
  • This category is expected to stay steady at $28.2 million from FY 2012 to FY 2013.

Utilities:
  • After slightly decreasing the past 2 years this category is expected to increase $1.2 million based on lower coal costs, but higher costs for natural gas, electric and water.

Interest Expense:
  • Interest decreased $1.1 million from FY 2011 to FY 2012 due to the associated premium being recognized when the 2003 and 2004 bonds were refunded.
  • Interest is projected to increase $2.6 million from FY 2012 to FY 2013 as the University continues to strategically issue debt.

Ohio University Foundation:
  • The University continues to pay certain payroll costs associated with individuals who work on Foundation initiatives. This consists primarily of University Advancement staff, individuals in the Foundation Accounting office, and development officers.
  • This cost category is expected to remain comparable to the prior year.

Depreciation:
  • An expected increase of $2.2 million in depreciation is due to a large increase in assets added in prior years. $30 million in building value was added in FY 2012. This category will continue to increase in future years as new Bond issues fund capital asset additions.

Other Expenses:
  • This category is forecasted to increase $2.0 million. Subcontracts on grants are a large part of this category.

Internal Fees for Goods/Services:
  • An increase of $0.4 million is expected in this category as more billings are processed between departments.
RESULTS OF NET FROM OPERATIONS

Projected FY 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Unrestricted Net from Operations FY 2013 (in millions)</th>
<th>Restricted Net from Operations FY 2013 (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliaries</td>
<td>($6.2)(^1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens Campus</td>
<td>$23.8(^2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Medicine</td>
<td>$2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Campuses</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Learning</td>
<td>$13.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$34.5</td>
<td>$25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actual FY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Unrestricted Net from Operations FY 2012 (in millions)</th>
<th>Restricted Net from Operations FY 2012 (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliaries</td>
<td>$9.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens Campus</td>
<td>$18.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Medicine</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Campuses</td>
<td>($3.7)(^1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Learning</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$26.9</td>
<td>$32.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Negative Net from Operations above are prior to transfers from unit reserves to cover actual/forecasted transfers to Plant Funds for capital improvements and new construction.

\(^2\) FY 2013 Athens Campus Net from Operations forecast of $23.8 million is largely attributed to projected Investment Income.
# Ohio University

## Consolidated Sources Uses

For the Years Ending June 30, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 (Forecast)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>2010 Actual</th>
<th>2011 Actual</th>
<th>2012 Actual</th>
<th>April 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>303,352,545</td>
<td>331,064,132</td>
<td>347,313,985</td>
<td>381,951,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Investment Income</td>
<td>12,244,258</td>
<td>16,751,364</td>
<td>3,658,908</td>
<td>17,177,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Private Gifts, Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>16,007,904</td>
<td>16,014,639</td>
<td>21,143,411</td>
<td>12,321,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 State/Local/Other Government Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>10,392,481</td>
<td>11,519,837</td>
<td>10,985,179</td>
<td>9,160,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sponsored Programs (Federal)</td>
<td>65,715,628</td>
<td>81,783,020</td>
<td>71,896,569</td>
<td>64,217,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sponsored Programs (F&amp;A)</td>
<td>7,431,286</td>
<td>8,912,143</td>
<td>8,321,954</td>
<td>6,251,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 State Appropriations</td>
<td>150,724,662</td>
<td>141,257,564</td>
<td>142,834,049</td>
<td>120,758,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Federal Appropriations</td>
<td>20,539,400</td>
<td>21,321,876</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Auxiliary Enterprise Sales &amp; Services</td>
<td>93,492,054</td>
<td>93,852,450</td>
<td>96,748,008</td>
<td>93,616,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sales &amp; Services</td>
<td>9,715,185</td>
<td>10,620,941</td>
<td>8,331,864</td>
<td>7,390,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ohio University Foundation</td>
<td>3,194,318</td>
<td>4,555,277</td>
<td>7,020,780</td>
<td>6,092,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Other Sources</td>
<td>30,583,626</td>
<td>42,716,733</td>
<td>15,377,340</td>
<td>9,055,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal In-Year Revenues</strong></td>
<td>723,393,347</td>
<td>780,369,977</td>
<td>733,632,047</td>
<td>727,992,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses of Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>771,137,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Salaries &amp; Wages (including benefits)</td>
<td>358,534,286</td>
<td>367,065,076</td>
<td>367,571,295</td>
<td>324,106,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Undergraduate Financial Aid</td>
<td>83,531,465</td>
<td>92,796,807</td>
<td>84,654,608</td>
<td>85,770,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Graduate Financial Aid</td>
<td>31,808,174</td>
<td>32,211,085</td>
<td>27,293,744</td>
<td>27,299,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 General Expense</td>
<td>52,948,049</td>
<td>52,059,563</td>
<td>55,878,339</td>
<td>49,674,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Professional Services</td>
<td>19,567,689</td>
<td>31,483,151</td>
<td>41,415,648</td>
<td>36,927,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Travel and Entertainment</td>
<td>14,917,458</td>
<td>13,984,764</td>
<td>15,816,049</td>
<td>12,359,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>23,366,463</td>
<td>23,074,855</td>
<td>28,265,836</td>
<td>15,910,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Utilities</td>
<td>15,866,417</td>
<td>15,586,460</td>
<td>15,519,113</td>
<td>12,449,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Interest Expense</td>
<td>7,797,543</td>
<td>7,275,033</td>
<td>6,130,158</td>
<td>2,951,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Ohio University Foundation</td>
<td>4,315,032</td>
<td>4,207,432</td>
<td>3,896,469</td>
<td>3,220,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Depreciation</td>
<td>34,502,716</td>
<td>34,197,262</td>
<td>31,942,012</td>
<td>28,443,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Other Expenses</td>
<td>48,212,392</td>
<td>36,384,355</td>
<td>35,547,988</td>
<td>28,926,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Transfers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Internal Fees for Goods/Services</td>
<td>(38,100,441)</td>
<td>(37,350,385)</td>
<td>(39,668,560)</td>
<td>(32,371,009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Budget Adjustments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>657,267,243</td>
<td>672,975,457</td>
<td>674,262,697</td>
<td>595,669,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net from Operations</strong></td>
<td>66,126,103</td>
<td>107,394,520</td>
<td>59,369,350</td>
<td>132,323,245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forecast

59,544,239
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>2010 Actual</th>
<th>2011 Actual</th>
<th>2012 Actual</th>
<th>April 2013</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>303,352,545</td>
<td>331,064,132</td>
<td>347,313,985</td>
<td>381,951,235</td>
<td>368,458,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Investment Income</td>
<td>12,198,038</td>
<td>16,693,520</td>
<td>3,658,881</td>
<td>17,177,058</td>
<td>19,073,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Private Gifts, Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>104,995</td>
<td>53,348</td>
<td>61,292</td>
<td>70,789</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 State/Local/Other Government Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>872,491</td>
<td>756,524</td>
<td>940,307</td>
<td>3,255</td>
<td>500,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sponsored Programs (Federal)</td>
<td>106,967</td>
<td>93,122</td>
<td>86,668</td>
<td>(42,757)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sponsored Programs (F&amp;A)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 State Appropriations</td>
<td>124,883,377</td>
<td>126,841,614</td>
<td>131,818,294</td>
<td>113,560,100</td>
<td>136,428,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Federal Appropriations</td>
<td>20,539,400</td>
<td>21,321,876</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Auxiliary Enterprise Sales &amp; Services</td>
<td>93,492,054</td>
<td>93,852,450</td>
<td>96,748,008</td>
<td>93,616,525</td>
<td>98,348,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sales &amp; Services</td>
<td>9,692,398</td>
<td>10,598,154</td>
<td>8,301,532</td>
<td>7,390,143</td>
<td>8,872,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ohio University Foundation</td>
<td>3,194,318</td>
<td>4,555,277</td>
<td>7,020,780</td>
<td>6,092,815</td>
<td>7,308,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Other Sources</td>
<td>16,366,349</td>
<td>42,713,379</td>
<td>15,821,839</td>
<td>9,677,048</td>
<td>15,181,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal In-Year Revenues</strong></td>
<td>584,802,933</td>
<td>648,543,397</td>
<td>611,771,586</td>
<td>629,496,210</td>
<td>654,172,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses of Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Salaries &amp; Wages (including benefits)</td>
<td>328,988,385</td>
<td>335,346,785</td>
<td>337,626,681</td>
<td>299,434,625</td>
<td>348,269,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Undergraduate Financial Aid</td>
<td>38,191,600</td>
<td>37,466,476</td>
<td>36,665,977</td>
<td>38,571,298</td>
<td>39,455,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Graduate Financial Aid</td>
<td>30,575,340</td>
<td>30,673,961</td>
<td>26,269,788</td>
<td>25,004,843</td>
<td>27,967,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 General Expense</td>
<td>48,086,811</td>
<td>47,617,492</td>
<td>51,697,086</td>
<td>46,109,379</td>
<td>53,852,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Professional Services</td>
<td>17,026,605</td>
<td>28,878,549</td>
<td>38,727,641</td>
<td>34,106,371</td>
<td>47,427,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Travel and Entertainment</td>
<td>12,496,999</td>
<td>11,508,013</td>
<td>13,631,100</td>
<td>10,875,916</td>
<td>13,385,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>15,414,533</td>
<td>16,494,691</td>
<td>17,552,003</td>
<td>14,354,476</td>
<td>17,315,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Utilities</td>
<td>15,772,437</td>
<td>15,468,035</td>
<td>15,386,876</td>
<td>12,346,126</td>
<td>16,597,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Interest Expense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Depreciation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Other Expenses</td>
<td>29,875,530</td>
<td>29,348,601</td>
<td>30,723,575</td>
<td>23,456,604</td>
<td>29,647,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Transfers</td>
<td>57,909,093</td>
<td>54,264,449</td>
<td>52,359,444</td>
<td>53,261,637</td>
<td>61,913,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Internal Fees for Goods/Services</td>
<td>(38,096,265)</td>
<td>(37,345,923)</td>
<td>(39,665,760)</td>
<td>(32,371,009)</td>
<td>(40,032,926)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Budget Adjustments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>560,556,099</td>
<td>573,928,562</td>
<td>584,870,881</td>
<td>528,370,815</td>
<td>619,663,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net from Operations</strong></td>
<td>24,246,833</td>
<td>74,614,835</td>
<td>26,900,705</td>
<td>101,125,395</td>
<td>34,508,248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ohio University

**Consolidated Restricted Sources Uses**

For the Years Ending June 30, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 (Forecast)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>2010 Actual</th>
<th>2011 Actual</th>
<th>2012 Actual</th>
<th>April 2013</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Investment Income</td>
<td>46,219</td>
<td>57,845</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Private Gifts, Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>15,902,909</td>
<td>15,961,291</td>
<td>21,082,119</td>
<td>12,250,504</td>
<td>17,565,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 State/Local/Other Government Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>9,519,989</td>
<td>10,763,312</td>
<td>10,044,872</td>
<td>9,157,680</td>
<td>11,313,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sponsored Programs (Federal)</td>
<td>65,608,661</td>
<td>81,689,898</td>
<td>71,809,901</td>
<td>64,260,070</td>
<td>70,683,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sponsored Programs (F&amp;A)</td>
<td>7,431,286</td>
<td>8,912,143</td>
<td>8,321,954</td>
<td>6,251,372</td>
<td>6,911,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 State Appropriations</td>
<td>25,841,285</td>
<td>14,415,950</td>
<td>11,015,755</td>
<td>7,198,593</td>
<td>10,490,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Federal Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Auxiliary Enterprise Sales &amp; Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sales &amp; Services</td>
<td>22,787</td>
<td>22,787</td>
<td>30,332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ohio University Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Other Sources</td>
<td>14,217,277</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td>(444,499)</td>
<td>(621,828)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal In-Year Revenues</strong></td>
<td>138,590,414</td>
<td>131,826,580</td>
<td>121,860,461</td>
<td>98,496,446</td>
<td>116,965,027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses of Resources</th>
<th>2010 Actual</th>
<th>2011 Actual</th>
<th>2012 Actual</th>
<th>April 2013</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 Salaries &amp; Wages (including benefits)</td>
<td>29,545,901</td>
<td>31,718,291</td>
<td>29,944,614</td>
<td>24,671,811</td>
<td>29,965,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Undergraduate Financial Aid</td>
<td>45,339,866</td>
<td>55,330,331</td>
<td>47,988,631</td>
<td>47,198,772</td>
<td>50,012,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Graduate Financial Aid</td>
<td>1,232,834</td>
<td>1,537,124</td>
<td>1,023,956</td>
<td>2,294,615</td>
<td>2,510,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 General Expense</td>
<td>4,861,237</td>
<td>4,442,071</td>
<td>4,181,253</td>
<td>3,565,461</td>
<td>4,278,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Professional Services</td>
<td>2,541,084</td>
<td>2,604,601</td>
<td>2,688,007</td>
<td>2,821,373</td>
<td>3,385,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Travel and Entertainment</td>
<td>2,420,459</td>
<td>2,476,751</td>
<td>2,184,948</td>
<td>1,483,486</td>
<td>1,785,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>7,951,930</td>
<td>6,580,164</td>
<td>10,713,833</td>
<td>1,555,871</td>
<td>10,974,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Utilities</td>
<td>93,980</td>
<td>118,425</td>
<td>132,236</td>
<td>103,724</td>
<td>124,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Interest Expense</td>
<td>7,797,543</td>
<td>7,275,033</td>
<td>6,130,158</td>
<td>2,951,854</td>
<td>8,743,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Ohio University Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Depreciation</td>
<td>34,502,716</td>
<td>34,197,262</td>
<td>31,942,012</td>
<td>28,443,212</td>
<td>34,131,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Other Expenses</td>
<td>18,336,863</td>
<td>7,035,754</td>
<td>4,824,413</td>
<td>5,470,054</td>
<td>7,929,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Transfers</td>
<td>(57,909,093)</td>
<td>(54,264,449)</td>
<td>(52,359,444)</td>
<td>(53,261,637)</td>
<td>(61,913,964)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Internal Fees for Goods/Services</td>
<td>(4,176)</td>
<td>(4,463)</td>
<td>(2,800)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Budget Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>96,711,144</td>
<td>99,046,895</td>
<td>89,391,816</td>
<td>67,298,596</td>
<td>91,929,036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Net from Operations                           | 41,879,270  | 32,779,685  | 32,468,645  | 31,197,850 | 25,035,991 |
WHEREAS, the appropriate planning and consultation has been completed within the University, resulting in recommendations for budget priorities, and

WHEREAS, the University has adopted a new all-funds budgeting approach that shows a more comprehensive view of resource generation and allocation, and

WHEREAS, the University has developed a balanced budget consistent with the provisions of the state budget.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Fiscal Year 2013-2014 budgets of the expected resources and expenditures for the Athens Campus, Auxiliary Operations, Regional Campuses, and the Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine as presented on the attached schedule are hereby approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The Vice President of Finance and Administration, in conjunction with the Executive Vice President and Provost and with approval of the President, is authorized to make adjustments in instructional and general operating expense allocations during the fiscal year to ensure the total does not exceed available unrestricted resources;
2. Expenditures for restricted funds shall be limited to the resources generated.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees authorizes the President, with the approval of the Chair of the Board, to make adjustments to the budget as presented to reflect any changes in state appropriations.
## Exhibit A: Proposed University Budget (All Funds)

### ALL FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th>ATHENS COLLEGES &amp; SCHOOLS</th>
<th>COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE</th>
<th>REGIONAL CAMPUSES</th>
<th>SUBVENTION INVESTMENT POOL</th>
<th>AUXILIARIES</th>
<th>ACADEMIC SUPPORT UNITS</th>
<th>OHIO UNIVERSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>State Share of Instruction/Appropriations</td>
<td>102,026,197</td>
<td>11,655,235</td>
<td>23,928,380</td>
<td>1,842,299</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tuition &amp; Educational Fees (net of financial aid)</td>
<td>227,836,109</td>
<td>18,186,252</td>
<td>35,130,753</td>
<td>2,521,134</td>
<td>(625,858)</td>
<td>(45,766,991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Room &amp; Board</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80,149,148</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>33,499,805</td>
<td>17,352,093</td>
<td>1,185,966</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85,960</td>
<td>52,616,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Facilities &amp; Admin Costs Recovery</td>
<td>6,618,868</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>3,875,976</td>
<td>605,000</td>
<td>193,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,701,000</td>
<td>1,499,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Endowment Distributions</td>
<td>8,339,894</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>392,955</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>139,449</td>
<td>10,022,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other External Sales</td>
<td>4,037,100</td>
<td>1,962,845</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,163,777</td>
<td>22,406,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Subvention/Strategic Pool Allocation (12.5%)</td>
<td>(38,286,132)</td>
<td>(3,747,484)</td>
<td>(7,398,099)</td>
<td>49,433,714</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>348,195,817</td>
<td>46,388,941</td>
<td>54,540,456</td>
<td>58,297,147</td>
<td>96,613,076</td>
<td>40,918,720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Total Salaries, Wages, &amp; Other Payroll</td>
<td>151,366,042</td>
<td>26,252,428</td>
<td>34,837,354</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,170,064</td>
<td>80,301,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Total Benefits</td>
<td>38,367,286</td>
<td>8,031,860</td>
<td>9,766,601</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,641,166</td>
<td>28,604,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Supplies, Services, &amp; Capitalized Costs</td>
<td>56,687,592</td>
<td>10,905,606</td>
<td>10,224,182</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,973,606</td>
<td>56,446,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Internal Allocations &amp; Sales</td>
<td>(563,621)</td>
<td>(400,234)</td>
<td>177,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5,901,763)</td>
<td>3,470,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Academic Indirect Costs Allocations</td>
<td>16,549,725</td>
<td>663,276</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>168,678</td>
<td>(17,381,679)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Administrative Indirect Costs Allocations</td>
<td>74,842,297</td>
<td>5,496,239</td>
<td>12,688,657</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,074,066</td>
<td>(105,101,259)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>General Fee Indirect Costs Allocations</td>
<td>30,567,813</td>
<td>738,438</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3,329,139)</td>
<td>(27,977,112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Total Expenses, Allocations &amp; Indirect Costs</td>
<td>367,817,133</td>
<td>51,687,612</td>
<td>67,693,794</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66,796,679</td>
<td>18,363,441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 21        | Results of Operations                      | (19,621,316) | (5,298,670) | (13,153,338) | 58,297,147 | 29,816,397 | 22,555,279 | 72,595,499 |
| 118       | Provisions for Facility Renewal            | 265,000 | - | - | - | 11,832,293 | 1,556,410 | 13,653,703 |
| 119       | Provisions for Non-facility Renewal        | 550,000 | - | - | - | 139,117 | 171,915 | 861,032 |
| 120       | Transfers to (from) Plant Fund -- Project Related | 1,000,000 | - | - | - | 12,267,299 | 12,777,044 | 15,104,614 |
| 22        | Provisions for Replacement & Depreciation  | 1,815,000 | - | - | - | 24,238,709 | 3,565,640 | 29,619,349 |
| 23        | Debt Service                               | 2,446,949 | 925,252 | 266,050 | - | 5,439,126 | 17,231,376 | 26,308,753 |
| 24        | Non-Mandatory Transfers to (from) Operating Funds | (778,408) | - | 683,000 | - | 177,561 | 362,542 | 444,959 |
| 25        | Non-Mandatory Transfers to (from) Foundation Funds | (10,000) | - | - | - | (40,000) | (94,455) | (144,455) |
| 26        | Transfers to (from) Strategic Investment Pool | (26,107,404) | (6,223,922) | (14,102,388) | 46,433,714 | - | - | (0) |
| 27        | Transfers to (from) Operations             | (26,895,812) | (6,223,922) | (13,419,388) | 46,433,714 | 137,561 | 268,087 | 300,240 |

| 28        | Total Funding Transfers                     | (22,633,863) | (5,298,670) | (13,153,338) | 46,433,714 | 29,815,396 | 21,065,103 | 56,228,341 |
| 29        | Total Expenses & Funding Transfers          | 345,183,270 | 46,388,941 | 54,540,456 | 46,433,714 | 96,612,075 | 39,428,543 | 628,587,000 |
| 30        | Net Results                                | 3,012,547 | - | - | 11,863,433 | 1,001 | 1,490,177 | 16,367,158 |
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Stephen T. Golding, Vice President for Finance and Administration, CFO and Treasurer

Re: FY 2014 Budget Resolution

During the June, 2013 Joint Committee meeting, the FY 2014 Budget will be discussed in greater detail.

A resolution to adopt the FY 2014 Operating Budget is included for consideration by the Resources Committee.
WHEREAS, the Ohio University 2013-2014 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 for purposes of investments in identified strategic priorities, and

WHEREAS, House Bill 59 allows the combined instructional and general fees for undergraduate students to increase by 2.0%, and

WHEREAS, the planning within the Athens Campus resulted in specific recommendations to combine rates for the Independent and Distance Learning programs into the eCampus Undergraduate program rate to create a single standard rate, to convert the rates for the Program for the Incarcerated to a similar hourly rate with a Specialized Services and Materials fee of $100 to cover paper materials and mailing, and to reduce the Specialized Services and Materials fee for the MBA Online program from $114 to $80 since course materials and textbooks will no longer be provided.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees adopts the 2013-14 Proposed Tuition Schedule - eCampus (Attachment A) and the reduction in the MBA Online program fee, effective Fall Semester 2013, unless otherwise noted.
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Stephen T. Golding, Vice President for Finance and Administration, CFO and Treasurer

Re: eLearning and Off-Campus Graduate Program Fees

The Board approved FY2014 tuition and fee resolutions at the April meeting. The resolution presented for approval at the June meeting provides for three updates, two of which are detailed on the rate schedule included which reflects existing program fees and the proposed, simplified eCampus schedule:

1. Combines Independent and Distance Learning into eCampus Undergraduate Programs resulting in a single standard rate, and
2. Converts the rates for the Program for the Incarcerated to an hourly Correctional Education rate which includes a Specialized Services / Materials fee.

The resolution also reduces the Specialized Services / Materials fee for the MBA Online program since materials will no longer be provided.
# Existing Rates

## eLearning and Off-Campus Graduate Programs
### Per Credit Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th>Instructional Fee</th>
<th>General Fee</th>
<th>Program Fee</th>
<th>Special Svcs/ Materials Fee</th>
<th>Ohio Resident Total</th>
<th>Non-Resident Fee</th>
<th>Out-of-State Resident Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eCampus Undergraduate Programs*</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Independent and Distance Learning
### Per Credit Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Instructional Fee</th>
<th>General Fee</th>
<th>Program Fee</th>
<th>Special Svcs/ Materials Fee</th>
<th>Ohio Resident Total</th>
<th>Non-Resident Fee</th>
<th>Out-of-State Resident Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Credit by Examination (CCE)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Study Portfolio</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Study Online</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence Courses (COR)</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## College Program for the Incarcerated
### Per Credit Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Fee</th>
<th>Instructional Fee</th>
<th>General Fee</th>
<th>Program Fee</th>
<th>Special Svcs/ Materials Fee</th>
<th>Ohio Resident Total</th>
<th>Non-Resident Fee</th>
<th>Out-of-State Resident Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-8 Hours</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11 Hours</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14 Hours</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17 Hours</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20 Hours</td>
<td>4,518</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,518</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Proposed Rates

## Attachment A

## OHIO UNIVERSITY

### 2013-14 Proposed Tuition Schedule - eCampus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th>Instructional Fee</th>
<th>General Fee</th>
<th>Program Fee</th>
<th>Special Svcs/ Materials Fee</th>
<th>Ohio Resident Total</th>
<th>Non-Resident Fee</th>
<th>Out-of-State Resident Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eCampus Undergraduate Programs*</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Education</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Correspondence, Independent Study, Course Credit by Exam
WHEREAS, pursuant to Board of Trustees Resolution 1983-679, Ohio University committed to participation in the salary reduction employer pickup plan of employee contributions for both the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System (OPERS) and State Teachers Retirement System (STRS) at percentages authorized by Ohio Revised Code Sections 145.47 and 3307.26, respectively; and

WHEREAS, effective, July 1, 2013, Ohio University desires to continue to pickup and pay the total amount of employee contributions, at the rate in effect, pursuant to the statutes referenced above;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the President is authorized to continue to implement the pickup of the employees’ contributions to the OPERS and STRS for all eligible employees at the percentage rates authorized by law.
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Stephen T. Golding, Vice President for Finance and Administration, CFO and Treasurer

Re: Consent Agenda Item – Ohio Public Employee Retirement System (OPERS) and State Teachers Retirement System (STRS) Rate Resolution

In 1983, Ohio University committed to participate in the salary reduction employer pickup plan for employee contributions to OPERS and STRS. This action was approved pursuant to Board of Trustees Resolution 1983-679.

Resolution 1983-679 reflected the effective contribution rate at that time. Employee contribution rates have since increased and there is a need to update the language in resolution 1983-679. This will bring the plan into compliance with current and future rate requirements.

This resolution simply ties the contribution rate to the Ohio Revised Code Sections that authorize the contribution rates by which employers must withhold as part of the pickup plan.

Employer pickup is defined by OPERS and STRS as the amount by which individual members’ (university employee) salary is reduced by the amount of the member retirement contributions. The employer then pays the contributions to OPERS or STRS. This form of pickup does not require any additional cash to be paid by the employer and the member receives the benefit of reduced gross income for state and federal purposes.

By adopting a plan that covers the statutory rate in effect, Ohio University will not be required to adopt an updated plan each year the employee contribution rate changes.

If you have any questions related to this resolution prior to the board meeting please let me know.
GUARANTEED TUITION

RESOLUTION 2013 --

WHEREAS, public universities have become increasingly tuition dependent as state support has declined in order to maintain their quality and cover their critical costs, and

WHEREAS, annual tuition increases are not a sustainable business model as student and family budgets are constrained and these increases represent a compounded impact; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees directed senior leadership to investigate alternative tuition models that would break the cycle of annual increases while maintaining the quality of the institution; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees and the university community have substantively engaged in a discussion of the merits of a guaranteed tuition model during the AY 2012-2013 year; and

WHEREAS, a guaranteed tuition model offers an opportunity for transparency in budget planning for students and parents, a financial incentive for timely graduation, the potential to reduce student debt upon graduation, and the opportunity to enhance student recruitment while providing predictability in tuition revenues.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees adopts the OHIO tuition guarantee program as outlined in Sub. H.B. No. 59 with the condition that it is approved by the Ohio Legislature and signed into law by Governor John Kasich. The Board of Trustees approves the general parameters and guidelines presented at this meeting and directs senior leadership to take all steps necessary for implementation of a tuition guarantee program including approval by the Board of Regents no later than the Fall of 2015 and earlier if possible. The Board also requests that senior leadership provide periodic updates as to the progress towards achieving this goal.
Interoffice Communication

Date:       June 3, 2013

To:         The President and Board of Trustees

From:       Stephen T. Golding, Vice President for Finance and Administration, CFO and Treasurer

Re:         Guaranteed Tuition Resolution

During the June, 2013 Joint Committee meeting, the OHIO Guaranteed Tuition Program will be discussed in greater detail.

A resolution to adopt the OHIO tuition guarantee program as outlined in Sub. H.B. 59 is included for consideration by the Resources Committee.
APPROVAL OF THE OHIO UNIVERSITY
FY2014 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

RESOLUTION 2013 ---

WHEREAS, the University has undertaken the development of a FY2014 Capital Improvement Plan, and

WHEREAS, this FY2014 Capital Improvement Plan has been developed in the context of the Board of Trustees approved FY 2013-FY 2018 Six Year Capital Improvement Plan and embodies the concepts incorporated within it, and

WHEREAS, the priorities of the Deans and Vice Presidents have been considered, and their endorsement of the plan given, and

WHEREAS, the Capital Funding and Priorities Committee has approved and made recommendation to the President, and

WHEREAS, the FY2014 Capital Improvement Plan has been approved by the President.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does hereby approve the attached FY2014 Capital Improvement Plan.
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Stephen T. Golding, Vice President for Finance and Administration, CFO and Treasurer

Re: FY 2014 Capital Improvement Plan

INTRODUCTION

The University has committed to the Board of Trustees to provide an annual capital improvement plan update annually. Enclosed please find the FY 2014 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for approval by the Board of Trustees at its June 2013 meeting. This plan outlines the substantial capital commitments and corresponding fund sources by type that are anticipated to be committed in the upcoming fiscal year. Overall capital activity is shown at $329.37 million, with the majority of funds sourced by debt at $252.4 million.

The FY 2014 CIP builds upon the previously approved FY 2012 and FY 2013 Capital Improvement Plans and continues our commitment to address the University’s deferred maintenance backlog where possible. The FY 2014 CIP is also informed by a number of challenges which have been previously discussed:

- Housing stock which offers stale options and is deteriorating faster than it can be rehabilitated
- The coal fired heating plant which is near the end of its useful life and will be out of regulatory compliance
- Development of swing space which is a dynamic process and can be disruptive to teaching and research
- Sporadic recent history for biennial capital bills and appropriation amounts from the state – The University will utilize future state appropriations for deferred maintenance needs

FY2014 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Based on these challenges, the FY 2014 CIP will accomplish the following:

- **Addresses top academic program needs:** This is a robust plan with academic program expansion and improvement of academic facilities at the heart of it.
  - Planning and programming – Seigfried rehabilitation, Clippinger replacement building, College of Business expansion, and Multi-phase Corrosion Center expansion.
  - Design is proposed for the Second Phase of the Scripps College Consolidation, the McCracken Rehabilitation and Addition, the Patton Arts and Education facility and the OUHCOM Cleveland project.
  - Construction and renovation continues with OUHCOM Dublin Facilities Renovations and the Multi-purpose Center Pavilion. Additional renovation and construction is anticipated with Health Science Facilities in both Dublin and Athens.
• **Utilizes debt issuance for major rehabilitation of general fund buildings that will include programmatic reconfiguration:** Debt funding is a major resource in the funding of almost all projects noted above. In some case debt is utilized to bridge anticipated committed gifts.

• **Utilizes anticipated state appropriations to provide projects to adequately keep up our newer general fund buildings and tackle deferred maintenance projects in our older general fund buildings.** $18.6 million was appropriated for deferred maintenance projects on the Athens campus and $3.8 million was appropriated for deferred maintenance for the regional campuses in FY 2013 as a biennial allocation from the State of Ohio.

• **Utilizes swing space so we can vacate buildings and do a better job of upgrading systems.** Tupper Hall will become a general classroom building. Lindley Hall will be an office building with some classroom spaces.

• **Leverages gift and grant funding:** The Patton Arts and Education Center is expected to be fully funded by a generous gift. Gift funding is significant for the OUHCOM Dublin Facility Renovations, the Multi-Purpose Pavilion, the McCracken Rehabilitation and Addition, and College of Business Expansion. The airport auxiliary anticipates continued grant support from the Federal Aviation Administration.

• **Utilizes Residential Housing Auxiliary debt to upgrade housing stock and offer more options:** The first phase of construction continues forward in FY 2014 utilizing debt as the primary fund source. Other housing initiatives continue through the use of auxiliary reserves: another phase of renovation in Bromley Hall, roof replacements and deferred maintenance projects.

• **Utilizes Auxiliary Reserves:** The Culinary Services Auxiliary will continue improvement with another phase of renovation to the Central Food Facility and deferred maintenance projects as well.

• **Utilizes performance contracting to implement energy conservation measures with payment from central utility account over a 15 year payback period:** A two year performance contract project of $28.3 million value was launched last year and continues into FY 2014.

• **Implements Heating Plant Replacement strategy:** A final recommendation on approach to location, fuel, and engineering design will be presented to the Board Resource Committee in June at the same time this FY 2014 CIP will be presented. Various models to financing have been explored over the past several months and after exploring public/private partnership opportunities, the best approach to financing has been identified as utilizing University debt for most if not all of the project. The project has been shown as $100 million in previous plans; the refined plan is projects a much lower budget of $70 million for what is still a very efficient long term plan.

### FUTURE APPROVALS

Requests for approval of individual projects within the capital plan over a threshold of $500,000 total project cost will be presented to the Board of Trustees at the appropriate time and the specific amount of funding and sources will be verified at that time as well. Request for approval of necessary bond issuances to accomplish the plan will also be presented to the Board of Trustees for approval at future meetings.

A resolution is attached to facilitate Board of Trustees approval of the FY2014 Capital Improvement Plan. Please let me know if you have questions.
### FY14 Annual Capital Plan Update

#### June 2013

(Dollars in millions)

#### Beginning of Fiscal Year General Fund Back-log Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lausche Heating Plant Replacement</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Performance Contract</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Multi-Purpose Pavilion</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. OU-HCOM Dublin: Facility Renovations</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. College of Communication Phase 2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Health Sciences Facilities-Dublin</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lindley Hall Swing Space Renovation</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tupper Hall Swing Space Renovation</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Health Sciences Facilities-Athens</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Planning Funds for FY2014</td>
<td>See Below:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a. McCracken Hall Renovation and Addition Design</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b. Patton Arts and Education Facility Design</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c. OU-HCOM Facility Programming &amp; Design (Diabetes/OMNI)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10d. Clippinger Replacement Feasibility Study</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10e. Seigfried Programming</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10f. Ridges Master plan</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10g. College of Business Expansion Study</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10h. Multi-Phase Corrosion Center Office Study</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10i. OU-HCOM Cleveland Design</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Deferred Maintenance &quot;Keep-Up&quot; Projects: Athens</td>
<td>$16.8M</td>
<td>See Below:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a. West Green Roof Replacements</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b. Alden Library Repairs</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c. Clippinger/Accelerator Bldg. Roof Repairs</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11d. Convocation Center Roof/Ramp Repairs</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11e. Lindley Steam Piping Replacement (See item # 7 above)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11f. Memorial Auditorium Repairs</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11g. Exterior Painting/Woodwork Repair</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11h. Peden Concrete Restoration</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11i. Pruitt Field Turf Replacement</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11j. Campus Lighting Improvements</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11k. Cutler &amp; Wilson Halls Waterproofing</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11l. Campus Roadway Improvements</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11m. Stocker Air Handling Unit Replacements</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11n. Other Deferred Maintenance Projects under $500,000</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Fund Athens: Safety Projects</td>
<td>$1M</td>
<td>See Below:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a. Sidewalk and Stair Repairs</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b. Other Safety Projects</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. High Visibility Grounds Project, Athens Campus</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13a. College Green Gateways, Sidewalks, Amphitheater Rehab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13b. Emeriti Park Lighting, Pond Dredging, and Irrigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13c. Richland Avenue Sidewalks and Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13d. Lindley Park Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Deferred Maintenance Projects: Regionals</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a. Shoemaker Center Repairs, Chillicothe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b. Shannon Hall Renovations, Eastern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14c. Herrold Hall Renovations, Lancaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14d. Deferred Maintenance &quot;Keep-Up&quot; projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Residential Housing</td>
<td>See Below:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a. Housing Development Phase 1</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not GF</td>
<td>Not GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b. Bromley Renovations (Final Phase)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not GF</td>
<td>Not GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c. Roof Replacements</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not GF</td>
<td>Not GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15d. Minor Capital Deferred Maintenance Projects</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
<td>Keep-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Auxiliaries</td>
<td>See Below:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a. Central Food Facility Renovation-Phase 4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not GF</td>
<td>Not GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16b. Minor Capital Projects</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not GF</td>
<td>Not GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16c. Airport: Runway Rehabilitation</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not GF</td>
<td>Not GF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total FY 2014 Capital Activity**: $329.37

O & M: $252.4

State Capital: $24.0

Public Grants: $24.5

Private Grants: $8.0

Deferred Maintenance Reduction: $13.8

Not GF: 24.3
FY 2014 Annual Capital Improvement Plan

- Context of FY2013-FY2018 Six Year Capital Plan, Board Approved November 2011
- Academic program driven
- Deferred Maintenance strategy
- $329.37 million total capital activity
- $252.4 million sourced by University debt
FY 2014 Annual Capital Improvement Plan

- FY2012 & FY2013 projects completed
  - 31 S. Court Street lease upfit
  - Bromley academic relocations
  - Chilled Water Expansion
  - Softball Lighting
  - Safety Projects

- FY2012 & FY2013 projects near completion
  - Peden Turf Replacement
  - Scripps College Consolidation, Phase I
  - Galbreath Chapel Rehabilitation
  - Bush Hall Rehabilitation
  - Nelson Commons, Phase II
  - Safety Projects
FY 2014 Annual Capital Improvement Plan

- Academic Program Challenges
  - Classroom buildings in strong need of rehabilitation
  - Today’s academic teaching models require more space than the standard classroom model
  - Number and size of Academic Programs have expanded
  - Increased demand for research and collaboration spaces
  - Lack of move-in ready space for immediate program expansion needs
  - 450,000 gsf inactive and poorly organized storage space would take significant investment to meet academic program needs

FY 2014 Capital Improvement Plan

- Difficult challenges
  - State appropriation skipped; last Capital Bill was 75% of previous
  - Deferred maintenance continues to grow
  - Housing stock does not offer amenities and configurations students want
  - Coal fired heating plant is at the end of its useful life and future regulations will be stringent
  - Disrepair is noticed by our students, faculty and staff
  - Building failures occur before planned solutions can be implemented
  - Both failures and construction disrupt daily activities
FY 2014 Capital Improvement Plan

- Addresses top academic program needs
- Utilizes debt for major rehabilitation of buildings
- Utilizes state appropriations for deferred maintenance
- Utilizes phasing and swing space
- Leverages gift and grant funding
- Utilizes Residential Housing Auxiliary debt to replace and upgrade housing stock
- Utilizes various Auxiliary reserves
- Utilizes performance contracting
- Employees heating plant replacement strategy

FY14 Annual Capital Plan Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year 2014: Capital Projects</th>
<th>Projected Budget</th>
<th>Debt</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>O &amp; M</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Gifts</th>
<th>Reserve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Leasehold Heating Plant Replacement</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Performance Contract</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Multi-Purpose Pavilion</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 O’HCOM Dublin: Facility Renovations</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 College of Communication Phase 2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Health Sciences Facilities-Ostlin</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Lindsey Hall Swing Space Renovation</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Tupper Hall Swing Space Renovation</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Health Sciences Facilities-Ostlin</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Planning Funds for FY2014</td>
<td>See Below</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional FY14 Projects on next slide.
### FY14 Annual Capital Plan Update

#### Fiscal Year 2014: Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Estimated Budget</th>
<th>Debt</th>
<th>State Capital</th>
<th>O &amp; M</th>
<th>Public Private</th>
<th>Office Searches</th>
<th>Deferred Maintenance Reimbursement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11a. West Green Roof Replacements</td>
<td>$1.1M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b. Adair Library Repairs</td>
<td>$2.7M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c. Clippinger/Knowles Hall Roof Repairs</td>
<td>$0.56M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11d. Conservation Center Roof Repairs</td>
<td>$1.5M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11e. Lindley Library Roof Replacement (Low Bldg. #7 Areas)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11f. Memorial Auditorium Repairs</td>
<td>$1.0M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11g. Fawcett Hall Interior Expense</td>
<td>$0.75M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11i. Moore Hall Interior</td>
<td>$0.75M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11j. Plant Field Turf Replacement</td>
<td>$1.0M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11l. Campus Lighting Improvements</td>
<td>$0.9M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11k. Caller &amp; Visitor Health Voltage Repair</td>
<td>$0.2M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11m. Campus Security Improvements</td>
<td>$1.0M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11n. Stocker Air Handling Unit Replacements</td>
<td>$3.0M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. General Fund projects: Safety Projects</td>
<td>$1.0M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a. Sidewalk and Wall Repairs</td>
<td>$0.0M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b. Other Safety Projects</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. High Visibility Grounds Projects, Athens Campus</td>
<td>$2.6M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13a. College Green Sidewalk, Pavement, Sprinklers &amp; Irrigation</td>
<td>$0.9M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13b. Emerit Fencing, Foot Detouring, and Irrigation</td>
<td>$0.9M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13c. Off Hours Sidewalks and Landscape</td>
<td>$0.9M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13d. Lindley Park Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$0.9M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kew-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional FY14 Projects on next slide...
FY 2014 Annual Capital Improvement Plan

- Projects over $500,000 will come back to the board for specific project approval
- Future debt issuances will come back to the board for specific approval
- Six Year Capital Plan Update in Fall 2013
- FY2015 Capital Improvement Plan next year
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Stephen T. Golding, Vice President for Finance and Administration, CFO and Treasurer

Re: LAUSCHE HEATING PLANT REPLACEMENT PLAN

Background:
In November of 2011, university staff and RMF Engineering presented the findings and recommendations of a university committee charged with planning for the Lausche Heating Plant replacement. The replacement has been a main feature of the University’s six year capital plan and the FY2013 Capital Improvement Plan update. There are two main differences from the project’s original plan – 1) the estimated cost is now $70 million rather than $100 million, and 2) the current plan is to finance the project with university debt rather than private debt via a public/private partnership. Refined engineering and delivery method are the main reasons for the lower budget. A separate bond issue this fall is planned specifically for this project.

Objectives:
The University has committed to phase out the use of coal as part of its Climate Action Plan. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations are becoming more stringent and make the use of coal much more difficult and costly. At the same time, the University’s boiler system has met it useful life and needs replacement in any case. The campus needs a plant with a flexible design that can be utilized to mitigate changing utility cost structures and vulnerability during utility company outage events. The capacity of the plant needs to take into account the rehabilitation and growth plans for the campus as a whole. The heating plant replacement project provides a means to partner with other entities such as the City of Athens or our local hospital in providing and generating various utilities whether it be on a routine or back-up basis.

Design:
While the cost of utilizing coal is rising, cost of gas appears to be relatively stable in the near future. The cost of electricity is forecast to rise dramatically. In the next three years, capacity and transportation charges will likely double from the current $42 per megawatt cost. This would have a $5.5 million annual impact to the university. This utility climate leads to a plant design with natural gas as the primary fuel and the ability to generate electricity to supplement the University’s electrical power purchases.

The specific criteria design calls for natural gas as a primary fuel and diesel fuel as back-up. The design will be more than 85% efficient in converting natural gas to useful energy. The plant produces steam year round for both heating and cooling as needed. Annual change overs from a heating mode to a cooling mode and vice versa will no longer be necessary. The plant will also utilize waste heat from the steam generation process to produce electricity to help manage the University’s average peak demand and supplement electrical purchases. And of course, the plant design will achieve EPA compliance and reduce greenhouse emissions.
The plant will feature two gas combustion turbines and two heat recovery steam generators that generate steam from the turbine exhaust. The plant will have two new gas boilers, one steam chiller and one electrical chiller, and state-of-the-art heat exchangers.

**Location:**
As identified in the original study, the location for the Lausche Heating Plant Replacement is adjacent to the existing Lausche heating plant. The chief reason is to best utilize the existing campus wide steam and chilled water distribution system that leads back to this location. The location is also adjacent to the university’s electrical substation which will be synergistic with the electrical generation components of the project. The current plan will construct a new shop building within the existing Facilities compound to house the university’s Electrical Shop, Life Safety Shop, and Mechanical Services group. The building that now houses these shops and once served the University as a laundry building will be demolished. The demolition creates the site for the new plant. The existing Lausche building is planned to remain for possible future expansion of the plant and for possible use in clean coal technology research experiments, but the former plant will no longer be used to produce steam for the campus using coal.

**Delivery Method and Timeline:**
The project is planned to be implemented through a design/build process. RMF Engineering aided the University in developing a criteria specification. The Design/Build contractor selection process is a two-step process with first a Request for Qualifications followed by a Request for Proposal. Prospective firms are now responding to the Request for Qualifications. The Request for Proposal stage is planned to begin in August 2013. A Board of Trustee approval of the full project is planned for the October 2013 meeting with a contract award to follow shortly thereafter. The long term schedule calls for design to be completed in fall 2014 and construction completion by spring 2016.

**Action Requested:**
The University is requesting authority to commit and award contracts up to $5 million to provide preliminary utilities in preparation for the Lausche Heating Plant Replacement project. A resolution is provided to facilitate that approval.

Please contact me if you have questions.
Lausche Heating Plant Replacement Plan

- Presentation to Board November, 2011
- Feature of Six Year Capital Plan
- Feature of FY2013 and FY2014 annual capital updates
- $70 million budget; less than earlier projections
- Requires demolition and replacement of shop building
- Design/Build process
- Separate University Bond Issue planned Fall, 2013
Lausche Heating Plant Replacement Plan

OBJECTIVES

- Commitment to phase out use of coal
- Replace plant at the end of its useful life
- Meet EPA regulations & reduce greenhouse emissions
- Extremely efficient design
- Additional capacity for the future
- Flexibility to react to changes in future utilities
- Reduced vulnerability to utility company outages
- Partnership opportunities for primary & back-up utilities
Lausche Heating Plant Replacement Plan

FUTURE OF UTILITIES

- Environmental restrictions and rising cost of coal will make coal use less cost effective
- Gas supplies appear to be stable into the near future
- Electricity cost will increase dramatically in next 3 years
  - Capacity & transportation charges could double from the existing $42 per megawatt cost
  - Could be a $5.5 million increase for OU annually
- Co-generation to level out OU’s demand can offset this increase
Lausche Heating Plant Replacement Plan

DESIGN
- Plant uses gas as primary fuel
  - Steam for heating and cooling
  - Electricity to supplement purchases and level OU’s demand
- Eliminates annual change overs from heating to cooling
- New plant will be more than 85% efficient in converting natural gas to useful energy

Lausche Heating Plant Replacement Plan

COMPONENTS
- Two gas combustion turbines generate electricity and exhaust heat
- Two heat recovery steam generators generate steam from the turbine exhaust
- Two new gas boilers
- Steam chiller and electrical chiller
- State of the art heat exchangers
- Diesel storage for secondary fuel
Lausche Heating Plant Replacement Plan

TIMELINE AND DELIVERY METHOD

- Design/Build delivery method
  - Request for qualifications for contractors: May, 2013
  - Request for proposals from contractors: August, 2013
  - Board of Trustee project approval: October, 2013
  - Contract Award: November, 2013
  - Design Completed: Fall, 2014
  - Construction Complete: Spring, 2016
APPROVAL OF PROJECT AND AUTHORIZATION TO DEVELOP CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS, RECEIVE BIDS AND AWARD CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS FOR HANING HALL NEW ELEVATOR and LAUSCHE HEATING PLANT REPLACEMENT PRELIMINARY INFRASTRUCTURE

RESOLUTION 2013-

WHEREAS, two capital projects have been planned, developed and funded as follows:

- Haning Hall New Elevator with a total project budget of $500,000 to be funded by state appropriations, and

- Lausche Heating Plant Replacement Preliminary Infrastructure with a total project budget of $5 million. Funding from University reserves will be reimbursed from a university bond issuance.

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 contracts within the total project budgets identified.
Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Stephen T. Golding, Vice President for Finance and Administration, CFO and Treasurer

Re: CONSTRUCTION PROJECT APPROVAL REQUEST:

- Haning Hall New Elevator
- Lausche Heating Plant Replacement Preliminary Infrastructure

The following construction projects in excess of $500,000 in total project cost are presented to the Board for project or budget revision approval. A resolution is provided that addresses these projects.

**Haning Hall New Elevator:**
Haning Hall is a 1906 former Post Office Building on West Union Street that currently houses the Lifelong and Distance Learning programs. The building does not currently have an elevator and this presents a major accessibility issue. This project will add an elevator to the building within the existing footprint. The total project budget is $500,000 and is funded from state appropriations.

**Lausche Heating Plant Replacement Preliminary Infrastructure:**
The Lausche Heating Plant Replacement Plan will be the subject of a major presentation at the June 2013 Board Resources Committee meeting. The University is seeking approval at this time to commit and award contracts up to $5 million for necessary preliminary infrastructure. The full project is estimated at $70 million and will be presented to the Board of Trustees at the October 2013 meeting. A specific university bond issuance is the planned fund source for this project. The $5 million currently requested for preliminary infrastructure will be initially funded by University reserved which will be reimbursed from the bond issue proceeds.

A resolution is included to facilitate approval. Please let me know if you have questions.
Construction Projects

Tab

Construction Projects Agenda

- Haning Hall New Elevator
- Lausche Heating Plant Replacement
- Preliminary Infrastructure
Haning Hall New Elevator

- 1906 former Post Office building has no elevator
- Major accessibility issue
- Building houses Lifelong and Distance Learning programs
- Budget: $ 500,000
- Fund source: State Appropriations

Lausche Heating Plant Replacement
Preliminary Infrastructure

- Preliminary infrastructure work only
- Total project budget to be considered for Board approval in October, 2013
- Budget: $ 5 million
- Fund source: University Reserves
  - to be reimbursed by University bond issuance
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Stephen T. Golding, Vice President for Finance and Administration, CFO and Treasurer

Re: Series 2013 Debt Issuance

The University priced a $145 million tax-exempt bond issue on May 22, 2013. Barclays served as book-running senior manager, with Goldman Sachs as co-senior. Huntington, Rice Financial and PNC Capital Markets rounded out the selling group as co-managers. The bonds were structured as “net premium” bonds and generated $161 mm in proceeds, which were used as follows: a) $121 mm for new campus projects; b) $25 mm to refinance the Series 2004 Bonds, achieving $1.9 mm in debt service savings; and c) $14 mm to restructure the Series 2001 Bonds, including the associated swap termination.

The bond issue was structured with a final maturity of December 1, 2043. The new money portions of the bonds were issued as 30-year debt while the refinanced bonds matched their original final maturities. Overall, the Bonds achieved an “all-in true interest cost” of 3.91%. By netting out the refunding portion of the bonds to analyze the cost of the 30-year new money debt on a stand-alone basis, this portion of the financing achieved an all-in cost of 3.95%.

In addition, the University’s credit ratings of “Aa3/A+” with a stable outlook were reaffirmed by Moody’s and Standard and Poor’s, respectively. Both rating agencies lauded the Board of Trustees’ involvement in the debt planning process. For example, Moody’s wrote in their report “We consider it a credit positive that management and the board of trustees carefully reviewed the six-year capital plan in FY2013 before issuance of Series 2013 and reduced the overall plan and borrowing amount. Management indicated they will continue to review each capital phase and the university’s financial position carefully before proceeding to issue new debt.” Standard and Poor’s cited “The stable outlook anticipates OU’s continued favorable enrollment and demand trend, positive financial results, and strong governance and management that we believe will prudently guide the institution through its CIP and successfully attend to other important university objectives under constrained resources without jeopardizing the credit rating by incurring excessive amounts of additional debt.”

The Bond issue is scheduled to close on June 5, 2013.
Summary

- $145,710,000 Series 2013 Bonds Priced on May 22nd
  - Net premium bonds generated $161 mm in proceeds:
    - $121 million financed new campus projects
    - $25 million refinanced the Series 2004 Bonds for debt service savings
    - $14 million restructured the Series 2001 Bonds, including associated swap termination
  - Bond ratings of “Aa3/A+” with a stable outlook reaffirmed by Moody’s and Standard & Poor’s, respectively
  - Tax-Exempt, 30-year final maturity, 10-year call
  - All-in True Interest Cost of 3.91%
  - Costs of issuance represented 0.5% of total proceeds
New Money Highlights

- $121 mm borrowed to finance various campus projects (see next slide for breakdown)
- Despite a weaker market at pricing, All-In True Interest Cost Achieved of 3.95%
- Average annual debt service of $6.9 million, paid over a 30-year basis
- Structured with a 10-year call feature to maintain future flexibility
## New Money Projects Financed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Series 2013 Debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OU Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine – Dublin</td>
<td>$9,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine – Cleveland</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindley Hall Upfit</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tupper Hall Upfit</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoonover Center for Communication – Phase II</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCracken Hall Renovation</td>
<td>$4,126,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUHCOM Diabetes/Omni Programming and Schematic Design</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming and Feasibility Studies</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Development – Phase I</td>
<td>$67,199,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Multi-Purpose Facility &amp; Other Recreational Athletic Fac.</td>
<td>$10,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$120,976,310</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Refunding of Series 2004

- $25 mm in proceeds retired the Series 2004 Bond issue
- Present value savings achieved of $1.9 million, representing 7.8% of bonds refunded
  - Savings are realized over an 18-year timeframe
- Amortization of this component of the borrowing structured to match the final original maturity of the Series 2004 Bonds
Restructuring of Series 2001

- $14 mm in proceeds retired the Series 2001 Bond issue
- Bonds restructured from variable rate mode backed by a Dexia liquidity facility to a traditional fixed rate mode
  - Dexia liquidity agreement terminated
  - Associated swap terminated at a cost of $1.4 mm
- Benefits of restructuring included:
  - Elimination of bank credit risk associated with liquidity facility (Dexia’s ratings downgrade increased OU’s interest costs significantly)
  - Fixed rate mode locked in for life of issue at a period of historically low rates; no need for future restructurings that would incur additional legal bills and pricing uncertainties with respect to expiration of liquidity facilities, which typically have only a 1-3 year term
  - Expected interest savings over life of bond issue at least $68,000*

*This number excludes future legal costs, any interest rate increases associated with bank credit risk, and potential increases in liquidity facility costs.
Questions/Feedback?
WHEREAS, OhioHealth Corporation (OhioHealth) has provided steadfast support for Ohio University’s efforts to expand the educational reach of its Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine to central Ohio, and

WHEREAS, OU-HCOM, with OhioHealth as its preeminent healthcare partner, will embark on an educational enterprise—increasing the numbers of primary care physicians that will ultimately serve the healthcare needs of the citizens of Ohio, and

WHEREAS, OhioHealth has provided a generous gift that has aided in the development of the Ohio University Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine central Ohio extension campus, and

WHEREAS, this commitment from OhioHealth as OU-HCOM’s preeminent partner, is necessary for the establishment of the OU-HCOM central Ohio extension campus and represents a substantial shared commitment to the future of health care in the region that reflects the shared missions of service and dedication to the future of health care in Ohio by OhioHealth and Ohio University, and

WHEREAS, this gift will influence the Ohio University for many years as it seeks to transform the healthcare and medical education landscape of central Ohio.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the buildings at 7001 and 7003 Post Road, Dublin, Ohio, will henceforth be named, respectively, OhioHealth Medical Education Building 2 and OhioHealth Medical Education Building 1.
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Stephen T. Golding, Vice President for Finance and Administration, CFO and Treasurer

Re: NAMING OF 7001 AND 7003 POST ROAD, DUBLIN
OHIOHEALTH MEDICAL EDUCATION BUILDING 1 and
OHIOHEALTH MEDICAL EDUCATION BUILDING 2

Ohio University is committed to delivering a student-centered experience that promotes the welfare of the communities it serves. Ohio University recognizes that the development of a medical extension campus in Dublin, Ohio will further the institution’s educational, research and service goals. The Ohio University Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine’s central Ohio extension campus will result in partnerships and synergies that will benefit Ohio University, medical students, and central Ohio citizens by increasing the numbers of physicians trained for service to the state and by emphasizing the training of primary care physicians.

In December 2012, OU-HCOM received approval from the Commission on Osteopathic College Accreditation (COCA) to move forward with plans for the new campus, which will be located at 7001, 7002, and 7003 Post Road in Dublin, Ohio. The campus will open in 2014 with an inaugural class of 50 students. The approval from COCA to move forward on the central Ohio extension campus marks a milestone for one of the major initiatives identified in the historic $105 million gift from the Osteopathic Heritage Foundations to OU-HCOM in April 2011.

A gift to the Ohio University Foundation has been made by OhioHealth Corporation (OhioHealth) to provide support for the development of the extension campus. The Gift Agreement between the Ohio University Foundation (on behalf of Ohio University) and OhioHealth provides naming rights to OhioHealth for buildings located at 7001 and 7003 Post Road, Dublin Ohio, subject to approval by the Ohio University Board of Trustees and in accordance with the Ohio University Naming Policy.

This commitment from OhioHealth as OU-HCOM’s preeminent partner is necessary for the establishment of the OU-HCOM central Ohio extension campus and represents a substantial shared commitment to the future of health care in the region that reflects the shared missions of service and dedication to the future of health care in Ohio by OhioHealth and Ohio University.
Therefore, in recognition of the generous gift from OhioHealth, the university recommends that the buildings at 7001 and 7003 Post Road, Dublin, Ohio be named, respectively, OhioHealth Medical Education Building 2 and OhioHealth Medical Education Building 1.

I have enclosed a resolution for the naming of these buildings for consideration by the Board of Trustees at their June meeting.

If I can be of further assistance or provide additional information regarding this matter, please contact me.
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Stephen T. Golding, Vice President for Finance and Administration, CFO and Treasurer

Re: University Dashboard Update

In September of 2011, the senior leadership of Ohio University developed a university dashboard that aligned with the 4x4 strategic plan. At that time, the trustees reviewed other ways in which boards tracked metrics for their institutions and the functions of dashboards. The dashboard was intended to provide an ‘at a glance view’ of the current institution, monitor performance toward strategic priorities, academic quality, and those indicators needed to fulfill the fiduciary responsibilities for trustees. The dashboard included indicators that provided trend data and comparative data when available.

The Academics Committee will be reviewing many of the academic quality dashboard indicators at their June meeting. The dashboard is included on the agenda for the Resources Committee as an information item.
### First-Year Retention
- **80.0%**
  - Percent of new freshman who return for a second year

### Six-Year Graduation Rates
- **65%**
  - Percentage of new freshman graduating at Ohio University within six years

### Degrees Granted
- **6,212**
  - Number of undergraduate degrees awarded

### ACT Composite
- **24.0**
  - Mean ACT score for new freshman

### Student-Faculty Interaction Rating
- **40.1 & 50.1**
  - National Survey of Student Engagement ratings of interaction with faculty

### Performance Of (number students) Past
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$54.7</td>
<td>$63.4</td>
<td>$57.4</td>
<td>$66.1</td>
<td>$67.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Undergraduate Headcount
- **22,685**
  - Athens headcount enrollment, full-time, includes online

### Average Faculty Compensation
- **$93.6 to $134.6 (in thousands)**
  - Mean Group I faculty salary and benefits for 2012/2013

### Research & Creative Activity Expo
- **652 Students**
  - Participation in research and creative activity expo

### Grants and Contracts
- **$67.2 million**
  - Amount of sponsored funding received in the form of grants and contracts from public and private sources

### Tuition Discount
- **19.2%**
  - The extent to which the University provides scholarship allowances to defray the cost of tuition and fees

### Primary Reserve Ratio
- **49.6%**
  - Expendable net assets as a percentage of total annual expenditures

### Debt Burden Ratio
- **3.3%**
  - One-year change in net assets as a percentage of total annual revenue

### Investment Performance
- **-0.2%**
  - Investment return on the University’s diversified pool which includes its endowments and a portion of working capital

### Deferred Maintenance Backlog
- **$80**
  - Dollar amount per square foot that our physical plant requires in order to eliminate deferred maintenance

### Student-Faculty Interaction Rating
- **40.1 & 50.1**
  - National Survey of Student Engagement ratings of interaction with faculty

### University Dashboard - Summer, 2013 Update
Campaign Priorities and Progress
## Campaign Progress

as of May 28, 2013 (*in THOUSANDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fiscal 2013</th>
<th>Campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Attainment*</td>
<td>$25,108</td>
<td>$424,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Giving*</td>
<td>$6,872</td>
<td>$190,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Proposals*</td>
<td>$10,082</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Proposals*</td>
<td>$11,603</td>
<td>$61,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits</td>
<td>2,177</td>
<td>10,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Prospects</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campaign Progress
by source as of May 28, 2013 (*in THOUSANDS)

- Alumni: $223,537
- Other Individuals: $19,593
- Corporations: $13,020
- Foundations: $149,718
- Other Organizations: $18,590
Campaign Progress
by designation as of May 28, 2013 (*in THOUSANDS)

- Academic Divisions: $174,795
- Athletics: $7,036
- Faculty and Staff: $62,395
- Library: $2,789
- Other Restricted: $33,999
- Physical Plant: $4,318
- Property: $77,126
- Public Service: $2,635
- Research: $3,328
- Student Aid: $50,314
- Unrestricted: $5,723
## Campaign Progress
by unit as of May 28, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College / Unit</th>
<th>Raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>$12.30 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>$11.19 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Fine Arts</td>
<td>$10.20 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health Sciences &amp; Professions</td>
<td>$4.39 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine</td>
<td>$134.05 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Tutorial College</td>
<td>$0.84 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patton College of Education</td>
<td>$37.62 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ College of Engineering &amp; Tech</td>
<td>$119.07 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripps College of Communications</td>
<td>$34.92 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>$1.03 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voinovich School</td>
<td>$0.45 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Campaign Progress
by unit as of May 28, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College / Unit</th>
<th>Raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center for International Studies</td>
<td>$2.63 Milion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>$19.25 Milion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>$2.89 Milion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>$1.59 Milion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chillicothe Campus</td>
<td>$0.78 Milion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Campus</td>
<td>$1.33 Milion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster Campus</td>
<td>$4.08 Milion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Campus</td>
<td>$1.04 Milion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanesville Campus</td>
<td>$0.63 Milion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alumni Demographics

General Information
General Information

- 201,557 Living Alumni
- 190,717 “reachable”
  - Good address
  - Domestic
General Information

Gender

Male, 96,363
Female, 105,056
General Information

Age

- 30s
- 40s
- 50s
- 60s
- 70s
- 80s
- 90s
- 20s
- 50s
Alumni Demographics

Degree Information
Degree Information

Degree Level

- Undergraduate, 165,373
- Masters, 38,522
- Doctorate, 7,368
- Associate, 15,078

Nearly 75% of alumni hold an undergraduate degree.
Degree Information
Decade

132,000 degrees awarded since 1990.
Degree Information
College/Unit

- Arts and Sciences
- Education
- Business
- Communication
- Health Science & Professions
- University College
- Engineering
- Fine Arts
- Regional Higher Education
- Osteopathic Medicine
- International Studies
- Honors Tutorial
- Graduate College
- Voinovich School
Address Information
Domestic/International

- Domestic, 190,722
- International, 6,364
Address Information
Top Non-US Countries

- Malaysia
- India
- Hong Kong
- Japan
- China
- Taiwan
- Nigeria
- Thailand
- Indonesia
- Korea
- Brazil
- Singapore
- Ghana
- Saudi Arabia
- Australia
- Canada
- Kenya
160,000 alumni in these twelve states. 115,000 in Ohio alone.
Address Information
Top Non-Ohio Metro Areas

- New York City
- Washington, DC
- Chicago
- Pittsburgh
- Los Angeles
- New England
- San Francisco
- Atlanta
- West Virginia
- Denver
- Charlotte
- Florida Gulf Coast
Conclusion
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Pamela J. Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost

Re: Academic Quality: Student Success

Dr. David Descutner, Dean and Executive Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, will discuss the strategic and tactical approach to student success being undertaken. The presentation will review the collaborative approach involving colleges and other units across the university.

The completion agenda has become a national imperative and the state of Ohio has made this a priority in the funding formula. Completion metrics such as retention rates and graduation rates will impact revenues and influence enrollments as students and their parents pay increasing attention to these measures of student success.

At Ohio University, we are committed to helping students fulfill their promise, and they are more likely to accomplish this if they receive exemplary student support services that facilitate their efforts toward timely completion of their degree programs.
Academic Quality: Student Success at Ohio University
A Strategic and Collaborative Approach

Dr. David Descutner
Dean and Executive Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education

Student Success is OHIO’s Mission

OHIO’s commitment to a holistic understanding of student success is manifest in its Mission Statement’s affirmation that “the intellectual and personal growth of the individual” is a central purpose of the university and that its programs are designed “to help develop individuals who are informed, responsible, productive citizens.”
Strategic Approach to Student Success

- Specific tactics have been informed by:
  - Research and recommendations from national organizations
  - The Four Fundamentals
  - OHIO’s Office of Institutional Research findings
  - Examples of national organizations include the Policy Center on the First Year Experience and the National Survey of Student Engagement.

Strategic Approach to Student Success

- Initiatives and programs implemented or enhanced since 2004:
  - A comprehensive First Year Experience Program (FYE) that includes a significantly improved Bobcat Student Orientation
  - A thriving Learning Community Program with affiliated first-year seminars enrolling more than 2700 students; the instructors of many of these seminars are the students’ advisors
  - A Common Intellectual Experience Program on Sustainability
  - A Welcome Weekend in fall before classes begin that features each college welcoming and setting expectations for its new students
  - The President’s First Year Convocation
  - A resource fair highlighting opportunities for student involvement
  - LINKS and the College Adjustment Program
  - The Majors Fair
  - A systematic incorporation of Arts for Ohio within the FYE
  - Institutional Research’s assessments of these initiatives and programs have driven our continuous improvement practices
Collaborative Approach to Student Success

- Student Success is an institution-wide responsibility and nearly every unit is contributing to the effort
- Among the key partner units are:
  - University College
  - The Colleges and Schools
  - Regional Higher Education
  - University Libraries
  - Faculty Senate
  - Provost’s Office
  - President’s Office
  - Student Affairs
  - Diversity & Inclusion
  - Intercollegiate Athletics

Collaborative Approach to Student Success

- Key Centers and Offices within those units include:
  - Academic Advancement Center
  - Allen Student Help Center
  - Office of Multicultural Student Access and Retention
  - Student Accessibility Services
  - Regional Higher Education Student Services
  - The Women’s Center
  - The LGBT Center
  - Campus Involvement Center
  - Career and Leadership Development Center
  - Residential Housing
  - Education Abroad
  - Provost’s Undergraduate Research Fund
**Overarching Goals for Student Success**

- The overarching institutional goals for student success are to improve:
  - Course completion rates
  - Persistence/retention rates
  - Graduation rates
  - Ability to track the placement of our graduates

**Specific Goals for Student Success**

- Improved advising
- Expanded learning community opportunities
- Enhanced first-year courses
- More effective interventions with targeted populations of first-year students, including first-generation students and veterans
- Richer integration of Colleges/Schools with Student Affairs’ offices, including the Career and Leadership Center, Residence Life, and the Campus Involvement Center
- Continued development of the Common Experience Project on Sustainability
- Increased number of courses infused with service-learning
- Increased number of students participating in undergraduate research and in Education Abroad
- Creation of a comprehensive Second Year Experience Program comparable to our FYE in its range and efficacy.
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Pamela J. Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost

Re: Core Values

The University’s core values have been discussed over the past two years. The process has been iterative and has involved the university leadership, the senates, and constituent groups across all the campuses.

The core values statements will be reviewed at the June Academics Committee meeting.
Ohio University’s Core Values

- Excellence is our hallmark: outstanding people, ideas, and programs drive our educational mission.

- Integrity, civility, and diversity define our community: these values guide our leadership in a global society.

- Stewardship enhances our legacy: as Ohio’s first institution of public higher education, we are mindful of our accountability to the public trust.
APPOINTMENT TO REGIONAL COORDINATING COUNCILS

RESOLUTION 2013-

BE IT RESOLVED BY the Board of Trustees of Ohio University that the following persons be appointed to membership on the Coordinating Council at each of the regional campuses of Ohio University.

Ohio University - Chillicothe

  Rick A. McNelly  For a three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016, vice Tom Beard whose term expired.

  Michael B. Haller  Reappointment of a second three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016.

  Bill McKell  Reappointment of a second three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016.

Ohio University - Eastern

  Andrew Hutyera  Reappointment of a third three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016.

  Tracey Lancione-Lloyd  Reappointment of a third three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016.

  John Mattox  Reappointment of a third three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016.

  Gerald Narcisi  Reappointment of a third three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016.
Deborah Hanson Shutler | Reappointment of a third three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016.

Keith Sommer | Reappointment of a third three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016.

Ohio University - Lancaster

Steve Wigton | For a three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016, vice Mina Ubbing, whose term expired.

Carri Brown | Reappointment of a third three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016.

Mike Courtney | Reappointment of a second three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016.

Ohio University - Southern

James Payne | Reappointment of a second three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016.

Ohio University - Zanesville

Abby A. Nguyen | For a three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016, vice Daniel Vincent, whose term expired.

James (J.P.) Feldner | Reappointment of a third three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016.

Stoey Stout | Reappointment of a second three-year term beginning July 1, 2013, and ending at the close of business June 30, 2016.
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Pamela J. Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost

Re: Regional Coordinating Council Members

Appointments of members to the Coordinating Council for each regional campus are made annually, at the June Board of Trustees meeting, for the following fiscal year. The resolution includes appointment of three new members for FY2014 as well as reappointments for the returning members.

Enclosed are resumes for new appointees – Rick A. McNeely for the Chillicothe campus, Steve Wigton for the Lancaster campus, and Abby A. Nguyen for the Zanesville campus.
RICK A. McNELLY
1815 Kessinger School Rd • Jackson, OH 45640 • (740) 418-6546 • rmcnelly@pebo.com

PROFESSIONAL SUMMARY

Professional Insurance and Employee Benefits Specialist with over 30 years experience in the industry. Small business owner and entrepreneur. Former County Commissioner. Board of Directors of Jackson Area Chamber of Commerce. Jackson County Rotary member. Board Member of the Ohio Valley Regional Development Commission and Holzer Foundation. Vast knowledge of area which Ohio University–Chillicothe serves and strong connections with area stakeholders.

Married to Ohio University graduate Ellen McNelly, retired special education teacher at Jackson City Schools. Father of six children.

EDUCATION

Ohio University
Bachelor of Business Administration in Marketing

Athens, OH
Graduated 1978

WORK EXPERIENCE

Peoples Insurance Agency
Head of Employee Benefits Division
78 Broadway St, Jackson, OH 45640

Manage employee benefits operations for Peoples Insurance Agency in three states, overseeing seven agencies. Manage and oversee day to day operations as well as increase group insurance and employee benefits sales throughout the region. Motivate staff of over 40 employees in Tri-State area.

♦ Provide employee benefits knowledge to staff as well as customers ranging from county governments and schools to private business
♦ Help clients to select the best employee benefit options to serve their staff in the best way possible while staying within budgetary limits

McNelly Insurance and Consulting Agency
Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
78 Broadway St, Jackson OH 45640

Began agency from the ground up, serving over 50 groups and 2,000 individuals.

♦ Developed revenues of over $500,000

Jackson County Commissioner
Commissioner
199 Portsmouth St., Jackson OH 45640

Oversaw budget for Jackson County, worked with area employers on economic development. Implemented benefits programs which saved the County over three million dollars during the elected term. Assisted several companies in expanding operations to grow jobs.

♦ Increased business growth within Jackson County
♦ Served as President for two out of four years

McNelly, Patrick and Associates / Oak Hill Financial Insurance Agency
President / CEO
78 Broadway St, Jackson OH 45640

President of McNelly, Patrick and Associates until January 2001, when Oak Hill Financial Insurance Agency (a subsidiary of Oak Hill Banks (now WesBanco) acquired agency, and then served as CEO for two years. Served over 500 groups with revenue of over $2.5 million.

♦ With partner, grew agency from ground up and became one of the largest employee benefits agencies in the State of Ohio.
ADMINISTRATION EXPERIENCE:

August 2012 - Present Superintendent, Lancaster City Schools

2009 – 2012 Director of Human Resources – Lancaster City Schools

Responsibilities: All district personnel services including hiring of all district employees, employee evaluation procedures, teacher evaluation committee chair, Resident Educator mentoring program for teachers in their first four years, personnel assignments, personnel costs and salary adjustments, personnel compliance, contract negotiations with unions, 3 union liaison committees, district building construction committee with Ohio Schools Facility Commission (OSFC), bond levy leadership team, district expulsion hearing officer, Master Teacher program coordinator, District Leadership Team (DLT) member, building principal mentoring on personnel development and DLT action steps, Board Standing Personnel Committee administrator, member on 5 of 6 Board Standing Committees (Personnel, Finance, Support Services, Program, and Policy), personnel licensure, Local Professional Development Committee (LPDC) chair, substitute services for licensed staff, Family Medical Leave administration, new teacher orientation, district officer for Title IX and sexual harassment, clerical staff professional development, Response to Intervention (RTI) committee member, and district insurance committee member.

2006 – 2009 Principal – Lancaster High School

Highlights: Transitioned LHS into a grades 9-12 high school, transitioned Stanbery into a career tech campus, increased career tech programs, hired and trained five school administrators, hired and developed 40% of present teaching staff, served on the district’s first district leadership team (DLT). Developed and implemented all programs listed below under Stanbery Freshman Campus, in addition: Extended Opportunity credit recovery program, academic support study halls, activity period TBTs, full day freshman orientation (FroshFest), increased guidance department programming, Readiness and Emergency Management System (REMS), Freshman Focus classes, Personal Finance classes, dual enrollment, required AP testing, department coordinators leadership meetings, and building leadership team (BLT). Testing Results: met 35 of 36 indicators over 3 years (met graduation rate all 3 years, the only time LHS has met the graduation rate), scored consistently above similar districts and state averages, and rated excellent 2 of 3 years.

2001 – 2006 Associate Principal – Lancaster High School, Stanbery Freshmen Campus

Developed and implemented the following programs: Teacher based teams (TBTs) using formative assessment data to drive instruction, Marzano teaching strategies, documented principal classroom walkthroughs to provide teacher feedback, school wide literacy plan, praxis based teacher observations, co-teaching special education classes, reading and math intervention classes, 9th grade practice OGT testing, and curriculum guides. Testing Results: met all state indicators on 9th Grade Proficiency and Ohio Graduation Tests each year, scored consistently above similar districts and state averages, rated excellent each year.

2000 – 2001 Assistant Principal – Lancaster High School

1997 – 2000 Assistant Principal – Stanbery Freshmen School
TEACHING/COACHING EXPERIENCE:

1995 – 1997  OWE Math Teacher/Head Football Coach – Circleville High School
1983 – 1984  Graduate Assistant Football Coach – West Virginia University
             High School
1981 – 1982  Biology/Life Science Teacher/Assistant Football, Basketball and Track Coach – Lima
             Shawnee High School

EDUCATION:

Superintendent Licensure Program – The Ohio State University 2010
Superintendents Leadership Academy – The Ohio State University 2008, 2009, 2010
Principal Certification Program – Ashland University 1998
OWE Certification – Kent State University - 1993
Master’s Degree in Sports Administration – West Virginia University - 1984
Bachelor’s Degree in Biology Education – Capital University – 1981

MEMBERSHIPS:

Central Ohio Human Resource Directors
Ohio Association of School Personnel Administrators
Lancaster Rotary Club
United Way of Fairfield County - Education Council Member
St. Peter’s Lutheran Church – Council Member
Lancaster Country Club
ABBY A. NGUYEN
4300 Amby Lane, Chanhersville, Ohio 43727 | 740.674.6522 | anguyen@genesischs.org

EDUCATION
Northcentral University, Prescott Valley, Arizona
Doctorate Business Administration
Specialization: Industrial/Organizational Psychology
2010-Current

University of Findlay, Findlay, Ohio
Masters Business Administration
Concentration: Healthcare Management
1999

Ohio University, Athens, Ohio
Bachelor of Science, Nursing
Minor: Psychology
1994

Ohio University, Zanesville, Ohio
Associate Degree, Nursing
1992

AWARDS
Nominated for OHA Healthcare Worker of the Year
2002
RN of the Year
2001

EXPERIENCE
Genesis Healthcare System, Zanesville, Ohio

Accepted Chief Nursing Officer Position
Transitioning to position in July, 2013 in preparation for current CNO retirement.
July, 2013

Director of Acute Care Services
2013-Current
Responsible for ultimate clinical functions of 7 inpatient nursing units and facility liaison for the acute dialysis unit. Nursing unit specialties include: Inpatient Cancer and Palliative Care Unit, Cardiac-Telemetry Unit, Observation Unit, Respiratory/Pulmonary/Stroke Unit, Renal/Wound/Isolation Unit, Critical Care Unit, Progressive Care Unit.

Oversight of 5 managers and approximately 400 personnel.

Interim Chief Nursing Officer
Fall, 2012
Responsible for all nursing functions and clinical practice throughout the healthcare system.

Director of Medical Services
2008-2013
Responsible for ultimate clinical functions of 5 inpatient nursing units and an outpatient clinic. Nursing unit specialties include: Inpatient Cancer and Palliative Care Unit, Cardiac-Telemetry Unit, Observation Unit, Respiratory/Pulmonary/Stroke Unit, Renal/Wound/Isolation Unit, Outpatient Chemotherapy Clinic.

Oversight of 4 managers and over 250 personnel.

Successful start-up of a 26 bed observation unit, 16 bed medical cardiac unit, and a Hospitalist rounding RN program.

Interim Director of Hospice and Palliative Care
2011-2012
Grew hospice program from average daily census of 61 in November, 2011 to 105 in June, 2012.
Actively analyzed program operations and made numerous changes to build program volumes: i.e. developed marketing position, selection and approval of an electronic medical record, started continuous care services, enhanced services for various disciplines, started kids grief camp.

Director of Cancer Services
2003-2008
Primary clinical liaison with The Arthur G. James Cancer Hospital and Richard J. Solove Cancer Research Center.
Responsible for all clinical functions of the inpatient oncology unit and outpatient chemotherapy clinic.
ADDITIONAL EXPERIENCE
Central Ohio Technical College
Nursing Clinical Instructor
Oversight of 4-6th quarter nursing students for the clinical practice aspect of their nursing curriculum 2006 – 2008

Genesis Hospice and Palliative Care
Clinical Coordinator 1999 – 2003

Genesis Hospice and Palliative Care
RN Case Manager 1994-1999

Bethesda, Medical/Surgical
Staff RN
Worked as relief charge nurse 1992-1994

Armco Plant
Plant RN 1992-1994

Bethesda, Medical/Surgical
Patient Care Technician 1990-1992

SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS
Guest speaker regarding healthcare related topics
Puerto Rico, Chicago, Philadelphia
Topics: Observation Units, Observation vs. Admission Status, Readmission Reduction Strategies

American Cancer Society Ambassador: met with legislators regarding upcoming cancer related legislative bills

MEMBERSHIPS
American College of Healthcare Executives
Ohio Hospital Organization
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Pamela J. Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost

Re: Promotion and Tenure

The results of the annual Promotion and Tenure process are attached for your information. There are 22 promotions to Professor and 31 promotions to Associate Professor with Tenure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Middle Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Suff.</th>
<th>College/Campus</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Promotion and Tenure Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Holcomb</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Department of African American Studies</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Crockett</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Department of Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Department of Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td></td>
<td>Masson</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Department of Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne</td>
<td>Chapman</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Department of Classics &amp; World Religions</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayesha</td>
<td>Ki'Shani</td>
<td>Hardison</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Department of English</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Wyatt</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Department of Environmental &amp; Plant Biology</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Edna</td>
<td>Wangui</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Department of Geography</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trauscheizer</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Department of History</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>Jarvis</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Department of Linguistics</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Such</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Department of Modern Languages</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td>LeBar</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Department of Philosophy</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang</td>
<td>Chen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Department of Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Vander Ven</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Department of Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Welser</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Department of Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fodor</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Department of Finance</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed Khurram</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Bhutta</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Department of Management</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coombs</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Department of Management</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stoner</td>
<td></td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Department of Management</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>McGann</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Department of Management Information Systems</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusuf</td>
<td>Kalyango</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>E.W. Scripps School of Journalism</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>School of Communication Studies</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ashworth</td>
<td></td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>School of Media Arts and Studies</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td></td>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>Department of Educational Studies</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Burdick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>Department of Chemical &amp; Biomolecular Engineering</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>Department of Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Deering</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>Department of Engineering Technology &amp; Management</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaki</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kuruppail</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>Department of Engineering Technology &amp; Management</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>Department of Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Razvan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bunescu</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>School of Electrical Engineering &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Juedes</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>School of Electrical Engineering &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaya</td>
<td></td>
<td>ENT</td>
<td>School of Electrical Engineering &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hackenmiller</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>School of Art</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tresa</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Randall</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>School of Dance</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>Howell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>School of Film</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Middle Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Suff.</td>
<td>College/Campus</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Promotion and Tenure Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiala</td>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>School of Music</td>
<td>School of Music</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>School of Theater</td>
<td>School of Theater</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haugen</td>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>School of Theater</td>
<td>School of Theater</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele</td>
<td></td>
<td>Morrone</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>Department of Social &amp; Public Health</td>
<td>Department of Social &amp; Public Health</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Berryman</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>School of Applied Health Sciences &amp; Wellness</td>
<td>School of Applied Health Sciences &amp; Wellness</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joann</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Benigno</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>School of Rehabilitation &amp; Communication Sciences</td>
<td>School of Rehabilitation &amp; Communication Sciences</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Russ</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>School of Rehabilitation &amp; Communication Sciences</td>
<td>School of Rehabilitation &amp; Communication Sciences</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benencia</td>
<td>OST</td>
<td>Department of Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>Department of Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>OST</td>
<td>Department of Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>Department of Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>O'Connor</td>
<td>OST</td>
<td>Department of Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>Department of Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walkowski</td>
<td>OST</td>
<td>Department of Osteopathic Manipulative Medicine</td>
<td>Department of Osteopathic Manipulative Medicine</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td></td>
<td>McCall</td>
<td>OST</td>
<td>Department of Specialty Medicine</td>
<td>Department of Specialty Medicine</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Trube</td>
<td>RHE</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education, Ohio University Chillicothe</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education, Ohio University Chillicothe</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>RHE</td>
<td>Electronic Media, Ohio University Southern</td>
<td>Electronic Media, Ohio University Southern</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayley</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Haugen</td>
<td>RHE</td>
<td>English, Ohio University Southern</td>
<td>English, Ohio University Southern</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pramod</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kanwar</td>
<td>RHE</td>
<td>Mathematics, Ohio University Zanesville</td>
<td>Mathematics, Ohio University Zanesville</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Vance</td>
<td>RHE</td>
<td>Nursing, Ohio University Chillicothe</td>
<td>Nursing, Ohio University Chillicothe</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Delaney</td>
<td>RHE</td>
<td>Nursing, Ohio University Southern</td>
<td>Nursing, Ohio University Southern</td>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Tenure Data</td>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor with Tenure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College/Campus Abbreviations**

ART  College of Arts and Sciences  
CBA  College of Business  
COM  Scripps College of Communication  
EDU  Patton College of Education  
ENT  Russ College of Engineering and Technology  
FAR  College of Fine Arts  
HHS  College of Health Sciences and Professions  
OST  Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine  
RHE  Regional Campuses
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Pamela J. Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost

Re: Fall 2013 Enrollment Update

Student-based revenue from tuition and subsidy drives the budget of the institution. This semi-annual Enrollment presentation updates the Board on this past year’s enrollments and how the Fall 2013 class is evolving.

Craig Cornell, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, will provide the Enrollment Update.

This presentation will highlight the following:

- In light of a challenging and competitive environment, Ohio University has been successful in meeting the goals of the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan with record enrollments in the 2012-13 school year.

- How the various populations within the Fall 2013 class are developing.
Enrollment Update

Freshmen, Fall 2013

Due to our efforts in reaching new markets and focusing our enrollment planning – we continue to see significant shifts in the student enrollment “funnel”

GOAL: 4,045
2012-13 Enrollments - Overview

University Overall Enrollment Metrics, Fall 2012

Overall Campus Headcount Enrollment
- All Ohio University Enrollments - 37,140, an increase of 1,014 – a new record!
  - SEMP GOAL - 35,219
- Athens Headcount- 21,514, a decrease of 165 due to increased degree conferrals
  - SEMP GOAL – 21,683
- Athens Undergraduate – 16,981, a decrease of 290 due to increased degree conferrals
  - SEMP GOAL – 17,512
- Athens Graduate and Graduate Outreach - 4,158, an increase of 104 – a new record!
  - SEMP GOAL – 3,805
- E-learning- 5,380, an increase of 1,027 – a new record!
  - SEMP GOAL – 3,883
- Regional Higher Education- 10,077, an increase of 152
  - SEMP GOAL – 10,335
- Osteopathic Medicine- 513, an increase of 21
  - SEMP GOAL – 467
Fall 2013 New Student Enrollments – How the Classes are Shaping Up

Enrollment Update, 2013 – Graduate and RHE

• Graduate Students
  ◦ Essentially flat with last year in applications, and slightly up in admits
  ◦ In line to meet or break last year’s record

• Regional Higher Education
  ◦ Currently up 14% in applications overall compared to last year – still early though with this population
  ◦ Up at 4 of the 5 campuses, and only slightly below at the 5th
Enrollment Update, 2013 – Freshmen Enrollments

Freshman Applications

This includes an 8% increase for in-state and a 51% increase for out-of-state students

Target Student Populations from the SEMP:

- Overall Freshmen
  - Up 19% in applications (2nd highest among state schools), a new record already!
  - Up 12% in admits (selectivity and shaping of class)
  - Up 12% in housing deposits (past the May 1st confirm date)
  - In line to surpass goal of 4,045 freshman, may set a new record?
- Transfers
  - Up 7% in applications
  - In line to surpass last year’s record enrolled transfer students
- International
  - Up 15% in applications and 85 countries represented in the pool
  - In line to meet or surpass last year’s record enrolled international students
- Multicultural
  - Up 45% in applications, and 21% in housing deposits so far
  - #1 in state with multi-cultural student applications (2x the next school with African American Student applications)
  - In line to surpass last year’s record enrolled multi-cultural students
- Student Academic Quality
  - ACT composite - Admits and Deposits equal to last year
  - High School GPA - Admits and Deposits equal to last year
Discussion and Q & A
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Pamela J. Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost

Re: Scholarship Task Force Update

The Scholarship Task Force was charged with developing a new scholarship program for Ohio University that takes into consideration student access, affordability and the ability to remain competitive by meeting the goals of the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan.

This presentation will cover the overview of the work of the task force and the next steps moving forward.

The presentation will provide an update to the ongoing efforts of the Student Scholarship Task Force and will demonstrate:

1. The current scholarship model provides clear guidelines for students but is overly restrictive.
2. A need to be more competitive and meet student’s affordability and enrollment decisions on a per-student basis will be the outcome of a new scholarship model that is being developed.
3. The findings of the Task Force, revenue implications and next steps to implement the new model for the Fall 2014 class
Student Scholarship Task Force Update

Craig Cornell, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management

Gateway Award Program

The FY13 general fund academic scholarship budget of approximately $19.5 million is used to leverage our costs and effectively create a discount rate for our students and families.

• Pros
  • Solid combination of need, merit and the combination of need AND merit awards
  • Clear, published guidelines for merit awards
    • Transparent for students and families
  • In-state tuition for high achievers
  • Generous non-resident award
  • Unique blend of merit and need
    • Need-based awards promote our access mission
  • Clear guidelines allow, to some extent, ease of administration

• Cons
  • The published guidelines are very restrictive
    • No leeway for students who hold high ACT/SAT but miss the 3.0 gpa or have extremely high gpa but below a 25 ACT
    • No ability for case-by-case judgments/exceptions
  • Several levels have lost their “purchasing power” and are no longer competitive with other institutions
Undergraduate Tuition, Room, and Board Expenses Comparison

Average Student Aid Award (Freshman Loan and Average Discount Rate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total T/F, R/B</th>
<th>&quot;Average&quot; Student Aid Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>$16,788</td>
<td>$5,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-08</td>
<td>$17,334</td>
<td>$5,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>$17,850</td>
<td>$8,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>$19,388</td>
<td>$8,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>$20,109</td>
<td>$9,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>$20,574</td>
<td>$9,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>$21,264</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discount Rate
- 16.4%
- 15.4%
- 17.6%
- 17.3%
- 18.9%
- 19.2%

US Government raises freshman loan amount from $3,500 to $11,449

Enrollment Challenges - Student Cost and Affordability

Future Program and Needs

Our new scholarship model will allow us to look at various student populations and determine the student enrollment behavior based on aid received and their likelihood to enroll.

Student Population #1
Yield = 24.8%
Avg Grant: (E) = $5,402
(N) = $3,424

Yield - Admitted to Enrolled Percentage
(E) - Average institutional aid for those that enrolled
(N) - Average institutional aid for those that did not enroll

This model will inform us where our aid programs are effective by showing many different data elements. It will inform us the best ways to leverage our costs and meet our enrollment goal for various cohorts taking price sensitivity into consideration.
Enrollment and Tuition Revenue Implications of the New Model

As the new model becomes more student-centric in awarding aid to maximize net-tuition and influence affordability by awarding a more tailored aid program, there will be some changes beyond our current enrollments and thereby dollars spent in scholarships and net-tuition revenue. Using only 2012 data, the following chart demonstrate this scenario:

Enrollment and Net Tuition Revenue Implications

[Chart showing relationship between scholarship dollars and net tuition revenue]
**Enrollment and Net Tuition Revenue Implications**

Using only 2012 data, the following chart demonstrates this PRELIMINARY scenario for our in-state student population:

| PRELIMINARY In-State Student Metrics in Current and New Scholarship Model Ranges |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                               | In-State Enrollment | Tuition Revenue | Institutional Aid Spent |
| Fall 2012 Base Year           | 3,303             | $62,321,047     | $6,400,369               |
| Fall 2013* projection — Lower (95%) interval | 3,256 | $63,994,038     | $6,647,369               |
| Fall 2013* Projection         | 3,499             | $68,719,436     | $7,191,353               |
| Fall 2013* Upper (95%) interval | 3,752 | $73,646,773     | $7,748,597               |

*Fall 2013 represents a preliminary analysis if we were awarding the new program this year.

This chart demonstrates that using 2012 as the base year, if we awarded for the Fall 2013 class under the new model then our preliminary median-line projections for in-state students would be:

- Enrolling an additional 196 in-state students in the freshman class
- Spending $790,984 more in student aid for the freshman class
- Generating more gross revenue of $6,398,389
- Realizing net revenue of $5,607,405 in the first year

And that is only the in-state students!

---

**The 2013 Test and Next Steps**
Upon presenting this new model and the data across campus at various meetings (SEMSC, Executive Staff, Academic Leadership, Faculty Senate), several remarked that they would like to do something THIS year in 2013 based on our current findings. We therefore modeled several changes and were able to hone in on the following:

- Using existing unspent financial aid dollars of approximately $1.1 million expected final spend enhance current programs that we projected the following:
  - Increase of 74 freshman students, both in and out of state
  - Increase of net-tuition revenue of approximately $115,000 and overall revenue (room and board included) of approximately $845,000

The 2013 Test!

Preliminary Results:

- Approved – March 12th
  (funds already available from unspent financial aid budget)
- Merit Award letters mailed around the 18th
- Freshman Packaging starts on the 27th

- Housing Deposit difference 2013 from 2012
  - March 8th +250
  - March 12th - New Enhancements Approved
  - March 15th +226
  - March 18th - First Letters Sent to Students
  - March 22nd +266
  - March 27th - Freshman Awarding Begins
  - March 29th +277
  - April 5th +268
  - April 19th +305
  - May 1st – Nationally Accepted College Commitment Date
  - May 3rd +440
  - Today +
Next Steps

• Solicit a final round of input about the new model from the Strategic Enrollment Management Steering Committee, Executive Staff, Deans, Faculty Senate and other constituent groups;
• Determine how commitments for unique populations like students in HTC, Fine Arts, multicultural and others will be handled in the new award program;
• Develop talking points and a communication plan about the new award program for university personnel to assist in Fall 2014 student recruitment activities;
• Once Fall 2013 enrollments are finalized, fully develop the new model with the 2012 and 2013 data sets;
• Determine financial aid minimums for merit (academic quality) awarding to assist in effective early recruiting and student communication. At the same time encourage those populations to complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) to determine additional need-based award financing opportunities;
• Fully utilize the new model starting with the Fall 2014 class.

Student Scholarship Task Force Membership

• Craig Cornell, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, Chair
• Valerie Miller, Director of Student Financial Aid and Scholarships, Vice Chair
• Hala Annabi, Professor, Management Information Systems, College of Business
• Candace Boeninger, Asst. Vice Provost and Director of Undergraduate Admissions
• Candice Casto, Director of Investment and Endowment Operations
• Jim Fonseca, Interim Executive Dean of Regional Higher Education
• Laurie Hatch, Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology
• Norma Humphreys, Assistant Dean, College of Fine Arts
• Jill Lallier, Senior Associate Director, Student Financial Aid
• Cecil Walters, Director, Office for Multicultural Access and Retention
• Joni Wadley, Interim Director, Office of Institutional Research
• Jim Hill, Associate Vice President for Development and Campaign Manager, ex-officio
• Mike Angelini, Associate Vice President for Finance, ex-officio
Discussion and Q & A
Ohio University

Report from the Student Scholarship Task Force

2012-2013

Ohio University will be the nation’s best transformative learning community where students realize their promise, faculty advance knowledge, staff achieve excellence, and alumni become global leaders.

-Ohio University Vision Statement
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**Executive Summary**

Ohio University has seen great success in meeting the enrollment goals outlined in the “Strategic Enrollment Management Plan 2010-2016” (SEMP) with progressive record-breaking enrollments, significant application growth, and strong targeted student population growth over the past several years. However, continued competitive pressures, limitations in the grid-based Gateway Award Program, and the desire to open new recruitment markets have begun to chip away at the efficacy and purchasing power of our student scholarships. The need to effectively align our scholarship award programs with the SEMP, while taking into account increased competition for students and external pressure related to declining state and federal student support, motivated the formation of a Student Scholarship Task Force (SSTF). The SSTF was appointed and charged by Provost Benoit to review our current award program and to make recommendations about the next iteration of scholarship leveraging programs at Ohio University.

This report compiled by the Student Scholarship Task Force highlights the background and functioning of the current Gateway Program; its strengths and limitations; core principles that should be taken into consideration in a new scholarship leveraging program; and the type of funding commitments that will be necessary to meet the goals of the SEMP using a new scholarship approach that is smart, sustainable, and strategic.

To fully implement the new program, the suggested next steps are:

1. Solicit a final round of input about the new model from the Strategic Enrollment Management Steering Committee, Executive Staff, Deans, Faculty Senate and other constituent groups;
2. Determine how commitments for unique populations like students in HTC, Fine Arts, multicultural and others will be handled in the new award program;
3. Develop talking points and a communication plan about the new award program for university personnel to assist in Fall 2014 student recruitment activities;
4. Once Fall 2013 enrollments are finalized, fully develop the new model with the 2012 and 2013 data sets;
5. Determine financial aid minimums for merit (academic quality) awarding to assist in effective early recruiting and student communication. At the same time encourage those populations to complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) to determine additional need-based award financing opportunities;
6. Fully utilize the new model starting with the Fall 2014 class.
SECTION 1: THE STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP TASK FORCE

The Student Scholarship Task Force (SSTF) was established in the Fall of 2012 by Pam Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost, and chaired by Craig Cornell, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, with the following charge:

*The Student Scholarship Task Force is charged with making recommendations on Ohio University’s academic scholarship programs on the Athens campus. The Task Force should examine ways that the university can best leverage its scholarship dollars to maximize net tuition revenue, to enhance student affordability, and to provide the type of competitive positioning necessary to meet the enrollment goals of the institution.*

The SSTF consisted of the following membership:

- Craig Cornell, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, Chair
- Valerie Miller, Director of Student Financial Aid and Scholarships, Vice Chair
- Hala Annabi, Professor, Management Information Systems, College of Business
- Candace Boeninger, Asst. Vice Provost and Director of Undergraduate Admissions
- Candice Casto, Director of Investment and Endowment Operations
- Jim Fonseca, Interim Executive Dean of Regional Higher Education
- Laurie Hatch, Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology
- Norma Humphreys, Assistant Dean, College of Fine Arts
- Jill Lallier, Senior Associate Director, Student Financial Aid
- Cecil Walters, Director, Office for Multicultural Access and Retention
- Joni Wadley, Interim Director, Office of Institutional Research

- Jim Hill, Associate Vice President for Development and Campaign Manager, ex-officio
- Mike Angelini, Associate Vice President for Finance, ex-officio

This report represents the efforts of the SSTF over the 2012-13 academic year.
SECTION 2: CURRENT SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS AT OHIO UNIVERSITY

Section 2.1 History of the Gateway Award Program at Ohio University's Athens Campus

Starting in the 2006-2007 academic year, Ohio University introduced the Gateway Scholarship Award Program. This program, consisting of a series of named awards, was developed as the cornerstone of the Athens campus financial aid scholarship and grant programs. The Office of Student Financial Aid and Scholarships was charged with its administration.

The Gateway Award Program was a set of individual awards designed to leverage institutional dollars with the goal of effectively discounting student costs to maintain Ohio University’s affordability for its students and their families. This program consisted of several different awards that took into consideration student academic success (merit) and their established financial ability to pay (need). The various Gateway Awards, as well as other ongoing targeted programs, made up the totality of scholarship award programs on the Athens campus.

The Gateway Award Program was groundbreaking at its inception. The concept of three unique tiers – merit, merit and need, and need-only – provided a distinctive approach.

For recruitment purposes, the university published the specific award table for academic tier only and packaged those awards annually on December 1. Additional need-based awards were entered into the overall aid package in the spring thereby providing time to incorporate information from the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA).

Section 2.2 Current Undergraduate Financial Aid Program Awards

In totality, approximately $33 million dollars annually are used to leverage Athens campus undergraduate student costs. The source of the funding is the general fund budget. Current awards can be divided into the following categories:

1. Gateway Award Program – Student scholarships for entering freshman, renewable for three years (assuming student meets requirements).
2. Targeted Student Awards – Student awards for targeted student populations such as continuing students, transfer students, College of Fine Arts talent programs, diversity, alumni, etc.
3. Other aid programs – (e.g. Athletics, employee fee waivers).

Table 2.1 below outlines the parameters of the current Gateway Awards and Table 2.2 below lists the parameters of the current targeted student award programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Number of Students Awarded Annually (average)</th>
<th>Current Award Amount</th>
<th>Award Criteria</th>
<th>Need or Merit</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Excellence</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>In- State Tuition (currently at $10,216)</td>
<td>High School GPA of 3.0, AND ACT (or SAT equivalent) of 32-36</td>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>Highest award given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Scholarship</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Awards range from $500 to $4,000</td>
<td>High School GPA of 3.0, AND ACT (or SAT equivalent) of 25-31</td>
<td>Merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Grant</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>Awards range from $600-$2,700</td>
<td>Students in the range of a Gateway Excellence or Gateway Scholarship and demonstrated need</td>
<td>Need and Merit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Trustee</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Students eligible for the Gateway Excellence or Gateway Scholarship and out-of-state</td>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>For out-of-state students only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Bobcat</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>Awards range $1,200-$1,800 annually</td>
<td>Need award for all students who demonstrate need with ACT (or SAT equivalent) of 31 or lower</td>
<td>Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2 Ohio University Targeted Award Programs – 2011-12 school year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Students Awarded Annually (average)</th>
<th>Current Award Amount</th>
<th>Award Criteria</th>
<th>Need or Merit</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King/Chavez/Parks and OU Incentive Awards</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>$6,000 - $9,000</td>
<td>Varies – in general 23 ACT (or SAT equivalent) and 3.0 High School GPA</td>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>Available primarily to disproportionately underrepresented students. Support program accompanies award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts Talent Awards</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$500 - $10,000</td>
<td>Talent – selection by College of Fine Arts</td>
<td>Talent and Merit</td>
<td>Audition, portfolio review and/or interview required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2.3 Current Scholarship Program Awards – Advantages and Disadvantages

The current Gateway Award Program provides clear, published guidelines for merit awards that facilitate administration; a generous non-resident award; and a unique blend of merit and need that promotes our excellence and access missions. However, the published guidelines can sometimes be restrictive, with no leeway for students who hold high ACT/SAT but miss the 3.0 GPA or who have high GPAs but fall below a 25 ACT. There are no provisions for case-by-case judgments or exceptions. Additionally, the lower ends of the award table, particularly the $500 awards, have lost their “purchasing power” between 2006-07 and 2012-2013. For instance, when adjusting for inflation, this award would need to be increased to $576. Further compounding award effectiveness is the increase since 2006 of over 15.47% in in-state tuition at Ohio University (see Table 2.3). Only the Gateway Excellence Awards have increased over time to keep pace with in-state tuition.

Table 2.3 Ohio University In-State Tuition 2006-07 to 2012-13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-State Tuition</td>
<td>$8,847</td>
<td>$8,907</td>
<td>$8,907</td>
<td>$8,907</td>
<td>$9,537</td>
<td>$9,870</td>
<td>$10,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2.4 Nature of the Competitive Recruitment Environment In The State And Region

At OHIO, in-state Ohio students make up the vast majority of new students, generally 85-90% of the freshman class. As shown in Chart 2.1, this in-state graduating population continues to shrink each year.
This demographic trend has led to increasing competition among universities for a limited supply of students across the state of Ohio. In addition, this phenomenon also exists within the region surrounding Ohio, wherein we draw the majority of our out-of-state students.

*Chart 2.1 State of Ohio High School Graduating Class Projection, 2012*

---

**Section 2.5 Competitive Environment Among Peer Ohio Institutions**

Each of the public institutions in the state of Ohio handles its internally funded scholarship programs differently. Due to the uniqueness of these programs, student demographics, and other factors, data on the actual award amounts and their distribution is not available. However, there are general indicators that allow for some comparative analysis. Through searches of publically available information and conversations with staff at other Ohio public institutions enrollment management staff have been able to determine the following (see, Table 2.4):

- All institutions except OHIO and Wright State advertise scholarships starting at $1,000.
- Seven institutions have a required minimum ACT for academic scholarships that falls below the ACT requirement at OHIO.
- One key competitor to OHIO promises through an on-line calculator a minimum of $500, and up to $2,000 more, for freshmen with ACT scores between 25 and 30.
Table 2.4 Scholarship Comparison - OHIO IUC Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship Award Ranges</th>
<th>Required ACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>$1000 - $6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
<td>$1000 - $8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>$2000 - $6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State University</td>
<td>$1000 - $4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>$1000 - $4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>$2000 - $13075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>$2000 - $5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>$500 - $4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toledo</td>
<td>$1500 - $6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State University</td>
<td>$500 - $18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown State University</td>
<td>$1500 - $4500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2.6 OHIO’s “Gap”

The cost differential between a student’s aid awards and the cost of published tuition and fees is called the “gap.” Analysis of this gap over time demonstrates that cuts in state and federal award programs are outpacing OHIO’s increasing commitments to financial aid through our tuition discount rate (as shown in Chart 2.2).
Section 2.7 Summary of Current Financial Aid Leveraging Strategy

OHIO has had a robust and beneficial financial aid leveraging strategy since 2006. The openness and guaranteed nature of the “Gateway” program, combined with a strong merit, merit and need, and need-based only awarding model allowed us to continue our commitment to excellence and access. However, over the past six cycles of freshman awarding, we have begun to see several significant limitations inherent in the current model. In order to ensure that we have a robust awards program that will allow us to meet the goals of the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan and to be successful in competing for students, work has begun on the outlines of a new scholarship program.
SECTION 3: COMPONENTS OF A NEW SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM AT OHIO UNIVERSITY

Section 3.1 Overview

While our current scholarship program presents a number of challenges, there are many aspects of the program that have been instrumental in achieving enrollment milestones, increasing student access, and maintaining student affordability. These key elements need to be preserved and incorporated into a new aid strategy.

The Student Scholarship Task Force has proposed the following parameters, which will keep any future program in alignment with the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan (SEMP):

- A continued commitment to recruiting students with strong academic credentials.
- A continued commitment to need-based aid and affordability.
- A continued commitment to the facilitating the matriculation of students with need and strong academic credentials.
- A continued commitment to targeted awards as a means of encouraging the enrollment of underrepresented students and supporting programs of distinction, such as the Honors Tutorial College or the College of Fine Arts, which have specific requirements relating to academic achievement and/or artistic talent.

In addition, the following parameters were identified as areas needing to be addressed and that should be considered in our development of new scholarship strategies:

- The importance of making student yield (i.e. the transition of admitted student to an enrolled student) a foundational element of our approach to student aid..
- Flexibility to allow for the consideration variety of factors in determining a student’s aid package.
- The ability to adjust aid programs continually to keep up with increases in both inflation and student costs.
- Maximize net tuition revenue by awarding the correct amount of aid that will limit both under- and over-awarding aid to students.

In an effort to develop a strategy for addressing the issues outlined above, OHIO engaged the services of an outside consulting firm to review our financial aid award and enrollment data. Generally, the most effective method for developing program changes for financial aid is to use information from two consecutive years. However, due to the conversion to the PeopleSoft system and to significant changes in the Fall 2012 freshman class, which saw a significant growth in out-of-state student applications, we elected to begin with a single year’s data—Fall 2012. The analysis presented in this section is derived from that dataset but a combination of Fall 2012 and the Fall 2013 datasets will to be used in finalizing a new program.
Section 3.2 A Continued Commitment To Students With Strong Academic Credentials

The SEMP outlines the goal of increasing the quality of the incoming freshman class by an annual 0.1 increase in the average class ACT. As demonstrated in Tables 2.1 and 2.2 above, several of the awards from the Gateway program are clearly defined to support the goal of recruiting academically able students.

With the desire to grow the overall quality of our classes, then, it is necessary to remain competitive with our merit-based awards. Two key results of this commitment are the increasing student quality metrics (Composite ACT and High School GPA) of the entering class as demonstrated in Table 3.1. Continued efforts to bring in larger student applicant pools with these quality metrics, combined with an effective leveraging strategy, should allow us to continue to meet the goals of the SEMP quality metrics as shown in Table 3.2.

Table 3.1 Freshman Student Quality Indicators, 2007-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Freshman Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Composite Score</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Freshman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Strategic Enrollment Management Plan Student Academic Quality Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEMP New Freshman Student ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Score Goal</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEMP New Student Freshman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA Goal</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3.3 A Continued Commitment To Need-Based Aid and Affordability

Since the inception of the current Gateway Award Program, demonstrated financial need has been taken into consideration when determining scholarships. The significant growth seen by students receiving Pell grants at OHIO (see, Table 3.3), demonstrates that many students rely on our aid programs to make an OHIO education a viable option. Support for students with financial need has been, and will continue to be, integral to reaching our enrollment targets.

Table 3.3 Athens Campus Pell Grant Recipients and Dollars Awarded, 2007-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens Campus Pell</td>
<td>2,932</td>
<td>3,237</td>
<td>3,324</td>
<td>4,504</td>
<td>6,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens Campus Pell</td>
<td>$7,339,141</td>
<td>$8,908,439</td>
<td>$10,433,276</td>
<td>$16,743,205</td>
<td>$23,965,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollars Awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student affordability can be measured in a variety of ways. One key metric is student indebtedness. However, student indebtedness can be problematic as students take out loans for many reasons. Chart 3.4 shows OHIO data, which illustrates that in the years when we had the lowest tuition increases over a graduating class’s four-year career, the entire student population took on more debt than previous and following cohorts.

*Chart 3.1 Student Tuition and Fees Increases versus Increase in Indebtedness over a 4-Year Career*

A better indicator of student ability to pay and, therefore, willingness to attend is simply the choice that an individual student makes regarding which institution to attend. As shown in table 3.5 below, the cost and financial aid an individual student receives are often the determining factors.

*Chart 3.2 Top Reasons Students Remove Colleges from Their Lists*
Section 3.4 A Continued Commitment To Students With A Combination Of Both Need And Strong Academic Credentials

As discussed earlier, both merit and need-based aid programs form a strong foundation for meeting our enrollment goals and maintaining student affordability. For the 2012 school year, students who demonstrated need, with a $0-$6,000 expected family contribution and an ACT score of between 25 and 31, were eligible for both a need and merit based award. This population of over 900 students demonstrated approximately an 8% greater yield rate than our same students with less need. Additionally, this population, whereby both need and merit are considered in the awarding, perform more successfully with respect to retention. This dual effect of aid programs for talented students with financial need is a hallmark of OHIO and will need to be maintained in a new model.

Section 3.5 A Continued Commitment To Under-Represented Student Populations And Merit Based Programs Of Distinction

Historically, under-represented students (defined as African-American, Hispanic, Asian-American and Native American) at Ohio University have consistently made up approximately 10% of the entering freshman class. Although multicultural students are diffused across each of the sub-populations discussed in Sections 3.2 and 3.3, the importance of this group of students in creating a diverse environment is an essential part of the higher education experience for all students.

OHIO has seen a significant change over the past several years as shown in Table 3.6 below as a result of our efforts with recruitment and scholarship leveraging for this population. Building access to under-represented student populations of merit requires unique approaches in today's competitive environment. Competitively, it is necessary for programs targeted to underrepresented students to award additional aid and provide unique programming. Therefore, a new model must take into account and adjust for these commitments appropriately.

Table 3.4 New Under-Represented Students by Number and Overall Percentage of the Freshman Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Under-Represented</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>(5.9%)</td>
<td>(8.0%)</td>
<td>(7.9%)</td>
<td>(7.8%)</td>
<td>(9.0%)</td>
<td>(9.1%)</td>
<td>(9.8%)</td>
<td>(11.35%)</td>
<td>(13.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting in 2010, as a result of the changes to the Census, the multicultural categories were re-defined including the choice of “2 or more races”. The impact of this change may create a new baseline for these categories starting with the Fall 2010 class.

Programs like the Honors Tutorial College and talent-based scholarships for Fine Arts students, among others, have a long history at OHIO. It may be necessary for these types of programs to award additional aid to overcome the particularly competitive environments faced by highly valued, unique academic programs.
Section 3.6 The Approach For Future Program Development – Student Yield As A Foundation

The record student application numbers (i.e. student interest) that Ohio University has experienced over the past several years (see Table 3.7), especially in out-of-state students, has created a significant change in yield behaviors (see Table 3.8). Student “yield” is the ratio of admitted to enrolled students. The drop that we are seeing is not uncommon for institutions that experience the growth in applications that OHIO has had, but is a significant number to monitor as it determines the admit rate needed to meet SEMP goals. Yield, therefore, is a significant consideration in the development of an effective scholarship program.

Table 3.5 Student Applications by In and Out State, 2007-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013 Anticipated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-State</td>
<td>10,081</td>
<td>11,605</td>
<td>11,751</td>
<td>11,002</td>
<td>10,870</td>
<td>12,786</td>
<td>13,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>2,219</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>2,364</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>4,680</td>
<td>7,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,020</td>
<td>14,046</td>
<td>14,204</td>
<td>13,366</td>
<td>13,392</td>
<td>17,471</td>
<td>20,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6 Student Admits, Enrollments and Yield- 2007-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Student</td>
<td>10,679</td>
<td>10,931</td>
<td>11,591</td>
<td>11,372</td>
<td>11,437</td>
<td>13,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>3,985</td>
<td>4,072</td>
<td>3,976</td>
<td>3,883</td>
<td>3,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3.7 The Approach For Future Program Development – Meet Students On An Individual Basis

The student decision flow, from interested student to matriculated student, pivots on the question of affordability. Cost and financial aid are the two primary reasons that a student removes a college from consideration (see, Chart 3.5). Ultimately, a student will enroll based on the perceived value of the institutional cost and her or his confidence in being able to finance attendance. A model that is able to analyze individual student cohorts and adjust for the affordability with precision is lacking in OHIO’s current awarding program.

Section 3.8 The Approach For Future Program Development – The Ability To Adjust Aid Programs Continually To Keep Up With Increases In Both Inflation And Student Costs

Since the advent of the Gateway Award Program in 2006 the base awards for the programs, and the nature of the set dollar amounts that have not changed. The SEMP anticipated that corrective action
would need to be taken to ensure that our awards remained competitive. In endorsing the goals of the SEMP, the university agreed to reserve part of the new revenues from enrollment growth to stem the erosion of scholarship values due to tuition increases and to support new scholarship program needs. That commitment will need to be maintained in order to successfully develop a new aid-leveraging program.

Section 3.9 The Approach For Future Program Development – Maximize Net Tuition Revenue By Awarding The Correct Amount Of Aid

The measure of an effective student–based aid program is whether it can secure enrollments by effectively leveraging the “right” amount of aid, while at the same time maximizing the net tuition revenues of the institution. The two extremes, as illustrated in Chart 3.9, demonstrate the enrollment effects of offering all students a full-ride on one end and offering students no aid on the other. The middle of this curve, as shown in this example, is the maximization of net tuition by effective leveraging across the entire student pool.

Chart 3.3 Variances on Net – Tuition Based on Leveraging Techniques
**SECTION 4: FUNDING NEEDS OF THE NEW SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM AT OHIO UNIVERSITY**

Section 4.1 Overview

The central budget allocation used to fund the existing OHIO scholarship programs is based on the current grid-based award system. The new model being proposed will need additional funding in order to provide the flexibility needed to be successful in our leveraging of student aid. We will need to offer more money to applicants throughout the enrollment cycle with an understanding that a portion of that aid will not be expended.

As net tuition revenue is the primary outcome of this model, ultimately any additional dollars spent in the program will return more in net tuition to the institution thereby maximizing the investment. Since it may take a few years to fully refine the funding model, the following recommendations should be considered a starting point.

Section 4.2 The Approach

In attempting to determine an accurate funding need, the task force looked at Fall Term 2012 scholarship awards and enrollment metrics. The model is based on student yield by category. The goal is to maximize net tuition revenue by maximizing yield based on established institutional enrollment goals. In addition, a number of additional variables were used to best determine the appropriate awarding for students among various cohorts with the goal of creating a per-student awarding matrix that meets students at their price-sensitivity thereby greatly increasing their likelihood to enroll.

Our findings from the Fall 2012 dataset showed that OHIO’s scholarship programs show larger student yields across the board and success in meeting institutional goals. For instance, among in-state students who demonstrated the highest need, 42% of admitted students enrolled, compared to approximately 32% of all students analyzed. This is a strong showing and appears also in the case of need, merit, or need and merit based awards. One implication of these findings is it will take more scholarship dollars to effectively yield higher percentages of these students.

Using Fall 2012 as a base assumption, we modeled the incoming Fall 2013 class as of March 2013. As we are still in the process of admitting students for the Fall 2013 term the data-set is preliminary, but we are far enough along in the admissions process to be able to make preliminary calculations and award estimates. The results are encouraging and illustrate scholarship needs in the new model. Tables 4.1 and 4.2 demonstrate both in and out-of-state preliminary findings for projected enrollments, revenues and institutional aid needs.
Table 4.1 In-State Student Metrics in Current and New Scholarship Model Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In-State Enrollment</th>
<th>Tuition Revenue</th>
<th>Institutional Aid Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012 Base Year</td>
<td>3,303</td>
<td>$62,321,047</td>
<td>$6,400,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013* projection – Lower (95%) interval</td>
<td>3,256</td>
<td>$63,994,038</td>
<td>$6,647,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013* Projection</td>
<td>3,499</td>
<td>$68,719,436</td>
<td>$7,191,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013* Upper (95%) interval</td>
<td>3,752</td>
<td>$73,646,773</td>
<td>$7,749,597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fall 2013 represents a preliminary analysis

Table 4.2 Out-of-State Student Metrics in Current and New Scholarship Model Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Out-of-State Enrollment</th>
<th>Tuition Revenue</th>
<th>Institutional Aid Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012 Base Year</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>$6,093,347</td>
<td>$2,026,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013* projection – Lower (95%) interval</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>$5,784,783</td>
<td>$2,202,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013* Projection</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>$7,326,875</td>
<td>$2,809,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013* Upper (95%) interval</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>$9,251,030</td>
<td>$3,520,498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fall 2013 represents a preliminary analysis

The tables above outline the possible threshold scenarios if implemented for the 2013 class based on current data. Using these projections, OHIO would be able to increase the freshman class to its stated SEMP goal of 266 more students, while increasing tuition revenue by $7,631,917 and only increasing aid leveraging by $1,573,937. That equates to a total of $6,057,980 in net-tuition revenue in the freshman class. It is important to note that this sum is only the net-tuition calculation and does not take into account other revenue sources such as state subsidy and residence life revenue increases. It also does not fully reflect the commitments outlined in Sections 3.2 through 3.5.
SECTION 5: CONCLUSION

The charge to the Student Scholarship Task Force—was to develop a new model—while retaining the best pieces of the existing Gateway methodology. This report represents the SSTF’s review of our current scholarship approach and outlines the parameters to be taken into consideration when developing a new financial aid leveraging strategy for OHIO.

To fully implement the new program, the suggested next steps are:

1. Solicit a final round of input about the new model from the Strategic Enrollment Management Steering Committee, Executive Staff, Deans, Faculty Senate and other constituent groups;
2. Determine how commitments for unique populations like students in HTC, Fine Arts, multicultural and others will be handled in the new award program;
3. Develop talking points and a communication plan about the new award program for university personnel to assist in Fall 2014 student recruitment activities;
4. Once Fall 2013 enrollments are finalized, fully develop the new model with the 2012 and 2013 data sets;
5. Determine financial aid minimums for merit (academic quality) awarding to assist in effective early recruiting and student communication. At the same time encourage those populations to complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) to determine additional need-based award financing opportunities;
6. Fully utilize the new model starting with the Fall 2014 class.
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Pamela J. Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost

Re: AQIP Update

In our continued efforts to keep the Board informed of Ohio University's accreditation work, you will be receiving regular updates at this and future meetings. We are preparing for Ohio University's reaffirmation of accreditation with the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, which is scheduled to take place in 2015-16, and we are planning ahead in anticipation of this action.

As reported to you previously, the criteria for accreditation were significantly revised as of January 1, 2013. At the last Board meeting, we introduced you to these new criteria and focused on Criterion 1: Mission. The attached brief presentation prepared by Mike Williford, Associate Provost for Institutional Accreditation, continues these updates with a focus on HLC Criterion 2: Integrity.

In response to the Board's request for additional information on accreditation, I am including a 12-page policy brief from the Higher Learning Commission on The Criteria for Accreditation. This is the most up-to-date summary of the new criteria, as well as HLC's Assumed Practices (formerly Minimal Expectations) and Obligations of Affiliation. In addition, additional information on AQIP, Ohio University's pathway to regional accreditation, can be found here: http://ncahlc.org/AQIP/aqip-home.html.
AQIP Update

- Higher Learning Commission (HLC) accreditation
  - All locations, programs, services of Ohio University
  - Academic and academic support units
- Since 2002, Ohio University has been a member of the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP), an accreditation pathway through the HLC
- Ohio University has been continuously accredited since 1913
- Ohio University’s accreditation last reaffirmed in 2008-09
- Scheduled reaffirmation in 2015-16
AQIP Update

Effective January 1, 2013

5 Criteria for Accreditation

1. Mission—The institution’s mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution’s operations.

2. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct—The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

3. Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support—The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

4. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement—The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

5. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness—The institution’s resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.
Guiding Values of Criteria

1. Focus on student learning
2. Education as a public purpose
3. Education for a diverse, technological, globally connected world
4. A culture of continuous improvement
5. Evidence-based institutional learning and self-presentation
6. Integrity, transparency, and ethical behavior or practice
7. Governance for the well-being of the institution
8. Planning and Management of resources to ensure institutional sustainability
9. Mission-centered evaluation
10. Accreditation through peer review

Criterion 2, Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

5 Core Components:

• 2.A. The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows fair and ethical policies and processes for its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

• 2.B. The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.
Criterion 2, Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

5 Core Components (continued):

• 2.C. The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

• 2.D. The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

• 2.E. The institution ensures that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.

AQIP Update

Major activities planned:

• 2013-14
  • Assimilate and distribute new HLC Criteria for Accreditation
  • Participate in ongoing AQIP action project activities and reports
  • Prepare comprehensive AQIP Systems Portfolio
    • Due November 2013
    • Meetings throughout summer 2013 to prepare Portfolio draft
    • Establish body of evidence that Ohio University meets criteria
    • Appoint advisory committee to review and approve Portfolio

• 2014-15
  • Receive and respond to Systems Appraisal (HLC evaluation of Systems Portfolio)
  • Quality Checkup Site Visit—HLC team to visit Ohio University
  • Strategy Forum participation—send team to HLC site

• 2015-16
  • Reaffirmation of Accreditation
AQIP Update

• Future updates will focus on additional criteria for accreditation
The Criteria for Accreditation
(with proposed changes to the Assumed Practices and Obligations of Affiliation)

On February 24, 2012, the HLC Board of Trustees adopted new Criteria for Accreditation, Assumed Practices, and Obligations of Affiliation. The final versions appear in this booklet. They are effective for all institutions as of January 1, 2013.

In the past the Criteria for Accreditation had been reviewed in their entirety every five years. Beginning this year, the Board will consider adjustments to the Criteria, including the Assumed Practices, annually, usually with first reading in February and second reading in June.

Based on comments received from institutions and peer reviewers, certain Assumed Practices appeared to raise implementation questions. The Board considered these comments at its meeting on February 21-22 and accepted on first reading the proposed changes to the Assumed Practices that appear in this document. The Board also accepted on first reading a change to Institutional Obligation 13. The Commission invites comments on these changes before the Board takes final action at its meeting on June 27-28, 2013. Comments can be sent to policycomments@hlcommission.org. Comments on these policies are due by May 6, 2013.
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1 The New Criteria: An Overview

In its review of institutions, the Higher Learning Commission seeks a culture of aspiration and continual improvement rather than satisfaction of minimum requirements. It also seeks to acknowledge the great diversity of its member institutions. For these reasons it uses the term “criteria” rather than “standards.”

Prior to admission to candidacy for accreditation and again in applying for initial accreditation, an institution demonstrates that it meets the Commission’s Eligibility Requirements. The Eligibility Requirements and process for seeking status are available in a separate document.

The accreditation process is governed by the Criteria for Accreditation. Within the Criteria there are Criterion Statements and Core Components that ensure institutional effectiveness. Underlying the Criteria and Core Components is a set of assumptions shared by the community of practice within higher education and made explicit in the section on Assumed Practices.

Finally, the Commission articulates Obligations of Affiliation, which are behavioral requirements for its member and candidate institutions, including the requirement that they abide by Commission policies.

Guiding Values

The Criteria for Accreditation reflect a set of guiding values for institutional accreditation. The Commission articulates these guiding values so as to offer a better understanding of the Criteria and the intentions that underlie them. Institutions are not expected to address these values: they are offered as explanation.

The Criteria for Accreditation and Core Components

The Criteria are designed to seek evidence of continual improvement and aspiration on the part of member institutions rather than to define minimum qualifications. Each Criterion begins with a broad statement of Commission expectations related to the Criterion. The Core Components identify areas of particular focus within the Criterion. Some of these Core Components are further elaborated or explicated in sub-components. The sub-components are not comprehensive: they elaborate certain aspects of the Core Component that the Commission seeks to ensure are not overlooked, but they do not fully constitute the Component. Some of the Core Components do not have sub-components because such elaboration has not appeared necessary. An institution provides evidence with regard to those sub-components of the Core Components that apply to the institution. An institution has the opportunity in its documentation and a team has the option in its review
to identify topics or issues related to a Core Component other than those specified in the sub-components.

In preparation for accreditation and reaffirmation of accreditation, an institution provides evidence that it meets all the Criteria and all the Core Components. The distinctiveness of an institution’s mission may condition the strategies it adopts and the evidence it provides that it meets the Criteria.

The Commission reviews the institution against the Core Components and Criteria through its evaluation processes according to the following evaluative framework.

The Core Components
The institution meets the Core Component if the Core Component:

a) is met without concerns, that is the institution meets or exceeds the expectations embodied in the Component; or

b) is met with concerns, that is the institution demonstrates the characteristics expected by the Component, but performance in relation to some aspect of the Component must be improved.

The institution does not meet the Core Component if the institution fails to meet the Component in its entirety or is so deficient in one or more Core Components of the Criterion that the Criterion is judged not to be met.

The Criteria for Accreditation
The institution meets the Criterion if the Criterion:

a) is met without concerns, that is the institution meets or exceeds the expectations embodied in the Criterion; or

b) is met with concerns, that is the institution demonstrates the characteristics expected by the Criterion, but performance in relation to some Core Components of the Criterion must be improved.

The institution does not meet the Criterion if the institution fails to meet the Criterion in its entirety or is so deficient in one or more Core Components of the Criterion that the Criterion is judged not to be met.

The institution meets the Criterion only if all Core Components are met. The institution must be judged to meet all five Criteria for Accreditation to merit accreditation.

The Commission will grant or continue accreditation (with or without conditions or sanctions), deny accreditation, or withdraw accreditation based on the outcome of its review.

The Assumed Practices
Higher education functions within a community marked by shared practices among colleges and universities, practices that have developed out of shared experience, are basic to higher education in the United States, and have been tested over time. Institutional accreditation evolved within these shared practices and it relies upon the assumption that institutions follow them.

The Assumed Practices are foundational to the Criteria for Accreditation. Unlike the Criteria and Core Components, they are generally matters to be determined as facts, rather than matters requiring professional judgment, and they are unlikely to vary by institutional mission or context.

Because accredited institutions engage in these Assumed Practices as a matter of course, the Commission does not ask that an accredited institution explicitly address them in an evaluation process except where specifically required to do so to ensure continuing conformity. Such circumstances include when an institution is undergoing a Change of Control, Structure, or Organization, and when an institution is in the process of removal from probation or an order of show-cause.

When it discovers that an accredited institution is not following an Assumed Practice, the Commission initiates a review, in accordance with its policy and procedure, to determine whether the institution remains in compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. The Commission also requires that the institution take action to bring its practice into conformity with the Assumed Practices. An accredited institution that finds through its own processes that its practice is departing from the Assumed Practices should take immediate steps to correct the deficiency; it is not required to disclose its finding to the Commission provided that it moves quickly to initiate a remedy.

An institution seeking Candidacy must explicitly demonstrate conformity with the Assumed Practices. An institution seeking initial accreditation must again explicitly demonstrate conformity with these Practices as it addresses the Criteria for Accreditation. Institutional conformity with the Assumed Practices is necessary but only partial evidence of fulfillment of the Criteria for Accreditation. Commission decisions regarding accreditation status, while considering conformity with the Assumed Practices, will ultimately be based on a finding of fulfillment of the requirements for Candidacy for an institution seeking Candidacy or the Criteria for Accreditation for an institution seeking accreditation.

Obligations of Affiliation and Commission Policies
The Institutional Obligations of Affiliation describe behavioral requirements on the part of member
of **guiding values**. The Commission articulates these guiding values so as to offer a better understanding of the Criteria and the intentions that underlie them.

1. **Focus on student learning**

For the purpose of accreditation, the Higher Learning Commission regards the teaching mission of any institution as primary. Institutions will have other missions, such as research, healthcare, and public service, and these other missions may have a shaping and highly valuable effect on the education that the institution provides. In the accreditation process, these missions should be recognized and considered in relation to the teaching mission.

A focus on student learning encompasses every aspect of students’ experience at an institution: how they are recruited and admitted; costs they are charged and how they are supported by financial aid; how well they are informed and guided before and through their work at the institution; the breadth, depth, currency, and relevance of the learning they are offered; their education through co-curricular offerings; the effectiveness of their programs; what happens to them after they leave the institution.

2. **Education as a public purpose**

Every educational institution serves a public purpose. Public or state-supported institutions make that assumption readily. Not-for-profit institutions receive their tax-exempt status on the basis of an assumption that they serve a public purpose. And although it may appear that a for-profit institution does not require a public purpose, because education is a public good its provision serves a public purpose and entails societal obligations. Furthermore, the provision of higher education requires a more complex standard of care than, for instance, the provision of dry cleaning services. What the students buy, with money, time, and effort, is not merely a good, like a credential, but experiences that have the potential to transform lives, or to harm them. What institutions do constitutes a solemn responsibility for which they should hold themselves accountable.

3. **Education for a diverse, technological, globally connected world**

A contemporary education must recognize contemporary circumstances: the diversity of U.S. society, the diversity of the world in which students live, and the centrality of technology and the global dynamic to life in the 21st century. More than ever, students should be prepared for lifelong learning and for the likelihood that no job or occupation will last a lifetime. Even for the most technical qualification, students need the civic learning and broader intellectual capabilities that underlie success in the workforce. The Commission distinguishes higher education in part on the basis of its reach beyond narrow vocational training to a broader intellectual and social context.

4. **A culture of continuous improvement**

Continuous improvement is the alternative to stagnation. Minimum standards are necessary but far from sufficient to achieve acceptable quality in higher education, and the strongest institutions will stay strong through ongoing aspiration. The Commission includes improvement as one of two major strands in all its pathways, the other being assurance that member institutions meet the Criteria and the Federal Requirements.

A process of assessment is essential to continuous improvement and therefore a commitment to assessment should be deeply embedded in an institution’s activities. Assessment applies not only to student learning and educational outcomes but to an institution’s approach to improvement of institutional effectiveness.
For student learning, a commitment to assessment would mean assessment at the program level that proceeds from clear goals, involves faculty at all points in the process, and analyzes the assessment results; it would also mean that the institution improves its programs or ancillary services or other operations on the basis of those analyses. Institutions committed to improvement review their programs regularly and seek external judgment, advice, or benchmarks in their assessments. Because in recent years the issues of persistence and completion have become central to public concern about higher education, the current Criteria direct attention to them as possible indicators of quality and foci for improvement, without prescribing either the measures or outcomes.

Innovation is an aspect of improvement and essential in a time of rapid change and challenge; through its Criteria and processes the Commission seeks to support innovation for improvement in all facets of institutional practice.

5. Evidence-based institutional learning and self-presentation

Assessment and the processes an institution learns from should be well-grounded in evidence. Statements of belief and intention have important roles in an institution’s presentation of itself, but for the quality assurance function of accreditation, evidence is critical. Institutions should be able to select evidence based on their particular purposes and circumstances. At the same time, many of the Assumed Practices within the Criteria require certain specified evidence.

6. Integrity, transparency, and ethical behavior or practice

The Commission understands integrity broadly, including wholeness and coherence at one end of the spectrum and ethical behavior at the other. Integrity means doing what the mission calls for and not doing what it does not call for; governance systems that are freely, independently, and rigorously focused on the welfare of the institution and its students; scrupulous avoidance of misleading statements or practices; full disclosure of information to students before students make any commitment to the institution, even a commitment to receive more information; clear, explicit requirements for ethical practice by all members of the institutional community in all its activities.

7. Governance for the well-being of the institution

The well-being of an institution requires that its governing board place that well-being above the interests of its own members and the interests of any other entity. Because the Commission accredits the educational institution itself, and not the state system, religious organization, corporation, medical center, or other entity that may own it, it holds the governing board of an institution accountable for the key aspects of the institution’s operations. The governing board must have the independent authority for such accountability and must also hold itself independent of undue influence from individuals, be they donors, elected officials, supporters of athletics, shareholders, or others with personal or political interests.

Governance of a quality institution of higher education will include a significant role for faculty, in particular with regard to currency and sufficiency of the curriculum, expectations for student performance, qualifications of the instructional staff, and adequacy of resources for instructional support.

8. Planning and management of resources to ensure institutional sustainability

The Commission does not privilege wealth. Students do expect, however, that an institution will be in operation for the duration of their degree programs. Therefore, the Commission is obliged to seek information regarding an institution’s sustainability and, to that end, wise management of its resources. The Commission also watches for signs that an institution’s financial challenges are eroding the quality of its programs to the point of endangering the institution’s ability to meet the Criteria for Accreditation. Careful mid- and long-range planning must undergird an institution’s budgetary and financial decisions.

9. Mission-centered evaluation

The Commission understands and values deeply the diversity of its institutions, which begins from the diversity of their missions. Accordingly, mission in some degree governs each of the Criteria. The Commission holds many expectations for all institutions regardless of mission, but it expects that differences in mission will shape wide differences in how the expectations are addressed and met.

10. Accreditation through peer review

Peer review is the defining characteristic of accreditation and essential for a judgment-based process in a highly complex field. But self-regulation can be met with public skepticism. Therefore, peer review for accreditation must: (1) be collegial, in the sense of absolute openness in the relationship between an institution and the peer reviewers assigned to it as well as between the institution and the Commission; (2) be firm in maintaining high standards, not mistaking leniency for kindness or inclusiveness; and (3) be cognizant of the dual role of peer reviewers in both assuring and advancing institutional quality.
The Criteria for Accreditation

The Criteria for Accreditation are the standards of quality by which the Commission determines whether an institution merits accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation. They are as follows:

Criterion One. Mission

The institution’s mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution’s operations.

Core Components

1.A. The institution’s mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.
   1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.
   2. The institution’s academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
   3. The institution’s planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission. (This sub-component may be addressed by reference to the response to Criterion 5.C.1.)
1.B. The mission is articulated publicly.
   1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
   2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution’s emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.
   3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

1.C. The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.
   1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.
   2. The institution’s processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

1.D. The institution’s mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.
   1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.
   2. The institution’s educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
   3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Criterion Two. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Core Components

2.A. The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows fair and ethical policies and processes for its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

2.B. The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

2.C. The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.
   1. The governing board’s deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.
   2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution’s internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.
   3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests, or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.
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2.D. The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

2.E. The institution ensures that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.

1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.

2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.

3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Criterion Three.
Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Core Components

3.A. The institution’s degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.

2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for its undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.

3. The institution’s program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

3.B. The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.

2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.

3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.

4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.

5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution’s mission.

3.C. The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.

2. All instructors are appropriately credentialed, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.

3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.

4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.

5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.

6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and cocurricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.
3.D. The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.

2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.

3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.

4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution’s offerings).

5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

3.E. The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution’s mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.

2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students’ educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

**Criterion Four. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement**

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

**Core Components**

4.A. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.

2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcriptes, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning.

3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.

4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.

5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.

6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

4.B. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.

2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.

3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.

4. The institution’s processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

4.C. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention,
1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.

2. The institution’s resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.

3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution’s organization, resources, and opportunities.

4. The institution’s staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.

5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

5.B. The institution’s governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution’s governance.

2. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight for the institution’s financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.

3. The institution enables the involvement of its admin-

istration, faculty, staff, and students in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

5.C. The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.

2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.

3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.

4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution’s sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.

5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

5.D. The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.

2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.
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The Assumed Practices

Policy wording to be deleted or revised is shown as *strike-through* (old wording); new policy language, whether through addition or revision, is shown in **bold** (new wording).

Foundational to the Criteria and Core Components is a set of practices shared by institutions of higher education in the United States. Unlike Criteria and Core Components, these Assumed Practices are (1) generally matters to be determined as facts, rather than matters requiring professional judgment and (2) unlikely to vary by institutional mission or context.

**A. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct**

1. The institution has a conflict of interest policy that ensures that the governing board and the senior administrative personnel act in the best interest of the institution.

2. The institution has ethics policies for faculty and staff regarding conflict of interest, nepotism, recruitment and admissions, financial aid, privacy of personal information, and contracting.

3. The institution provides its students, administrators, faculty, and staff with policies and procedures informing them of their rights and responsibilities within the institution.

4. The institution provides clear information regarding its procedures for receiving complaints and grievances from students and other constituencies, responds to them in a timely manner, and analyzes them to improve its processes.

5. The institution makes readily available to students and to the general public clear and complete information including:

a. statements of mission, vision, and values
b. full descriptions of the requirements for its programs, including all pre-requisite courses
c. requirements for admission both to the institution and to particular programs or majors
d. policies on acceptance of transfer credit, including how credit is applied to degree requirements. (Except for courses articulated through transfer policies or institutional agreements, the institution makes no promises to prospective students regarding the acceptance of credit awarded by examination, credit for prior learning, or credit for transfer until an evaluation has been conducted.)
e. all student costs, including tuition, fees, training, and incidentals; its financial aid policies, practices, and requirements; and its policy on refunds
f. policies regarding academic good standing, probation, and dismissal; residency or enrollment requirements (if any)
g. a full list of its instructors and their academic credentials
h. its relationship with any parent organization (corporation, hospital, church, or other entity that owns the institution) and any external providers of its instruction.

6. The institution assures that all data it makes public are accurate and complete, including those reporting on student achievement of learning and student persistence, retention, and completion.

7. The institution portrays clearly and accurately to the public its current status with the Higher Learning Commission and with specialized, national, and professional accreditation agencies.

a. An institution offering programs that require specialized accreditation or recognition by a state licensing board or other entity in order for its students to be certified or to sit for the licensing examinations in states where its students reside either has the appropriate accreditation and recognition or discloses publicly and clearly the consequences to the students of the lack thereof. The institution makes clear to students the distinction between regional and specialized or program accreditation and the relationships between licensure and the various types of accreditation.

b. An institution offering programs eligible for specialized accreditation at multiple locations discloses the accreditation status and recognition of the program by state licensing boards at each location.

c. An institution that advertises a program as preparation for a licensure, certification, or other qualifying examination publicly discloses its pass rate on that examination, unless such information is not available to the institution.

8. The governing board and its executive committee, if it has one, include some “public” members. Public members have no significant administrative position or any ownership interest in any of the following: the institution itself; a company that does substantial business with the institution; a company or organization with which the institution has a substantial partnership; a parent, ultimate parent, affiliate, or subsidiary corporation; an investment group or firm substantially involved with one of the above organizations. All publicly-elected members or members appointed by publicly-elected individuals or bodies (governors, elected legislative bodies) are public members.¹

9. The governing board has the authority to approve the annual budget and to engage and dismiss the chief executive officer.¹

10. The institution documents outsourcing of all services in written agreements, including agreements with parent or affiliated organizations.

11. The institution takes responsibility for the ethical and responsible behavior of its contractual partners in relation to actions taken on its behalf.

**B. Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support**

1. Programs, Courses, and Credits
a. The institution conforms to commonly accepted minimum program length: 60 semester credits for associate’s degrees, 120 semester credits for bachelor’s degrees, and 30 semester credits beyond the bachelor’s for master’s degrees. Any variation from these minima must be explained and justified.

b. Institutions maintain structures or practices that ensure the coherence and quality of the programs for which they award a degree. Typically institutions will: The institution requires that at minimum 30 of the last 60 credits earned for the bachelor’s degree that the institution awards and 15 of the final 30 credits for an associate’s degree it awards be credits earned at the institution itself, through arrangements with other accredited institutions, or through contractual relationships approved by the Commission. Any variation from the typical minima must be explained and justified.

Institutions that do not maintain such a requirement, or have programs that do not, are able to demonstrate structures or practices that ensure coherence and quality to the degree. (Consortial arrangements are considered to be such structures. In addition, an institution that complies with the criteria for academic residency requirements of the Servicemembers Opportunity Colleges (SOC) will not be deemed out of conformity with this Assumed Practice provided that its policy is an exception for active duty servicemembers and not for students in general.)

c. The institution’s policy and practice assure that at least 50% of courses applied to a graduate program are courses designed for graduate work, rather than undergraduate courses credited toward a graduate degree. (Cf. Criterion 3.A.1 and 2.) (An institution may allow well-prepared advanced students to substitute its graduate courses for required or elective courses in an undergraduate degree program and then subsequently count those same courses as fulfilling graduate requirements in a related graduate program that the institution offers. In “4+1” or “2+3” programs, at least 50% of the credits allocated for the master’s degree—usually 15 of 30—must be for courses designed for graduate work.)

d. The institution adheres to policies on student academic load per term that reflect reasonable expectations for successful learning and course completion.

e. Courses that carry academic credit toward college-level credentials have content and rigor appropriate to higher education.

f. The institution has a process for ensuring that all courses transferred and applied toward degree requirements demonstrate equivalence with its own courses required for that degree or are of equivalent rigor.

g. The institution has a clear policy on the maximum allowable credit for prior learning as a reasonable proportion of the credits required to complete the student’s program. Credit awarded for prior learning is documented, evaluated, and appropriate for the level of degree awarded. (Note that this requirement does not apply to courses transferred from other institutions.)

h. The institution maintains a minimum requirement for general education for all of its undergraduate programs whether through a traditional practice of distributed curricula (15 semester credits for AAS degrees, 24 for AS or AA degrees, and 30 for bachelor’s degrees) or through integrated, embedded, interdisciplinary, or other accepted models that demonstrate a minimum requirement equivalent to the distributed model. Any variation is explained and justified.

2. Faculty Roles and Qualifications

a. Instructors (excluding for this requirement teaching assistants enrolled in a graduate program and supervised by faculty) have the authority for the assignment of grades. (This requirement allows for collective responsibility, as when a faculty committee has the authority to override a grade on appeal.)

b. The institution refrains from the transcription of credit from other institutions or providers that it will not apply to its own programs.

c. The institution has formal and current written agreements for managing any internships and clinical placements included in its programs.

d. The institution has a formal, decentralized process for faculty hiring, oversight of the curriculum—its establishment of the academic qualifications for instructional personnel; and the establishment of the academic qualifications for instructional personnel.

e. The institution has a clear policy on the maximum allowable credit for prior learning as a reasonable proportion of the credits required to complete the student’s program. Credit awarded for prior learning is documented, evaluated, and appropriate for the level of degree awarded. (Note that this requirement does not apply to courses transferred from other institutions.)

f. The institution maintains a minimum requirement for general education for all of its undergraduate programs whether through a traditional practice of distributed curricula (15 semester credits for AAS degrees, 24 for AS or AA degrees, and 30 for bachelor’s degrees) or through integrated, embedded, interdisciplinary, or other accepted models that demonstrate a minimum requirement equivalent to the distributed model. Any variation is explained and justified.

3. Support Services

a. Financial aid advising clearly and comprehensively reviews students’ eligibility for financial assistance and assists students in a full understanding of their debt and its consequences.

b. The institution maintains timely and accurate transcript and records services.

C. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

1. Instructors (excluding for this requirement teaching assistants enrolled in a graduate program and supervised by faculty) have the authority for the assignment of grades. (This requirement allows for collective responsibility, as when a faculty committee has the authority to override a grade on appeal.)

2. The institution refrains from the transcription of credit from other institutions or providers that it will not apply to its own programs.

3. The institution has formal and current written agreements for managing any internships and clinical placements included in its programs.
4. A predominantly or solely single-purpose institution in fields that require licensure for practice is also accredited by or is actively in the process of applying to a recognized specialized accrediting agency for each field, if such agency exists.

5. Instructors communicate course requirements to students through syllabi in writing and in a timely manner.

6. Institutional data on assessment of student learning are accurate and address the full range of students who enroll.

7. Institutional data on student retention, persistence, and completion are accurate and address the full range of students who enroll.

D. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

1. The institution is able to meet its current financial obligations.

2. The institution has a prepared budget for the current year and the capacity to compare it with budgets and actual results of previous years.

3. The institution has future financial projections addressing its long-term financial sustainability.

4. The institution maintains effective systems for collecting, analyzing, and using institutional information.

5. The institution undergoes an external audit by a certified public accountant or a public audit agency of its own financial and educational activities and maintains audited financial statements finances separately from the finances of any other related entity or parent corporation. For private institutions the audit is annual; for public institutions it is at least every two years.2

6. The institution’s administrative structure includes a chief executive officer, chief financial officer, and chief academic officer (titles may vary) with appropriate credentials and experience and sufficient focus on the institution to ensure appropriate leadership and oversight. (An institution may outsource its financial functions but must have the capacity to assure the effectiveness of that arrangement.)

Notes:

1 Institutions operating under federal control and authorized by Congress are exempt from these requirements. These institutions must have a public board that includes representation by individuals who do not have a current or previous employment or other relationship with the federal government or any military entity. This public board has a significant role in setting policy, reviewing the institution’s finances, reviewing and approving major institutional priorities, and overseeing the academic programs of the institution.

2 For example, for a bachelor’s degree requiring 120 credits, the institution accepts no more than 90 credits in total through transfer or other assessment of prior learning, and the remaining 30 must fall within the last 60 credits awarded the student.

3 Institutions under federal control are exempted provided that they have other reliable information to document the institution’s fiscal resources and management.

5. Institutional Obligations of Affiliation

While seeking and holding affiliation with the Commission, an institution voluntarily agrees to meet obligations set forth by the Commission as follows:

1. The institution meets obligations set forth by the Commission, including periodic evaluation through the structures and mechanisms set forth in Commission policies, submission of reports as requested by the Commission, filing of the Institutional Update, and any other requirements set forth in its policies.

2. The institution is candid, transparent, and forthcoming in its dealings with the Commission, including in its responses to any special inquiries or requests for information from the Commission. The institution agrees not to enter into any agreement that limits the nature or scope of its communications with the Commission or requires that a third party review and approve those communications prior to their transmission to the Commission.

3. The institution notifies the Commission of any condition or situation that has the potential to affect the institution’s status with the Commission, such as a significant unanticipated reduction in program offerings or serious legal investigation. (A fuller list of such conditions or situations is included in the Commission’s policy on special monitoring.)

4. The institution informs the Commission of its relationship with any related entity wherein institutional decision-making is controlled by that entity and of any changes in that relationship that may affect the institution’s compliance with Commission accreditation requirements. (Definitions and process requirements are contained in the Commission’s policy on institutions with related entities.)

5. The institution describes itself in identical terms to the Commission and to any other institutional accrediting body with which it holds or seeks affiliation with regard to purpose, governance, programs, sites, degrees, diplomas, certificates, personnel, finances, and constituents.

6. The institution notifies the Commission when it receives an adverse action from or has been placed on sanction by any other
accrediting agency or if a state has issued a pending or final action that affects the institution’s legal status or authority to grant degrees.

7. The institution assures its employees and students that it will consider fairly all complaints and third-party comments and not engage in retaliatory action against any who have submitted such information.

8. The institution accepts that the Commission will, in the interest of transparency to the public, publish outcomes from its accreditation process.

9. The institution portrays its accreditation status with the Commission clearly to the public, including the status of its branch campuses and related entities. The institution posts the electronic version of the Commission’s Mark of Affiliation in at least one place on its Web site, linking users directly to the institution’s status on the Commission’s Web site.

10. The institution communicates to its constituencies and applicants any Public Disclosure Notice it receives from the Higher Learning Commission.

11. The institution maintains prominently on its Web site a telephone number that includes an option for both current students and the public to speak with a representative of the institution.

12. The institution submits timely payment of dues and fees and accepts the fact of surcharges for late payment.

13. The institution agrees to accept binding arbitration in the event of an action by the Commission’s Board of Trustees that the institution disputes and is not able to resolve through the Commission’s processes. This agreement follows procedures developed and published by the Commission. The institution also agrees to grant immunity to the Commission from claims of civil liability related to judgments made by the Commission or its agents in the course of its work of accrediting institutions provided that it was acting in good faith and within the scope of its responsibilities.

6 Criteria for Accreditation: Glossary

There are a few words and phrases in the Criteria that require additional clarification, seemingly simple language that, in practice, may be used in different ways by different member institutions. This glossary explains how these words are used within the Criteria for Accreditation. Its intent is not to prescribe how institutions must use a particular word or phrase locally, but rather to offer a means to ensure a consistent reading of the meaning and expectations of the Criteria for Accreditation.

**Glossary**

- **auxiliary** denotes activities and services related to but not intrinsic to educational functions: dining services, student housing, faculty or staff housing, intercollegiate athletics, student stores, a Public Radio station, etc. In many institutions auxiliary simultaneously denotes a segregated budget and dedicated revenues.

- **assessment** and **evaluation** are used as ordinary language synonyms. When a narrower referent is intended, the terms are modified, as in “assessment of student learning” or “evaluation of academic services.”

- **control** as used in the Criteria refers to the institution’s status as a public, private-not-for-profit, or private-for-profit institution, and in the latter instances, to the institution’s ownership and the board’s power to direct its affairs.

- **dual credit** refers to courses taught to high school students for which the students receive both high school credit and college credit. These courses or programs are offered under a variety of names; the Criteria on “dual credit” apply to all of them as they involve the accredited institution’s responsibility for the quality of its offerings.

- **faculty** and **instructors** refer to all those an institution employs or assigns to teach students. **Faculty** is used to refer to the group rather than to each individual instructional staff member, typically to distinguish faculty from administration.

- **goals** and **outcomes** are used inconsistently by member institutions in the context of assessment of student learning, to the extent that one institution’s **goal** may be another’s **outcome** and vice versa. When they use either term, the Criteria indicate through context whether the term refers to the learning intended or to how much students actually learn.

- **public** in phrases such as “makes available to the public” or “states publicly” refers to people **in general**, including current and potential students. In phrases such as “the public good,” the Criteria refer to public, as opposed to private, good. The modifier **public** as used to describe governing board members is defined within the statement requiring such members.

- **wherever and however delivered** is intended to encompass all modes of delivery and all locations, modalities, and venues, including but not limited to the main campus, additional locations, distance delivery, dual credit, contractual or consortial arrangements.
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Pamela J. Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost

Re: University Dashboard Update

In September of 2011, the senior leadership of Ohio University developed a university dashboard that aligned with the 4x4 strategic plan. At that time, the trustees reviewed other ways in which boards tracked metrics for their institutions and the functions of dashboards. The dashboard was intended to provide an ‘at a glance view’ of the current institution, monitor performance toward strategic priorities, academic quality, and those indicators needed to fulfill the fiduciary responsibilities for trustees. The dashboard included indicators that provided trend data and comparative data when available.

With the assistance of Interim Director of Institutional Research, Dr. Joni Wadley, this presentation provides an annual update on the indicators relevant to the four fundamentals along with explanations regarding directional changes. While annual changes are reported, it is also important to examine five-year trend lines on these metrics.
## Past Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Retention</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Ohio Four-year Public Institutions</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-Year Graduation Rates</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Ohio Four-year Public Institutions</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Granted</td>
<td>6,212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Composite</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction Rating</td>
<td>40.1 &amp; 50.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Headcount</td>
<td>22,685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Ohio Four-year Public Institutions</td>
<td>17,564</td>
<td>18,363</td>
<td>19,996</td>
<td>21,655</td>
<td>22,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I Faculty</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Ohio Four-year Public Institutions</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Creative Activity Expo</td>
<td>652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>$67.2 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Ohio Four-year Public Institutions</td>
<td>$54.7</td>
<td>$63.4</td>
<td>$57.4</td>
<td>$66.1</td>
<td>$67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Faculty Compensation</td>
<td>$93.6 to $134.6 (in thousands)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Ohio Four-year Public Institutions</td>
<td>$125.4</td>
<td>$164.4</td>
<td>$196.4</td>
<td>$254.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I Faculty Retention</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Ohio Four-year Public Institutions</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts (Pledges)</td>
<td>$45.6 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Ohio Four-year Public Institutions</td>
<td>$89.6</td>
<td>$25.7</td>
<td>$21.4</td>
<td>$24.9</td>
<td>$45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Reserve Ratio</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Ohio Four-year Public Institutions</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Burden Ratio</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Ohio Four-year Public Institutions</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Performance</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Ohio Four-year Public Institutions</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td>-19.6%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Maintenance Backlog</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Ohio Four-year Public Institutions</td>
<td>$66</td>
<td>$69</td>
<td>$71</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Performance Indicators

- **Student-Faculty Interaction Rating:** 40.1 & 50.1
- **Undergraduate Headcount:** 22,685
- **Average Faculty Compensation:** $93.6 to $134.6 (in thousands)
- **Group I Faculty Retention:** 92%
- **Grants and Contracts:** $67.2 million
- **Gifts (Pledges):** $45.6 million
- **Primary Reserve Ratio:** 49.6%
- **Debt Burden Ratio:** 3.3%
- **Investment Performance:** -0.2%
- **Deferred Maintenance Backlog:** $80
Academic Quality: The Dashboard & the Four Fundamentals

Functions of the Dashboard

• Provides an “at a glance” view of the current state of the institution
• Monitors performance toward strategic priorities
• Monitors performance on the academic quality of the institution
• Provides data on key performance indicators needed to fulfill the fiduciary responsibilities of the trustees
### Monitoring Changes in the Dashboard Indicators 2011-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>5-year Average</th>
<th>Ohio Public Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Retention</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Year Graduation Rate</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Granted</td>
<td>6,212</td>
<td>5,073</td>
<td>3,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Composite</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction Rating</td>
<td>40.1 &amp; 50.1</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>20:1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 Faculty</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Creative Activity Expo Participation</td>
<td>652 students</td>
<td>566 students</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>$45.6 M</td>
<td>$61.76 M</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First-Year Retention

• Average ACT was down in 2011
• Increase in number of students on academic probation after their first quarter
• State average for first-year retention decreased reflecting a more mobile student population

Six-Year Graduation Rates

• Decrease in graduation rate followed decrease in retention rate from previous years
• Transfer out rate increased as students are more mobile
• Ohio University still currently third in the state
Degrees Granted

- Consistent with enrollment increases
- Increase in eLearning bachelor’s degrees
- Increase in anticipation of conversion to semesters
- Trend anticipated to continue consistent with the enrollment plan

ACT Composite

- Recruitment efforts
- Quality of academic programs
Student-Faculty Ratio

- Increase in student headcount in combination with faculty buyout and increase in faculty retirements resulted in slight decrease in student-faculty ratio

Group 1 Faculty

- Faculty buyout
- Faculty retirements
- Strategic staffing plans
Research and Creative Activity Expo Participation

- Semester conversion
- Undergraduate research culture

Grants and Contracts

- Revised to reflect private grants and contracts
- Includes capital grants and gifts
TRANSFER OF INDIVIDUAL INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAM DEGREES TO THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

RESOLUTION 2013 –

WHEREAS, the Graduate College was re-established as an academic unit in 2008, with part of its mission to foster interdisciplinary graduate education and research, and

WHEREAS, degrees awarded under the Individual Interdisciplinary Program are currently conferred by academic colleges other than the Graduate College, and

WHEREAS, the Individual Interdisciplinary Program was restructured by the Graduate Council in 2011 with the intention that it would be administered by the Graduate College, and

WHEREAS, the Graduate Council, which is made up of representatives from all of the colleges with graduate degree programs, has unanimously recommended that degrees under the Individual Interdisciplinary Program be awarded by the Graduate College.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Ohio University Board of Trustees recognizes the Ohio University Graduate College as a degree-conferring college, with responsibility for administration and conferral of degrees under the Individual Interdisciplinary Program, including the Master of Arts, Master of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy with Individual Program of Study.
Interoffice Communication

Date:       June 3, 2013

To:         The President and Board of Trustees

From:       Pamela J. Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost

Re:         Transfer of Individual Interdisciplinary Program Degrees to the Graduate College

The Individual Interdisciplinary Program (IIP) has since the 1970s provided a means for students to pursue advanced study and research in areas that combine disciplinary elements from two or more of the university’s traditional academic programs. The IIP offers the M.A., M.S., and Ph.D. degrees with the label Individual Program of Study. Under a system developed prior to the creation of the current Graduate College, IIP degrees are conferred by the academic college hosting the student’s primary advisor.

In 2011 the Ohio University Graduate Council, which is charged with recommending graduate education policy, established revisions to the IIP structure to strengthen the quality of the program. To ensure accountability, consistency, and appropriate administrative support, the Graduate Council recommended that the Graduate College, established in 2008, be responsible for oversight of the IIP.

Oversight of the IIP is consistent with the Graduate College’s mission. The Graduate College Task Force charged with outlining the role and function of the college explicitly recommended that it serve as the college of record for interdisciplinary programs not fully or predominantly contained within one of the other academic colleges.

The resolution accompanying this memo would transfer responsibility for conferral of IIP degrees to the Graduate College, thereby bringing this function into alignment with the Graduate College’s responsibility for other aspects of the program. Oversight and conferral of interdisciplinary degrees by the Graduate College is common at other universities and considered best practice by the Council of Graduate Schools. Graduate Council, comprised of faculty and administrative representatives from all of the colleges engaged in graduate education at the university, unanimously endorsed this action at its April 12, 2013 meeting.
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 to “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 hereby accepts the program review for the Medical Assisting Technology program on the Lancaster campus.
Interoffice Communication

Date: June 3, 2013

To: The President and Board of Trustees

From: Pamela J. Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost

Re: Program Reviews

- Lancaster Campus - Medical Assisting Technology Program
- College of Health Sciences and Professions - Applied Health Sciences and Wellness
- Patton College of Education
  - Department of Counseling and Higher Education
  - Department of Education Studies
  - Department of Teacher Education

The University has a rigorous program of internal review for academic programs. Programs are reviewed by the Academic Program Review Committee of the University Curriculum Council on a seven year cycle. Typically reviews occur over an academic year and culminate in a comprehensive report on the viability of the program. Executive summaries of the reviews are submitted to the Academics Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Included with your materials for the upcoming meeting are the Executive Summary for the program reviews listed above and a resolution(s) for board acceptance of the reviews. I will briefly discuss the disposition of the review recommendations during June’s committee meeting.
Review of the RHE Medical Assisting Technology (MAT) Program

Summary

The Program Review Committee presents their review and recommendations regarding the Medical Assisting Technology (MAT) program offered at the Lancaster campus.

The program is found to be viable but, after considering the response of the executive dean, the program review committee recommends a follow up review in academic year 2016 to determine whether the faculty that are due to retire have been replaced, and if not, to determine the viability of the program.
University Curriculum Council  
Academic Program Review Committee  
Medical Assisting Technology (MAT) –major code AA5019—  
Associate in Applied Science -- Ohio University Lancaster  
Seven-year Review  

Executive Summary  

The Medical Assisting Technology (MAT) Program is a program housed on Ohio University’s Lancaster campus. The two-year program awards the Associate in Applied Science degree with the goals of (1) creating a marketable entry-level medical assistant, (2) allowing a MAT graduate the ability to continue on with a bachelor’s degree, (3) having the OUL MAT program be recognized by medical facilities in the geographic area, and (4) preparing graduates for the Certified Medical Assistant exam. The program has one full-time faculty member (who is the program director) and one part-time adjunct faculty member. During the period of the review, enrollment increased from 9 to 13, with 4-6 graduates each year. Although there is little diversity in student gender and ethnicity, skewing white and female, many MAT students are first-generation college students and receive government assistance. Students who complete the program may sit for the Certified Medical Assisting exam, with a 100% pass rate.  

The MAT program fills a niche in programming at the Lancaster campus; students in the program report strong support from faculty and cite opportunities for career advancement as an outcome of the curriculum. The Program has an outstanding reputation in the community.  

Commendations  
The MAT program should be commended for its accreditation through the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP), the program director serving on the accrediting agency board, and its 100% job placement for graduates.  

Concerns  
The reviewers expressed some concerns. The imminent retirement of both faculty with no identified plan for replacement with qualified faculty leaves the program vulnerable. The new method of establishing pass rate percentage on the CMA examination will affect the CMA pass rate. The required teaching load is relatively heavy for an accredited program and includes administrative tasks to respond to and ensure continued accreditation. Competition with nursing programs will affect program demand.  

Recommendations  
The MAT program should actively recruit replacement faculty who meet accreditation requirements. The program should develop a growth strategy that includes analysis of competition, promotion of career path opportunities, and student recruitment opportunities. OUL and the program leadership should continue to develop partnerships for clinical experiences and to build upon post-degree placement sites.  

Review prepared by Deborah Henderson (Nursing) and David Carr (Recreation and Sport Pedagogy). Site visit conducted on May 2, 2012 by Tom Scanlan (Arts and Sciences), Ann Paulins (Human and Consumer Sciences Education), Eddith Dashiell (Communications).
Program Review

The Medical Assisting Technology (MAT) Program, housed on Ohio University’s Lancaster campus, is a two-year program that leads to an Associate in Applied Science degree. The goals of the MAT program are: (1) to create a marketable entry-level medical assistant, (2) to allow an MAT graduate the ability to continue on with a bachelor’s degree, (3) to have the OUL MAT program be recognized as a quality program by medical facilities in the geographic area, and (4) to provide a CAAHEP accredited program so the graduates can sit for the CMA (AAMA) exam--Certified Medical Assistant (American Association of Medical Assistants).

The MAT Program has one full-time faculty member (who is the program director) and one part-time adjunct faculty member. As required by the accrediting agency, the program director has a private office that includes locking file cabinets for student records.

The MAT students are both traditional and non-traditional students. Many of them are first-generation college students, are female, and receive government assistance. After graduating with their associate degrees, some of the students continue with their bachelor’s degrees in Technical and Applied Studies, Health Communication, or Health Services Administration. The students who complete the program may sit for the Certified Medical Assisting (CMA, AAMA) exam. In the past, the program had a 100% pass rate; however, Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) recently changed how it compiles data about the CMA (AAMA) exam pass rates—they are now computed on the graduates who take the exam and pass, not the number of individuals who take the exam, with a percent who pass the exam reported. The Program has an outstanding reputation in the community and graduates easily find jobs, often with their externship (practicum) experience sites.

Between 2003-04 and 2010-11, enrollments have increased from 9 to 13 (the range of students enrolled in that time period varied from 8 to 16). Typically, four and six students have graduated each year, with 100% job placement in the field. There is little diversity in student gender and ethnicity, with a high proportion of students being white and female.

The MAT program fills a niche in programming at the Lancaster campus; students in the program report strong support from faculty and cite opportunities for career advancement as an outcome of the curriculum.

Faculty Profile

The MAT Program has one full-time faculty member and one part-time adjunct faculty member. The full-time faculty member is also the Program Director (PD). Based on CAAHEP standards, the PD must be a CMA (AAMA). The PD oversees the program, teaches MA courses, files all reports with CAAHEP, etc., and is the practicum coordinator. The accrediting agency requires that the program director, faculty, and practicum coordinator all have job descriptions that are approved by MAERB/CAAHEP and are kept on file with the agencies. The job descriptions submitted with the self-study included the following: OUL MAT Faculty Job Description, OUL MAT Program Director Job Description, and OUL MAT Practicum Coordinator Job Description.
One part-time faculty member is a retired OU administrator. The part-time faculty member primarily teaches medical terminology and clinical courses while the full-time faculty teaches administrative courses. Both faculty members are female.

**Programmatic Practices**

**Teaching and Advising.** The teaching load for the full-time faculty member/program director (PD) is eight hours per quarter. The PD started receiving a four-credit quarter hour load reduction per quarter for accreditation tasks, not OU duties, as a result of the first CAAHEP on-site survey, which mandated a load reduction for the PD position. The courses taught by the PD and the part-time faculty is decided by the PD with consideration of students’ course needs. The PD is responsible for all student advising, as well as overseeing admission into the program. Admission duties include confirmation of all required CAAHEP forms and proof of requirements such as vaccinations and a health history.

**Support for Research.** The focus of this program is on career development with an associate degree awarded. There is little support required other than that relating to faculty interest in research and support that is available to all faculty on the OUL campus. Creative activity of the full-time faculty member is monitored by the OUL annual evaluation process. OUL provides travel support to all required conferences, such as AAMA Annual Conference every fall (held in a different region of U.S. each year) and the OSSMA (Ohio State Society of Medical Assistants) conference held every spring (in a different region of Ohio).

**Service.** All group I faculty members have service expectations. The PD is very active in the medical assisting accreditation process and takes responsibility for the OUL program administrative duties. Both faculty members are valuable to the OUL campus and serve within their program, at the campus, and in the Regional Higher Education system.

**Interdisciplinary Work.** The MAT Program works with various associate degree programs, including Health Technology, Human Services Technology, and bachelor degree programs, including Health Services Administration and Health Communication. The PD has been and is involved with CTAG for the MAT Program.

**Diversity of Faculty/Students.** As reported, there is one full time faculty member who serves also as the program director. There is an additional part time faculty member working with this program. While OUL makes attempts to make this program available to diverse groups of students, the data shows those interested in and pursuing this associate degree, have a particular demographic pattern of being female non-traditional students.

**Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity**

**Scholarship.** Both the full-time faculty member and part-time faculty member are required to keep current in medical assisting practices. The full-time faculty member/PD is a CMA (AAMA) and must complete continuing education units to keep the certification current and renew certification every five years. Evidence of the PD’s certification was attached to the self-study and was noted by reviewers. The PD is a national reviewer/surveyor for CAAHEP-
accredited programs in the U.S. The PD is also a licensed teacher in the state of Ohio. The PD is required to job shadow as a medical assistant periodically in order to maintain certification. The PD delivers presentations to organizations on topics such as “Conducting an Effective Meeting.”

**Resources**

**Staffing.** Staffing of the program is dependent on the two faculty members identified in the review. There is adequate support staff to assist faculty with tasks such as purchasing, travel arrangements, and other clerical support needs.

**Physical Facilities and Technology.** PD/FT faculty has a private office that includes locking file cabinets as required by the accrediting agency. The part-time faculty office space is housed within the MAT clinical lab. The MAT clinical lab, Room 216 Herrold Hall, consists of 780 square feet. The clinical lab contains lecture tables, two patient exam stations, venipuncture area, a counter to perform medical laboratory tests, a computer workstation, and storage cabinets and closet. It has working room for a maximum of 12 students at one time. The administrative classes are taught in one of two computer labs (Rooms 217 and 219 Herrold Hall) where students (maximum of 20 students) have adequate desk space for coding tasks, computers for course work, as well as storage cabinets for administrative supplies. Students currently use Medisoft for practice management, Synapse EHR for electronic health records, Microsoft Office, and Internet for access to needed sites, such as NIH.gov for other class assignments.

**Undergraduate Program Review**

**Curriculum.** The MAT curriculum is guided by University requirements for an associate degree and the CAAHEP Standards and Guidelines. The Standards and Guidelines change approximately every five years. When the last OU Seven-year Review occurred, the program was under the 2003 requirements and is now under the 2008 requirements. The Program has a strong advisory committee and medical advisor (local physician) who assist with decisions about the program and curriculum. This involvement is required by CAAHEP. The MAT courses and non-MAT required courses all provide content as required by OU and CAAHEP.

The majority of MAT courses are taken by majors; however, students outside the major can take Medical Terminology, Introduction to Medical Assisting, Law and Ethics, and Pharmacology and Disease Processes.

**Students.** The MAT students are both traditional and non-traditional students. Many of them are first-generation college students, female, and receive government assistance. After graduating with an associate degree, many students continue and earn a baccalaureate degree in Technical and Applied Studies, Health Communication, or Health Services.

**Graduate Program Review**

Not applicable.
Closing Summary

The reviewers commend the MAT program for its accreditation through the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP), having a program director and tenured faculty member who serves on the accrediting agency board, and the 100% job placement for graduates.

The reviewers expressed some concerns, among them are the imminent retirement of both faculty who teach in the program, no identified plan for replacement with qualified faculty meeting medical assisting professional standards, the new method of establishing pass rate percentage on the CMA examination which has affected OUL’s MAT CMA pass rate and the small but steady enrollment (n=9-13) which yields 4 to 6 graduates each year.

Reviewers state that the MAT program is viable, and offer the following recommendations. The MAT program should actively recruit replacement faculty who meet accreditation requirements. The program should develop a growth strategy that includes analysis of competition, promotion of career path opportunities, and student recruitment opportunities. OUL and the program leadership should continue to develop partnerships for clinical experiences and to build upon post-degree placement sites.
MEMORANDUM

To: Robert Brannan, Chair, UCC Academic Program Review Committee

From: Jim Smith, Dean, Ohio University Lancaster

Copy: Jim Fonseca, Executive Dean for Regional Higher Education

Subj: Internal Review of the A.A.S. in Medical Assisting Technology (major code AA5019)

Date: November 26, 2012

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the internal review of the Medical Assisting Technology (MAT) program. As noted, the program has been very successful in achieving a 100% pass rate on the Certified Medical Assisting (CMA) exam. This assessment of learning outcomes coupled with a 100% job placement rate are positive indicators about the quality of the instruction, enriching field experiences and engaged, caring faculty.

I concur with many of the observations of the site review team. One primary concern is that experienced program faculty will retire in May 2014 and a key part-time faculty member has indicated retirement as early December 2012. The report notes that 1.5 FTE are needed for delivery of program content. As the program coordinator has expressed intention to continue as a retired faculty member, some portion of coverage for the partial FTE will occur and the staffing plan for OUL has included replacement of the program coordinator (1 FTE) next year (pending approval). On a positive note, the continued involvement of the retiring program coordinator will facilitate maintaining information essential to the achievements of the past as we move forward.

While the issue of change in calculation procedures to the certification exam pass rate is concerning, the issue is common to other CAAHEP programs where taking or passing the exam is not required for employment in the field or related areas. The cost of $125 is a challenge for students receiving aid. It is not clear at this point the impact of the
change on the program with such a small number of graduates and when the AAMA reports a 67.5% pass rate among new CMAs (http://www.aama-ntl.org/becomeCMA/faqs_certification.aspx#stats) and an overall 70% threshold for the program to meet standards. In order to promote more students to take the exam will be dependent on the ability of the faculty to impress upon the students the value of the certification credential for professional advancement, career growth and potential increases in salary in some settings.

While running any academic program with one or two faculty is always challenging, the teaching load is consistent with other regional campus faculty. Release time is afforded for annual program direction and accreditation reporting needs and may be increased when it is necessary to conduct a self-study.

While one primary concern is the retirement of faculty, another significant concern is overall program enrollment. The program review report notes enrollment growth from 9 to 14 students which aligns to the program lab capacity of 12; given the small number of graduates, more students are needed. Ideally, the program should double in size (approximately 24) to allow for joint lectures supported with two lab sections. While the report notes competition with nursing, there may be the ability to leverage that audience that has an interest in health care. While many students select nursing initially some may discover that a pathway to MAT may fit better to their personal achievements and aptitude to the number and level of science, statistics and other prerequisite required. Working with student services and nursing advisors, MAT should be offered as an alternative to those that may be considering a new major away from nursing.

Directly tied to enrollment is appropriate promotion of the program to recruit students. OUL is addressing program promotion with changes to web pages, program brochures, and advertising of program clusters (e.g., the health care cluster which would include health technology, medical assisting technology and at the bachelor’s level health services administration and possibly nursing), and establishing/reinforcing partnerships with the schools. Over time, these changes should have a positive impact on inquiries about the program and its enrollment.

In conclusion, I concur that the program remains viable as I believe concerns expressed in this review are being addressed or can be managed effectively. I look forward to working with the present faculty, division coordinator and future program faculty to maintain accreditation, grow the program and serve our community.
November 25, 2012

Dr. Rob Brannan, Chair
Program Review Committee
University Curriculum Council

Dear Rob:

I was pleased to read the draft of the program review document for Medical Assisting Technology Program at the Ohio University Lancaster campus.

I agree with the review assessment that the MAT is a viable component of the curriculum at Lancaster and that the program serves a number of students by offering them training in current knowledge and methods in medical technology.

I also note the concerns and recommendations the Committee has. Please be assured that as long as RHE continues to offer the program, a full-time faculty member will be hired to be the lead faculty member and the program coordinator. I do note some concern in Dean Smith’s response regarding enrollment numbers, but assuming the program is not discontinued due to weak enrollment, RHE is committed to full-time faculty support for the program.

The report’s guidance in its recommendations, namely that the program develop a growth strategy that includes analysis of competition, promotion of career path opportunities, and student recruitment opportunities is helpful advice that we will follow, particularly in light of low enrollment. OUL and the program leadership will indeed continue to develop partnerships for clinical experiences and to build upon post-degree placement sites.

As you know, it is our goal to have the MAT program, and all RHE Associate Degree programs, offer an up-to-date curriculum that will prepare our students to enter the local workforce. In addition, many of our students will continue their educations by completion of a baccalaureate degree program. These programs may be a degree completion program such as the Bachelors of Applied Management or the Bachelors of Technical and Applied Studies, or they may be any number of other baccalaureate programs offered at the regional campuses or at Athens.

In summary I would like to thank the UCC Programs Committee and the reviewers who visited for their time and input into this process. RHE remains committed to the support of the MAT program and will do all it can to be sure that sufficient financial support, physical space, equipment and, of course, faculty and staff resources are dedicated to serving our local students in this program.

Sincerely,

James W. Fonseca
Interim Executive Dean
Regional Higher Education
April 2, 2013

David Ingram, Chair
UCC Program Review Committee
Alden Library
301G Faculty Commons
Athens, OH 45701

Dear David:

The regional deans and I appreciate the opportunity to respond to the concerns about the Associate in Applied Science degree in Medical Assisting Technology (MAT) program expressed in the recent UCC review. When you see our actions and explanations below, I am hopeful that you will agree with us that the MAT program is a good quality program and should no longer be considered “in jeopardy.”

The UCC will also be pleased to note that during the time period of our discussions, the OU MAT program has received its annual review from its accrediting agency, the Medical Assisting Education Review Board, and has achieved all outcome thresholds for the most recent period. This review is based on retention, job placement, survey of graduates and survey of employers.

For clarity, I have labeled the categories of concern below:

**Plan to replace faculty:** This issue raised in the Program Review has been resolved with the advance approval by the EVPP of a search for a replacement full-time faculty member if and when the current faculty member retires.

**Enrollment:** As Dean James Smith notes in his response to the UCC review, recruitment efforts will be expanded to increase enrollment in the MAT program. We believe that the offering of the BSN degree at the regional campuses is as likely to increase interest in the MAT as it is to draw students from it. We are hopeful that due to the high quality of the curriculum and the employment placement of graduates, that the new methods of establishing pass rate percentages on the CMA exam will not greatly impact enrollment.

**Linkage of enrollment and faculty replacement:** In any Associate Degree with limited enrollment, discontinuation of the program, with proper concern for protection of tenured faculty, is always a possibility. Technical associate degrees exist, to some extent, to serve current employment needs of our local communities and they are occasionally
discontinued due to changes in the labor market, as was the Associate Degree in Travel and Tourism some years ago in response to the dramatic decline of employment opportunities for travel agents and subsequent decline in student enrollment. On occasion an associate degree may be discontinued but much of its content may be established as a specialized track within another closely-related associate degree.

In the interest of not placing tenure-track faculty in jeopardy, re-evaluation of enrollment and program continuance on the occasion of the retirement of a sole tenured faculty member in a program is a very opportune time for such analysis. The regional deans and I do not see this re-evaluation as an indicator of a program in jeopardy, but instead, as a natural process of maintaining alignment to the economic development needs of the communities we serve.

Reaccreditation and faculty teaching load: We recognize that the standard teaching load for regional campus faculty and the additional time required for the accreditation process could result in an overload for programs with a limited number of faculty. Campus deans are quite willing to discuss possible teaching load reductions for faculty involved in peak times of the accreditation or re-accreditation process.

Assessment of Learning Objectives: In accord with its external accreditation status, the MAT program has established learning objectives and has in place a process of continuous improvement to ensure that learning objectives are being met. In accord with the assessment timetable developed for all regional campus associate degree programs, MAT faculty will work with other RHE Program Coordinators and University Assessment officials to satisfactorily demonstrate these learning objectives in a format compatible with the UCC process.

As noted by Dean Smith in his letter, I would also like to express my appreciation to the site visitors, to the UCC Program Review Committee and to all members of the UCC for their time spent on this process and for their helpful guidance. We are fortunate that the issues brought to our attention by the Review have been able to be expeditiously addressed and we are hopeful that the UCC no longer considers the program in jeopardy. Regardless of UCC's final categorization of the MAT program, the regional deans and I will be more than willing to work with you should the UCC feel that an update on the status of these issues or a follow-up site visit is needed for the MAT program in Spring of 2014.

Sincerely,

James W. Fonseca
Interim Executive Dean

cc: Martin Tuck, Dean, Chillicothe Campus
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 to “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 hereby accepts the program review for the Applied Health Sciences and Wellness program within the College of Health Sciences and Professions.
University Curriculum Committee
Academic Program Review

Applied Health Sciences and Wellness
Ohio University – College of Health Sciences and Professions

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Applied Health Sciences and Wellness degree programs are viable programs.

The School of Applied Health Sciences and Wellness (AHSW) was formed 2010 as the result of restructuring of the College of Health and Human Services to create the College of Health Sciences and Professions. Specifically, the programs are as follows:

- **Athletic Training.** The program includes an undergraduate degree program (Bachelor of Science in Athletic Training) and a graduate degree program for the athletic training profession. The profession specializes in the clinical diagnosis, immediate management, treatment and rehabilitation of acute, chronic or congenital musculoskeletal conditions. Both degree programs have been available at Ohio University since 1972.

- **Exercise Physiology.** The program includes an undergraduate degree program (Bachelor of Science in Exercise Physiology) and a graduate degree program (Master of Science in Physiology of Exercise). Professionals in the exercise physiology evaluate physical fitness levels and develop appropriate exercise programs for a wide range of populations, from cardiac rehabilitation patients to athletes to participants in community and corporate health programs.

- **Nutrition.** The program includes two undergraduate degree programs (Bachelor of Science in Food and Nutrition Sciences (Nutrition) and Bachelor of Science in Food and Nutrition Sciences (Applied Nutrition)), a minor in Applied Nutrition, and a graduate degree program (Master of Science in Food and Nutrition Sciences). The nutrition major (pre-medicine/pre-professional) is for those interested in a career in areas such as nutrition, medicine, veterinary medicine, dentistry, pharmacy and physical therapy. The applied nutrition major allows the student to pursue one of three concentrations: dietetics, environmental nutrition, and culinary nutrition.

The program also supports a certificate program in Diabetes. All three divisions function to prepare students to become clinicians and/or scholars.

Commendations

The Applied Health Sciences and Wellness degree programs are to be commended for the following:

- Large number of student majors in each of the three programs that continues to grow;
- Dedicated and collegial faculty and staff;
- All programs provide valuable services to the region;
- Accredited programs (Athletic Training and Nutrition); and

---

1Prepared in Fall 2012 by two internal reviewers from the UCC Academic Program Review Committee – Dr. William Shambora (Department of Economics, Ohio University) and Dr. Katherine Hartman (Department of Marketing, Ohio University) – and one external reviewer, Dr. Helaine Alessio (Department of Kinesiology and Health, Miami University).
• For most faculty, good scholarly output and productivity. This research and creative activities extends to work with students.

Concerns and Recommendations

Concerns with the program include the following:
• Limited number of faculty in proportion to student enrollment at both the Group I and Group II levels;
• Limited administrative staff support;
• Limited space for existing laboratory equipment;
• Lacking a formalized articulation of requirements for faculty evaluation including (but not limited to) promotion and tenure;
• High teaching and advising loads for research faculty; and
• Uneven utilization (i.e., some are over-used while others are under-used) of graduate assistants across the three programs.

Recommendations for the program include the following:
• Reduce the student to faculty ratio either by (1) hiring more faculty at the Group I and Group II levels for each program or (2) implementing an enrollment management system;
• Hire at least one more full-time administrative staff member;
• Identify appropriate laboratory space for EP and AT that can be successfully utilized within the next three years;
• Develop and disseminate a formalized set of requirements for tenure and/or promotion and corresponding evaluation criteria to all faculty;
• Reduce teaching load for research faculty and pre-tenure faculty;
• Hire a full-time chief academic advisor for undergraduate first year, second year, and transfer students; and
• Revisit the types of teaching, research, and service assistance that graduate students can provide.

PROGRAM REVIEW

The School of Applied Health Sciences and Wellness (AHSW) was formed 2010 as the result of restructuring of the College of Health and Human Services to create the College of Health Sciences and Professions. Specifically, the programs are as follows:

• **Athletic Training.** The program includes an undergraduate degree program (Bachelor of Science in Athletic Training) and a graduate degree program for the athletic training profession. The profession specializes in the clinical diagnosis, immediate management, treatment and rehabilitation of acute, chronic or congenital musculoskeletal conditions. Both degree programs have been available at Ohio University since 1972.

• **Exercise Physiology.** The program includes an undergraduate degree program (Bachelor of Science in Exercise Physiology) and a graduate degree program (Master of Science in Physiology of Exercise). Professionals in the of exercise physiology evaluate physical fitness levels and develop appropriate exercise programs for a wide range of populations,
from cardiac rehabilitation patients to athletes to participants in community and corporate health programs.

- **Nutrition.** The program includes two undergraduate degree programs (Bachelor of Science in Food and Nutrition Sciences (Nutrition) and Bachelor of Science in Food and Nutrition Sciences (Applied Nutrition)), a minor in Applied Nutrition, and a graduate degree program (Master of Science in Food and Nutrition Sciences). The nutrition major (pre-medicine/pre-professional) is for those interested in a career in areas such as nutrition, medicine, veterinary medicine, dentistry, pharmacy and physical therapy. The applied nutrition major allows the student to pursue one of three concentrations: dietetics, environmental nutrition, and culinary nutrition.

The program also supports a certificate program in Diabetes. All three divisions function to prepare students to become clinicians and/or scholars.

**Faculty Profile**

During the period of the review, the programs included a total of 28 faculty members. At the end of the 2011-12 academic year, the School included 16 faculty members: 10 Group I and 6 Group II, 6 female and 10 male, and 15 Caucasian and 1 African American. Current staffing (2012-13) consists of four in Athletic Training, 6.5 in Exercise Physiology (one faculty member serves as director of the school), and 5.5 in Food and Nutrition (one faculty member is half time with OU-COM) faculty members. All Group I faculty have terminal degrees and one of the Group 2 faculty has a terminal degree.

**Programmatic Practices**

**Teaching and Advising.** The base teaching load in the quarters system has been a 2/2/2 (6 courses or 18-24 credit hours per academic year) load for Group I faculty and a 3/3/3 (9 courses or 32 credit hours per academic year) teaching load for Group II and IV (visiting) faculty. This is the equivalent to 60-70% of a Group I faculty members total work load. Faculty serving as division coordinators are provided with a one course release per year, yet high student enrollments may prohibit coordinators from taking this release. In addition to their teaching responsibilities faculty are responsible for all academic advising of the students in their majors. Divisions use a variety of advising methods to meet this end. Undergraduate student to faculty advising ratios are as follows for Nutrition (~25:1), Athletic Training (~40:1) and Exercise Physiology (~70:1). Group I faculty also advise graduate students, ranging from one to as many as 22 per.

**Research and Creative Activity.** Group I have an annual evaluation process that requires at least two scholarly goals (e.g., presentation, publications, grants) per year. Group II faculty do not have any scholarly expectations, but are encouraged to participate in scholarly activities with other faculty and/or students. Promotion and Tenure guidelines allow for the flexibility in workload distribution. Pre-tenure faculty are given a one course load reduction during their probationary period. New faculty are provided with a start-up package which is designed to assist them in initiating their research stream.
Service. All faculty in AHSW can expect to be assigned to at least two School committees. New faculty will only serve on one committee for the first two years if possible. Tenured faculty can expect to serve as the Chair of one School committee. All faculty within AHSW are assigned to at least one college level committee, and may serve on an additional ad hoc College committee. Committee service on the University level is not assigned, but is expected as faculty progress towards tenure.

Interdisciplinary Work. Faculty are encouraged to make collaborative connections across the school, within our College and across the University. Strong connections of the faculty with the Heritage College of Medicine, Biological and Biomedical Sciences, Edison Biotechnology Institute, Diabetes Research Initiative, Appalachian Rural Health Institute, and the Ohio Musculoskeletal and Neurological Institute are evidence of interdisciplinary work.

Diversity of Faculty / Students. The sixteen faculty members that continue in AHSW from 2012 include 6 females and 10 males with one faculty member of ethnic diversity. The School adheres to the University policy on all faculty searches and is working to improve diversity. The most recent data for diversity among students include 276 males, 410 females, with 21 African Americans, 4 Asian, and 16 Hispanic, with 22 other ethnic origins.

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Scholarship. Scholarship continues to be important. For a seven year period between 2005-06 and 2011-12, the following summarizes SCA activities of the faculty.

- Total Number of SCA: $M = 59.29$, $SD = 11.99$, $Max = 79$, $Min = 46$
- Referred Presentations: $M = 32.00$, $SD = 3.96$, $Max = 37$, $Min = 26$
- Invited Presentations: $M = 7.14$, $SD = 1.07$, $Max = 8$, $Min = 5$
- Referred Publications: $M = 16.00$, $SD = 9.07$, $Max = 33$, $Min = 6$
- Books and Chapters: $M = 4.14$, $SD = 2.79$, $Max = 9$, $Min = 2$

Given the heavy teaching/advising loads that result from high student/faculty ratios within the School, the faculty of AHSW have been very productive in the past two years. Specifically,

- 91% of Group I faculty produced refereed presentations in 2010-11 and 2011-12; and
- 91% of Group I faculty produced refereed publications in 2011-12

In addition, the School had 19 students from the School presenting and several receiving awards in the annual Student Research and Creative Activity EXPO in May 2011.

External Support. Faculty and students have been active in grant writing. Last year the faculty of AHSW submitted 24 external grant/contract proposals including submissions to NIH, NSF, William T. Grant Foundation and several other regional and national funding agencies. Funding of external grant proposals has ranged from $1333 in 2011-12 to a peak of $1,753,404 in 2009-10. External funding in the range of $200,000 - $250,000 is secured annually to support the placement of graduate Athletic Training students in their regional sites.

Resources
Staffing. AHSW has one administrative associate to service the entire school. This means that some tasks that may be assumed to be performed by office staff are the responsibility of the faculty (i.e. copying, ordering supplies, booking travel, completing expense reports…).

Physical Facilities. Each faculty member has a personal office space which is supported by the College with a computer linked to a central copier/printer. The program has some well equipped laboratory spaces that must be used for teaching with clinical and/or research activities as well. The School has no dedicated research space. Examples of laboratories include:

- Athletic Training Lab (Grover E207)
- Exercise Science Lab (Grover E116)
- Exercise Physiology lab (Grover E228)
- Food Science Lab (Grover W213)
- Sensory Analysis Lab (Grover W215)
- Test Kitchen (Grover E115)
- Atrium Café (Grover E113)
- Nutrition Resource Room (Grover E117)

Technology. Each of the teaching laboratories is well equipped to provide students with hands-on experiences to develop the clinical skills required of their respective professions.

Undergraduate Program Review

Bachelor of Science in Athletic Training

Curriculum. The Professional Athletic Training Program began in 1972 and is accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE). During the first academic year the students are in the pre-athletic training (pre-professional) program while completing general education and foundational courses. To continue in the program students must apply to and be accepted into the professional program. Once admitted the following three years include professional preparation and extensive clinical education working with preceptors and providing supervised health care services to patients in the Ohio University intercollegiate athletics, Ohio University club sports, seven local high schools, and a general population of clinical and hospital patients. Upon graduation students are awarded a Bachelor of Science in Athletic Training and are eligible for national certification (ATC) by the Board of Certification (BOC) and state licensure (AT).

Students. For a seven year period between 2005-06 and 2011-12, the Professional Athletic Training Program undergraduate student head count ranged from 61 to 121 ($M = 89.57$, $SD = 20.62$).

Bachelor of Science in Exercise Physiology

Curriculum. Students start the academic program as pre-exercise physiology majors. By the end of their sophomore year it is anticipated that students have completed the majority of their foundational sciences (chemistry, biology) and will apply to the major.
All students who have completed the pre-major required courses with at least a C are admitted to the major. In their junior year the exercise physiology majors complete their physics, anatomy, human physiology and exercise physiology courses. As students progress through the program they complete biomechanics, motor learning, fitness testing and exercise prescription, resistance training, cardiovascular assessments, and exercise prescription for special populations. Majors are also required to gain practical experience in the field.

Students. For a seven year period between 2005-06 and 2011-12, the Exercise Physiology undergraduate student head count ranged from 366 to 440 ($M = 417.57$, $SD = 24.99$).

*Bachelor of Science in Food and Nutrition Sciences*

**Curriculum.** The Nutrition program (pre-medicine/pre-professional) is for those interested in a career in areas such as nutrition, medicine, veterinary medicine, dentistry, pharmacy & physical therapy. Students in the program must maintain a minimum overall grade-point average of 2.0 (C) & must earn a 2.0 or better in all required courses within the major. The Applied Nutrition program has 3 concentrations: dietetics, culinary nutrition (formerly institutional & school nutrition management), and environmental nutrition. Students in the program must maintain a minimum overall grade-point average of 2.0 (C) & must also earn a 2.0 or better in all required courses within the major. The dietetics track is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics (formerly Commission on Accreditation for Dietetic Association). The culinary nutrition track is for students interested in culinary nutrition, school nutrition, child nutrition, institutional wellness, and food-service management. The environmental nutrition track is for students interested in careers involving sustainability, agriculture, wellness and food policy. The minor in applied nutrition is designed for students interested in strengthening their knowledge of nutrition principles and applications.

Students. For a seven year period between 2005-06 and 2011-12, the Food and Nutrition undergraduate student head count ranged from 111 to 151 ($M = 128.29$, $SD = 13.34$).

**Graduate Program Review**

*Masters of Science in Athletic Training*

**Curriculum.** This post professional program is also accredited by the CAATE. The program’s mission is to promote and advance the athletic training profession through academics, scholarship, and practice. The program strives to provide advanced systematic study, innovative research opportunities, leadership development, teaching experiences, and professional service. An emphasis is placed on personal and professional development. All students engage in original research that leads to a manuscript or thesis. These research projects directly relate to current clinical practice.
The post professional program received accreditation in 2007. It is the first in Ohio and one of 14 in the country to receive this distinction.

**Students.** For a seven year period between 2005-06 and 2011-12, the Masters of Science in Athletic Training graduate student head count ranged from 16 to 33 ($M = 25.86, SD = 7.10$).

**Masters of Science in Exercise Physiology**

**Curriculum.** This degree option allows for two specializations, research or clinical. The students pursuing the research focus take additional courses with the emphasis on more foundational sciences and the development of research experience and laboratory skills. In addition to being actively involved with faculty research, our students conduct thesis research to complete their degree requirements.

**Students.** For a seven year period between 2005-06 and 2011-12, the Masters of Science in Exercise Physiology graduate student head count ranged from 9 to 16 ($M = 12.29, SD = 2.69$).

**Masters of Science in Food and Nutrition Sciences**

**Curriculum.** This program features a multidisciplinary approach to the study of food and nutrition sciences. Food and nutrition sciences faculty have diverse research interests and offer numerous unique opportunities for thesis research or innovative projects.

**Students.** For a seven year period between 2005-06 and 2011-12, the Masters of Science in Food and Nutrition Sciences graduate student head count ranged from 9 to 17 ($M = 14.57, SD = 2.88$).

**Commendations**

The Applied Health Sciences and Wellness degree programs are to be commended for the following:

There are a large number of student majors in each of the three programs and they all continue to grow. This reflects the popularity of the programs that address important knowledge and skills in a variety of professions. The high volume of students presents both opportunities and challenges.

Each of the disciplines has dedicated and collegial faculty and staff. They cooperate in delivering the curriculum to students as well as in professional collaborations and scholarly activities. The faculty are student-focused and work closely with students both in and outside of the classroom. This is evidenced by the large number of professional presentations and publications with students as well as the success of students on national accreditation exams and in obtaining professional employment related to their fields.
All programs provide valuable services to the local area. The Athletic Training program has been recognized as having a positive influence on medically underserved communities in Southeastern Ohio. Athletic Training faculty supervise students who serve as Athletic Trainers in high schools throughout the region. This includes both graduate and undergraduate students. Nutrition students develop nutrition plans for at-risk seniors in the Athens community. Exercise Physiology provides support to WellWorks, a university health and wellness program.

Nutrition faculty perform high quality work as researchers in food science and basic science laboratories and as food service professionals in the Atrium Café. Faculty in Exercise Physiology perform high quality work in basic and applied research as well as preparing and supervising students in professional experiences with the Wellworks program and Intercollegiate Sports. Similarly, Athletic Training faculty engage in high quality scholarship as well as provide valuable service to intercollegiate athletes at Ohio University and high school athletes in the region.

Although external funding has not been consistent, as recently as 2009-10, a significant amount of external funding, exceeding $1.7 million, was obtained by faculty across all majors. This is commendable.

Both Athletic Training and Nutrition continue to maintain accreditation from their professional organizations (e.g. Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education and Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics, respectively).

Most faculty have good scholarly output and productivity. For example, in 2011-12, the School had a total of 33 refereed publications with 91% of Group I faculty having at least one refereed publication. In addition, in 2011-12, the School had a total of nine published books and chapters. This extends to work with students and Group II faculty as co-presenters and co-authors.

**Concerns and Recommendations**

Concerns with the program include the following:

There is a limited number of faculty in proportion to student enrollment at both the Group I and Group II levels, with student to faculty ratios ranging from 25:1 to 70:1 across departments, averaging over 47:1 for the entire School. This is taxing faculty time, resources, and energy. The student/faculty ratio results in (1) very high class sizes (n > 60), even at the junior and senior levels, (2) high advising loads, and (3) difficulty in mentoring students at the one to one level.

There is only one staff support person for entire school. This limited administrative staff support results in faculty processing administrative type tasks including copying, processing reimbursements, and record keeping, among other tasks. There is also a concern about administrative support for programs that undergo accreditation. All of these tasks take away from time that faculty can spend teaching, advising, and conducting research.

While the School has up-to-date equipment for faculty and student use, the limited space has resulted in underutilization of existing laboratory equipment in teaching and research settings.
Unfortunately, the current building has virtually no room to grow as structured. Efforts to find additional space appear not to have been successful. If student enrollment continues to grow, this problem will intensify.

There appears to be a lack of a formalized articulation of requirements for faculty evaluation including (but not limited to) promotion and tenure. The College level goal and evaluation tool (PEP) has not been perceived by most faculty as being effective. In addition, there is some concern that requirements for tenure and promotion are not clearly outlined and documented.

Research faculty have both high teaching and heavy advising loads. This could negatively impact continuation of research productivity, and teaching quality and advisor effectiveness. It also could impact quality of life for faculty and their families. Therefore, there is some concern that this could result in high faculty turnover.

There appears to be an uneven utilization of graduate assistants across the three programs. Most graduate classes in the School are dual listed with undergraduate classes. Athletic Training graduate assistants are sometimes teaching laboratories in classes in which they have also recently been students. Exercise Physiology Graduate Assistants are not likely to be lead instructors in laboratories or classes, which does not contribute to their professional development.

Graduate students shared concerns about the small number of exclusively graduate level courses. In particular, Nutrition graduate students indicated frustration in finding challenging graduate level classes, learning about RD requirements, and in scheduling classes.

**Recommendations** for the program include the following:

The high student enrollment in the School has resulted in large class sizes, high advising loads, conflicts in scheduling laboratory for teaching, clinic, and research. These can compromise quality of instruction, advising, research, and outreach programs. To alleviate this stress, there are basically two avenues that can be taken to reduce the student to faculty ratio: (1) Hire more faculty at the Group I and Group II levels for each program or (2) Implement an enrollment management system.

Presently, there is one administrative staff member for the entire School. At least one more full-time administrative staff member should be hired.

It is important to identify appropriate laboratory space for Exercise Physiology and Athletic Training that can be made available within the next three years.

The School should develop and disseminate a formalized set of requirements for tenure and/or promotion and corresponding evaluation criteria to all faculty. This is urgent for pre-tenure faculty. A shared document should be available within the next two years to assist current probationary faculty.

Ensure that research and pre-tenure faculty are aware of opportunities to obtain reduced teaching load in order to focus on research.
Hire a full time chief academic advisor for undergraduate first year, second year, and transfer students. This will help relieve the burden of extremely high advising loads for faculty. There will continue to be advising expectations of faculty, but for upper level students, where the focus is likely to be on preparing for graduation, graduate school, and career goals.

Revisit the types of teaching, research, and service assistance that graduate students can provide. It is recommended that a plan be developed to improve the deployment of graduate students in classrooms, laboratories, field experiences, and other duties. Graduate Assistants should be adequately challenged in responsibilities that contribute to their professional development while they provide a valuable service to the School.
May 22, 2013

Dr. Pam Benoit, Executive Vice President and Provost
Ohio University
3rd Floor Cutler Hall
Athens, Ohio 45701

Dear Dr. Benoit:

It would like to thank the Provost’s Office and the internal and external reviewers for their work in completing the Academic Program Review of the programs in the School of Applied Health Sciences and Wellness. I have read the reviewers’ report, provided input and I am in agreement with the conclusions of the reviewers. I have shared the report with the faculty and staff of our School and complemented them on the commendations reported by the reviewers. We have also discussed the concerns and recommendations listed by the reviewers and are using them a part of our strategic plan to improve current function and to direct future developments within the School.

Several of the concerns listed in the report are related to resources including faculty, staff and space. The faculty of our School have worked hard to develop strong majors that attract large student population and we are hopeful that we will receive the resources to address these concerns in the future.

Once again I would like to thank the Provost’s Office for their support through this process.

Sincerely,

Roger M. Gilders, PhD,
School Director, Applied Health Sciences and Wellness

Cc: Dean Randy Leite
May 22, 2013

Dr. David Ingram
Edwards Accelerator Lab 106
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

Dear Dr. Ingram

I have had an opportunity to read the recently-completed Academic Program Review for programs in our School of Applied Health Sciences and Wellness. I appreciate the time and the attention that went into the review process. Having read the report, I would like to respond to the various recommendations that were included in the report.

1. Reduce the student to faculty ratio either by (1) hiring more faculty at the Group I and Group II levels for each program or (2) implementing an enrollment management system.
   We have made progress in hiring additional faculty during the current academic year. This includes a new Group II faculty in Nutrition and a new Group II clinical faculty in Athletic Training. We are also pursuing an endowed chair in Nutrition and are discussing an additional faculty member in Exercise Physiology. Further additions of faculty or decisions to reduce enrollment will depend on the unit’s position in terms of financial resources in the new RCM budget environment.

2. Hire at least one more full-time administrative staff member.
   As this is the only unit in the College with only one support staff position, we’ve built an additional administrative assistant into our FY14 budget request.

3. Identify appropriate laboratory space for EP and AT that can be successfully utilized within the next three years.
   Unfortunately, no additional space in Grover Center is available to the College for this use. We’ve spent the better part of the past year exploring various space options with nothing working out. University leadership has acknowledged our need for additional space but our needs must be considered in light of the broad spectrum of space needs across the institution. That said, it is our hope that we will gain additional
space in Grover Center in the coming few years as programs from other colleges are possibly relocated in other buildings.

4. Develop and disseminate a formalized set of requirements for tenure and/or promotion and corresponding evaluation criteria to all faculty.
   The School has an established Promotion & Tenure policy that has been approved by the faculty and by me as dean. This policy is consistent with the College P&T policy that was also approved by faculty vote this year.

5. Reduce teaching load for research faculty and pre-tenure faculty.
   The standard teaching load for all faculty in the College of Health Sciences and Professions is 24 semester hours per year. Group I faculty receive a reduction in their teaching load to 15-16 hours per academic year. This load is consistent with the teaching load for faculty in various other colleges at the University and at health-focused colleges at other institutions. New faculty frequently negotiate teaching load reductions as part of their start-up packages.

   As we move into the new RCM environment, we will continue to explore faculty teaching load requirements as we consider loads that reflect our budget reality while also acknowledging the work that research and service Group I faculty are expected to undertake.

6. Hire a full time chief academic advisor for undergraduate first year, second year, and transfer students.
   The College is presently conducting a search for a fulltime, professional advisor who will advise all freshmen across our academic units. This person will be in place by the start of the next academic year.

7. Revisit the types of teaching, research, and service assistance that graduate students can provide.
   The School will continue to receive graduate assistant funds. While many graduate assistants are placed in assignments to meet contractual arrangements that also provide valuable experience to the student, the School will have the ability to determine graduate assistant assignments beyond those arrangements.

I thank you again for facilitating this process. I believe the School of Applied Health Sciences and Wellness is a very strong unit with great potential. I look forward to continuing to work with the faculty to achieve that potential through the changes described above and other steps we may take moving forward.

Sincerely,

Randy Leite
Dean

cc: Pamela Benoit, Executive Vice-President and Provost
RESOLUTION 2013 –

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 to “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 hereby accepts the program review for the Department of Counseling and Higher Education program within the Patton College of Education.
University Curriculum Committee
Academic Program Review

Department of Counseling and Higher Education
Patton College of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Counseling and Higher Education is a viable program that met all four of the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) standards and was granted continuing accreditation for an eight-year period through October 31, 2016. The department is a graduate-only program that offers four M.Ed degrees (School Counseling, Clinical Mental Health Counseling, Rehabilitation Counseling, College Student Personnel) with a total Fall 2010 enrollment of 107 students, and two Ph.D. programs (Counselor Education & Supervision and Higher Education) with a total fall 2010 enrollment of 76. An M.S. program in Higher Education was placed on moratorium in January 2009. The “conceptual core” of the department is “We prepare leader-educators, practitioners and human service professionals who share our commitment to lifelong learning and serving society responsibly as change agents in meeting diverse human and social needs.”

Commendations

The Department of Counseling and Higher Education is to be commended for achieving continuing CACREP accreditation. The department is commended for its diverse faculty and student population, both of which are well above the average for Ohio University. The department is to be commended for encouraging participation in a college-level mentoring program for pre-tenured first and second year faculty and for the $1000 travel support and $500 technology support that each faculty member receives.

Concerns and Recommendations

The department faculty productivity in scholarship is difficult to ascertain because accreditation requires selected evidence, not a comprehensive list. Future reviews should include comprehensive details on faculty productivity.

---

1 The Department was successfully accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). In lieu of an external review of this department, it was decided that the department utilize its accreditation materials in the preparation of the self-study. The self-study materials were reviewed by a task force of Julie Suhr, Ph.D., (Professor, Psychology), Dr. William Shambora, Ph.D. (Associate Professor, Economics), and Dr. Robert Brannan (Associate Professor, Applied Health Sciences and Wellness). The committee requested an “Executive Summary” from the accreditation report, which was provided. The only concerns about utilizing the accreditation were that the accreditation documentation did not specifically address several “OU specific” issues, specifically perceptions of the P&T process by junior faculty and teaching loads. However, the committee did not feel that these omissions should hinder the process. This report was prepared by Dr. Robert G. Brannan (School of Applied Health Sciences and Wellness), Chair, UCC Academic Program Review Committee, 2010-2012.
Program Review

The Department of Counseling and Higher Education met all four of the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) standards and was granted continuing accreditation for an eight-year period through October 31, 2016. The department is a graduate-only program that offers six graduate degrees, four M.Ed degrees (School Counseling, Clinical Mental Health Counseling, Rehabilitation Counseling, College Student Personnel) with a total Fall 2010 enrollment of 107 students, and two Ph.D. programs (Counselor Education & Supervision and Higher Education) with a total fall 2010 enrollment of 76. An M.S. program in Higher Education was placed on moratorium in January 2009. The “conceptual core” of the department is “We prepare leader-educators, practitioners and human service professionals who share our commitment to lifelong learning and serving society responsibly as change agents in meeting diverse human and social needs.”

Faculty Profile

Total full-time faculty has ranged from 11-13 during the period of the review. The department has utilized 1-7 part-time Group III faculty during the same period. Since the last academic program review, the Counseling and Higher Education department has made thirteen new hires and had six retirements. The department has a diverse faculty, with 25% African-American and ~12% international, well above the average for Ohio University.

Programmatic Practices

The Counseling and Higher Education Department utilized the Patton College of Education and Human Services Faculty Workload Policy. The typical teaching load is 12 credit hours per academic year for Group I faculty and 15 hours for non-Group I faculty. Although faculty members have the capability of utilizing the workload policy to negotiate reduced teaching loads, specific details of faculty who have availed themselves of this were not provided.

The department is allocated at least one course release per year from the College. A college-level mentoring program is available for pre-tenured first and second year faculty to receive mentorship in the areas of research and creativity activity. Each Group I faculty receives $1000 for travel support and $500 for technology.

The department’s tenure-track and tenured faculty are required (per T&P guidelines) to provide professional service (international, national, regional, state, local, university, college, and school committees) and public service. Service typically represents approximately 20% of faculty effort.

To be eligible for counselor licensure, master’s and doctoral students must take the required courses as outlined by the state. Elective opportunities outside the department are encouraged. The Higher Education doctoral program is interdisciplinary by default, as higher education has a wide range of diverse disciplines that are integrated into understanding higher education administration. Accreditation requirement dictate that that students have required coursework in diversity.
Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

The departmental accreditation process required evidence of scholarly activity, but a comprehensive list is not available. During the period of the review, the department has received slightly more than one million dollars in external support for various projects, with about 70% of that sum from principal investigators from the department. It should be noted that a single faculty member (Valerie Conlon) accounted for 82% of the external funding generated by PI’s from within the department, and two others (Christine Bhat and Tom Davis) accounted for an additional 12%.

Resources

The department had indicated that adequate resources are available to fulfill its mission. The department employs one full-time administrative associate, an administrative assistant who serves five departments, and one hourly student who works 20 hours per week.

The department is located in McCracken Hall, which is equipped with distance learning classrooms, conference rooms, and faculty and staff offices. In addition, the department has two centers. The George E. Hill Center for Counseling and Research was established by program faculty to enhance professional development and research and serves as a training facility for Master’s and doctoral students in the Clinical Mental Health, School Counseling, Rehabilitation Counseling and Counselor Education programs. The Hill Center includes four individual counseling and two group counseling rooms. The Center for Higher Education conducts research and policy analysis focused on higher education issues in Ohio, the Appalachian region, and the nation at large.

McCracken Hall has the Curriculum and Technology Center (CTC) includes curriculum materials and a variety of multimedia equipment as well as two computer labs that are available to faculty and students throughout the university. A number of software programs are available for use on the computers in the lab. Classrooms are outfitted with a variety of technology tools including an instructor’s computer cart, DVD/VCR players, and an LCD projector. Instructors have access to mobile laptop carts (64 computers) to use in classrooms. A full-time Director of Distance Learning and Online Resources and a number of graduate assistants are located within the state-of-the-art Curriculum and Technology Center (CTC) on the Athens campus for candidate and faculty assistance.

Undergraduate Program Review

Not applicable.

Graduate Program Review

The curriculum prepares students for positions as school, clinical, and rehabilitation counselors, higher education personnel, and academic careers. Six graduate degrees are offered, four M.Ed degrees (School Counseling, Clinical Mental Health Counseling, Rehabilitation Counseling, College Student Personnel) with a total Fall 2010 enrollment of 107 students, and two Ph.D. programs (Counselor Education & Supervision and Higher Education) with a total fall
2010 enrollment of 76. An M.S. program in Higher Education was placed on moratorium in January 2009. The department reports that 25% of its students are non-white/Caucasian.

Institutional research indicates that the majority of graduates enter into careers in the education or health care/social welfare fields. This is consistent with the mission of the department. Graduates from Higher Education enter into education careers almost exclusively.

Data provided by the department indicate that 42 students received at least one quarter of graduate assistantship support during the 2009-2010 academic year. Students from the department also work in the Enrollment Associates Office which offers support services to help undergraduates reach their academic goals.

For Higher Education, the anticipated time to complete the master’s degree programs is 2.1-2.4 years and Ph.D. programs is 4.1-4.2 years.

Commendations

The Department of Counseling and Higher Education is to be commended for achieving continuing CACREP accreditation. The department is commended for its diverse faculty and student population, both of which are well above the average for Ohio University. The department is to be commended for encouraging participation in a college-level mentoring program for pre-tenured first and second year faculty and for the $1000 travel support and $500 technology support that each faculty member receives.

Concerns and Recommendations

The department faculty productivity in scholarship is reported to be less than one scholarly publication per faculty per year. It should be noted that the information received in the self study appears to have been self-reported, which may not provide an accurate accounting of scholarship.
Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, Counseling and Higher Education

Date: December 1, 2011

To: University Curriculum Committee Program Review Committee

From: John Henning, Chair, Department of Teacher Education
David Moore, Chair, Department of Educational Studies
Tracy Leinbaugh, Chair, Department of Counseling and Higher Education

Re: Department Chairs’ Response to Academic Program Reviews

The Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education within the Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education appreciate the work of the University Curriculum Council’s Program Review Committee for its review of our departments.

First, we greatly appreciate the committee’s willingness to utilize the national accreditation reports from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) as part of the materials submitted and reviewed for the academic program review process. Both NCATE and CACREP require us to provide evidence of meeting numerous standards related to (a) student performance as measured by student learning outcomes, (b) the collection, maintenance, and utilization of student and unit data to inform and improve programs, (c) field and clinical experiences including professional practica and internships, (d) faculty qualifications, (e) diversity experiences, and (f) governance issues including budget, technology, library resources, etc. As part of our daily work, we expend a great deal of effort to both maintain these standards and to collect evidence that demonstrates our effectiveness.

In addition to the standards, both NCATE and CACREP team members meet with all faculty members, current and past students, and relevant administration during their site visits. They are provided a tour of both Ohio University’s and the Departments’ resources as they relate to each of the three departments. The site teams vary in size from 3 to 9 members. Maintaining both NCATE and CACREP accreditation is an arduous, yet rewarding experience and we believe in the value of national accreditation.
In response to the only concern brought forward by the Program Review committee, that all probationary faculty were not able to meet with the NCATE and CACREP reviewers without tenured faculty present, the Patton College followed the accreditation protocols and site reviewer requests in scheduling meetings with faculty. Their requests were based on the number of programs under review by NCATE and CACREP as well as the relatively short onsite visit (2-3 days).

I would like to conclude by thanking you again for your thoughtful review of the Patton College’s Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education.
Date: November 14, 2011

To: University Curriculum Council Program Review Committee

From: Renée A. Middleton, Dean

Re: College Response to Academic Program Review for the Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education

The Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education and Human Services would like to thank the University Curriculum Council’s Program Review Committee for its review of the Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education.

The three departments in the Patton College are nationally accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Maintaining national accreditation by NCATE and CACREP is an ongoing process by which programs systematically collect, analyze, and use data to inform program and department improvements. We appreciate the committee’s willingness to allow the Patton College to provide our national accreditation documentation as a part of the Ohio University Academic Program Review process.

In response to the only concern brought forward by the Program Review committee, that all probationary faculty were not able to meet with the NCATE and CACREP reviewers without tenured faculty present, the Patton College followed the accreditation protocols and site reviewer requests in scheduling meetings with faculty. Their requests were based on the number of programs under review by NCATE and CACREP as well as the relatively short onsite visit (2-3 days).

I would like to conclude by thanking you again for your thoughtful review of the Patton College’s Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education. If I can be of any further assistance, please feel free to contact me.
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 to “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 hereby accepts the program review for the Department of Education Studies program within the Patton College of Education.
University Curriculum Committee
Academic Program Review

Department of Education Studies
Patton College of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Education Studies is a viable program that was accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education in April 2014 and was granted continuing accreditation until the next onsite visit in Fall 2014. The department is a graduate-only program that offers eight graduate degrees; four M.Ed programs (Educational Administration, Research and Evaluation, Cultural Studies, and Computer Education and Technology) with a total Fall 2010 enrollment of 147 students, two Ph.D. programs (Research and Evaluation, Cultural Studies, and Instructional Technology) with a total fall 2010 enrollment of 56, and an Ed.D. program (Educational Administration) with a total fall 2010 enrollment of 51. The Ph.D. program in Cultural Studies is no longer accepting students. The “conceptual core” of the department is “We prepare leader-educators, practitioners and human service professionals who share our commitment to lifelong learning and serving society responsibly as change agents in meeting diverse human and social needs.”

Commendations

The Department of Education Studies is to be commended for achieving continuing CACREP accreditation. The department is commended for its diverse faculty and student population, both of which are well above the average for Ohio University. The department is to be commended for encouraging participation in a college-level mentoring program for pre-tenured first and second year faculty and for the $1000 travel support and $500 technology support that each faculty member receives.

Concerns and Recommendations

The department faculty productivity in scholarship is difficult to ascertain because accreditation requires evidence, not a comprehensive list. Future reviews should include comprehensive details on faculty productivity. According to the NCATE accreditation report, “The unit does not ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice with P-12 students from at least two ethnic/racial groups and English language learners.” It should be noted that the Patton College now has an Office of Field Experiences and Professional Internships address this concern. For future reviews, completion rates should be monitored and compared to those reported in this review.

1Prepared by Robert G. Brannan (School of Applied Health Sciences and Wellness), Chair, UCC Academic Program Review Committee, 2010-2012. The Department was successfully accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). In lieu of an external review of this department, it was decided that the department utilize its accreditation materials in the preparation of the self-study. The self-study materials were reviewed by a task force of Julie Suhr, Ph.D., (Professor, Psychology), Dr. William Shambora, Ph.D. (Associate Professor, Economics), and Dr. Robert Brannan (Associate Professor, Applied Health Sciences and Wellness). The committee requested an “Executive Summary” from the accreditation report, which was provided. The only concerns about utilizing the accreditation were that the accreditation documentation did not specifically address several “OU specific” issues, specifically perceptions of the P&T process by junior faculty and teaching loads. However, the committee did not feel that these omissions should hinder the process.
Program Review

The Department of Education Studies was accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education in April 2010 and was granted continuing accreditation until the next onsite visit in Fall 2014. The department is a graduate-only program that offers eight graduate degrees; four M.Ed programs (Educational Administration, Research and Evaluation, Cultural Studies, and Computer Education and Technology) with a total Fall 2010 enrollment of 147 students, two Ph.D. programs (Research and Evaluation, Cultural Studies, and Instructional Technology) with a total fall 2010 enrollment of 56, and an Ed.D. program (Educational Administration) with a total fall 2010 enrollment of 51. The Ph.D. program in Cultural Studies is no longer accepting students. The “conceptual core” of the department is “We prepare leader-educators, practitioners and human service professionals who share our commitment to lifelong learning and serving society responsibly as change agents in meeting diverse human and social needs.”

Faculty Profile

Total full-time faculty has ranged from 14-20 during the period of the review. The department has utilized 3-18 part-time Group III faculty during the same period. Since the last academic program review, the Educational Studies department has had seven new hires and four retirements. The internal review acknowledges the diverse nature of the faculty, with 29% of faculty non-white/Caucasian, above the average for Ohio University.

Programmatic Practices

The Department utilized the Patton College of Education and Human Services Faculty Workload Policy. The typical teaching load is 12 credit hours per academic year for Group I faculty and 15 hours for non Group I faculty. Although faculty members have the capability of utilizing the workload policy to negotiate reduced teaching loads, specific details of faculty who have availed themselves of this were not provided.

The department is allocated at least one course release per year. A college-level mentoring program is available for pre-tenured first and second year faculty to receive mentorship in the areas of research and creativity activity. Each Group I faculty receives $1000 for travel support and $500 for technology.

The department’s tenure-track and tenured faculty are required (per T&P guidelines) to provide service through membership and participation in professional associations, serve on department, college, and university committees, participate with the centers, institutes, and partnerships, and engage in social justice activities. Service typically represents approximately 20% of faculty effort.

The National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) requires that the college have a committee that includes representation from all programs that prepare students for P12 settings. This committee includes representatives from each regional campus, the Colleges of Arts & Sciences and Fine Arts, P12 constituents, and faculty from the ES department as well as the Departments of Teacher Education and Counseling and Higher Education. It is unclear if outcomes from this committee affect the programmatic practices of the department.
Accreditation by NCATE requires that the department demonstrate that students have required coursework in diversity, have proficient diversity related proficiencies that are systematically assessed, and have experiences interacting with diverse faculty, P12 students, and other fellow ES students. It should be noted that according to the NCATE accreditation report, “The unit does not ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice with P-12 students from at least two ethnic/racial groups and English language learners. However, it should also be noted that the department now offers the Diversity Studies Certificate which requires students to take a minimum of five courses from any department in the areas of race/ethnicity, social class, gender, sexual orientation, and disability.

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

The departmental accreditation process required evidence of scholarly activity, but a comprehensive list is not available. During the period of the review, the department has received 4.2 million dollars in external support for various projects, with 34% of that sum from principal investigators from the department.

Resources

The department has indicated that adequate resources are available to fulfill its mission. The department employs one full-time administrative associate, an administrative assistant who serves five departments, and one hourly student who works 20 hours per week.

The department is located in McCracken Hall, which is equipped with distance learning classrooms, conference rooms, and faculty and staff offices. McCracken Hall has the Curriculum and Technology Center (CTC) which includes curriculum materials and a variety of multimedia equipment as well as two computer labs available to faculty and students throughout the university. A number of software programs are available for use on the computers in the lab. Classrooms are outfitted with a variety of technology tools including an instructor’s computer cart, DVD/VCR players, and an LCD projector. Instructors have access to mobile laptop carts (64 computers) to use in classrooms. A full-time Director of Distance Learning and Online Resources and a number of graduate assistants are located within the state-of-the-art Curriculum and Technology Center (CTC) on the Athens campus for candidate and faculty assistance.

Undergraduate Program Review

Not applicable.

Graduate Program Review

The department is a graduate-only program that offers eight graduate degrees; four M.Ed programs (Educational Administration, Research and Evaluation, Cultural Studies, and Computer Education and Technology) with a total Fall 2010 enrollment of 147 students, two Ph.D. programs (Research and Evaluation, Cultural Studies, and Instructional Technology) with a total fall 2010 enrollment of 56, and an Ed.D. program (Educational Administration) with a
total fall 2010 enrollment of 51. The Ph.D. program in Cultural Studies is no longer accepting students. The department reports that 31% of its students are non-white/caucasian.

Institutional research indicates that the majority of graduates enter into careers in the education. This is consistent with the mission of the department.

Data provided by the department indicate that 42 students received at least one quarter of graduate assistantship support during the 2009-2010 academic year.

The department reports that the anticipated time to complete the Educational Administration degree is 2-3 years for the master’s program and 5-7 years to complete the doctoral program. The completion rate for the M.Ed. degree is 80% and 50% for the Ed.D.

The department reports that the anticipated time to complete the Educational Research & Evaluation degree is 1-2 years for the M.Ed. and 3-4 years for the doctoral program. The completion rate for the M.Ed. degree is 100% and 68% for the Ed.D.

The department reports that the anticipated time to complete the Cultural Studies degree is four quarters for the M.Ed and four years for the doctoral program. The completion rate for the M.Ed. degree is 73% and 83% for the Ed.D.

The department reports that the anticipated time to complete the Computer Education and Technology M.Ed. program is two years with a 87% completion rate and the Instructional Technology doctoral program is 3.5 years with a 66% completion rate.

Commendations

The Department of Education Studies is to be commended for achieving continuing NCATE accreditation. The department is commended for its diverse faculty and student population, both of which are well above the average for Ohio University. The department is to be commended for encouraging participation in a college-level mentoring program for pre-tenured first and second year faculty and for the $1000 travel support and $500 technology support that each faculty member receives.

Concerns and Recommendations

The department faculty productivity in scholarship is difficult to ascertain because accreditation requires evidence, not a comprehensive list. Future reviews should include comprehensive details on faculty productivity. According to the NCATE accreditation report, “The unit does not ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice with P-12 students from at least two ethnic/racial groups and English language learners.” For future reviews, completion rates should be monitored and compared to those reported in this review.
Department of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, Counseling and Higher Education

Date: December 1, 2011

To: University Curriculum Committee Program Review Committee

From: John Henning, Chair, Department of Teacher Education
David Moore, Chair, Department of Educational Studies
Tracy Leinbaugh, Chair, Department of Counseling and Higher Education

Re: Department Chairs’ Response to Academic Program Reviews

The Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education within the Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education appreciate the work of the University Curriculum Council’s Program Review Committee for its review of our departments.

First, we greatly appreciate the committee’s willingness to utilize the national accreditation reports from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) as part of the materials submitted and reviewed for the academic program review process. Both NCATE and CACREP require us to provide evidence of meeting numerous standards related to (a) student performance as measured by student learning outcomes, (b) the collection, maintenance, and utilization of student and unit data to inform and improve programs, (c) field and clinical experiences including professional practica and internships, (d) faculty qualifications, (e) diversity experiences, and (f) governance issues including budget, technology, library resources, etc. As part of our daily work, we expend a great deal of effort to both maintain these standards and to collect evidence that demonstrates our effectiveness.

In addition to the standards, both NCATE and CACREP team members meet with all faculty members, current and past students, and relevant administration during their site visits. They are provided a tour of both Ohio University’s and the Departments’ resources as they relate to each of the three departments. The site teams vary in size from 3 to 9 members. Maintaining both NCATE and CACREP accreditation is an arduous, yet rewarding experience and we believe in the value of national accreditation.
In response to the only concern brought forward by the Program Review committee, that all probationary faculty were not able to meet with the NCATE and CACREP reviewers without tenured faculty present, the Patton College followed the accreditation protocols and site reviewer requests in scheduling meetings with faculty. Their requests were based on the number of programs under review by NCATE and CACREP as well as the relatively short onsite visit (2-3 days).

I would like to conclude by thanking you again for your thoughtful review of the Patton College’s Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education.
Date: November 14, 2011

To: University Curriculum Council Program Review Committee

From: Renée A. Middleton,Dean

Re: College Response to Academic Program Review for the Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education

The Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education and Human Services would like to thank the University Curriculum Council’s Program Review Committee for its review of the Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education.

The three departments in the Patton College are nationally accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Maintaining national accreditation by NCATE and CACREP is an ongoing process by which programs systematically collect, analyze, and use data to inform program and department improvements. We appreciate the committee’s willingness to allow the Patton College to provide our national accreditation documentation as a part of the Ohio University Academic Program Review process.

In response to the only concern brought forward by the Program Review committee, that all probationary faculty were not able to meet with the NCATE and CACREP reviewers without tenured faculty present, the Patton College followed the accreditation protocols and site reviewer requests in scheduling meetings with faculty. Their requests were based on the number of programs under review by NCATE and CACREP as well as the relatively short onsite visit (2-3 days).

I would like to conclude by thanking you again for your thoughtful review of the Patton College’s Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education. If I can be of any further assistance, please feel free to contact me.
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 to “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 hereby accepts the program review for the Department of Teacher Education program within the Patton College of Education.
University Curriculum Committee
Academic Program Review

Department of Teacher Education
Patton College of Education

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Teacher Education is a viable program that was accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education in April 2014 and was granted continuing accreditation until the next onsite visit in Fall 2014. The department offers 14 undergraduate degrees with a total Fall 2010 enrollment of 1225 students, three M.Ed. programs with a total Fall 2010 enrollment of 199 students, and a Ph.D. program with a total fall 2010 enrollment of 27. The “conceptual core” of the department is “We prepare leader-educators, practitioners and human service professionals who share our commitment to lifelong learning and serving society responsibly as change agents in meeting diverse human and social needs.”

Commendations

The Department of Teacher Education is to be commended for achieving continuing CACREP accreditation. The department is commended for its diverse faculty and student population, both of which are well above the average for Ohio University. The department is to be commended for encouraging participation in a college-level mentoring program for pre-tenured first and second year faculty and for the $1000 travel support and $500 technology support that each faculty member receives.

Concerns and Recommendations

The department faculty productivity in scholarship is difficult to ascertain because accreditation requires evidence, not a comprehensive list. Future reviews should include comprehensive details on faculty productivity. According to the NCATE accreditation report, “The unit does not ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice with P-12 students from at least two ethnic/racial groups and English language learners.” It should be noted that the Patton College now has an Office of Field Experiences and Professional Internships to help alleviate this concern. For future reviews, completion rates should be monitored and compared to those reported in this review.

1Prepared by Robert G. Brannan (School of Applied Health Sciences and Wellness), Chair, UCC Academic Program Review Committee, 2010-2012. The Department was successfully accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). In lieu of an external review of this department, it was decided that the department utilize its accreditation materials in the preparation of the self-study. The self-study materials were reviewed by a task force of Julie Suhr, Ph.D., (Professor, Psychology), Dr. William Shambora, Ph.D. (Associate Professor, Economics), and Dr. Robert Brannan (Associate Professor, Applied Health Sciences and Wellness). The committee requested an “Executive Summary” from the accreditation report, which was provided. The only concerns about utilizing the accreditation were that the accreditation documentation did not specifically address several “OU specific” issues, specifically perceptions of the P&T process by junior faculty and teaching loads. However, the committee did not feel that these omissions should hinder the process.
Program Review

The Department of Teacher Education was accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education in April 2014 and was granted continuing accreditation until the next onsite visit in Fall 2014. The department offers 14 undergraduate degrees with a total Fall 2010 enrollment of 1225 students. Specializations include early childhood education, middle childhood education, adolescent-to-young adult (AYA) education, special education/intervention specialists (mild-moderate educational needs, moderate-intensive educational needs, early childhood-intervention specialist), physical education, modern languages (French, Spanish, and German Education), Integrated Language Arts (which includes English, Communications, Journalism, and Theater), Integrated Mathematics (which includes the study of calculus, probability and statistics, and geometry), Integrated Science, Earth and Space Science, Life Science, Physical Science, Integrated Social Studies (which includes the study of history, economics, geography, and political science), Reading Education, and Curriculum and Instruction. The department offers three M.Ed. programs with a total Fall 2010 enrollment of 199 students, and a Ph.D. program with a total fall 2010 enrollment of 27. The “conceptual core” of the department is “We prepare leader-educators, practitioners and human service professionals who share our commitment to lifelong learning and serving society responsibly as change agents in meeting diverse human and social needs.”

Faculty Profile

Total full-time Group I faculty has ranged from 21-26 during the period of the review, The department has utilized 3-18 part-time Group III faculty during the same period.

Programmatic Practices

The Department utilized the Patton College of Education and Human Services Faculty Workload Policy. The typical teaching load is 12 credit hours per academic year for Group I faculty and 15 hours for non Group I faculty. Although faculty members have the capability of utilizing the workload policy to negotiate reduced teaching loads, specific details of faculty who have availed themselves of this were not provided.

The department is allocated at least one course release per year. A college-level mentoring program is available for pre-tenured first and second year faculty to receive mentorship in the areas of research and creativity activity. Each Group I faculty receives $1000 for travel support and $500 for technology.

The department’s tenure-track and tenured faculty are required (per T&P guidelines) to provide service through membership and participation in professional associations, serve on department, college, and university committees, participate with the centers, institutes, and partnerships, and engage in social justice activities. Service typically represents approximately 20% of faculty effort.

The National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) requires that the college have a committee that includes representation from all programs that prepare students for P12 settings. This committee includes representatives from each regional campus, the Colleges of Arts & Sciences and Fine Arts, P12 constituents, and faculty from the ES department
as well as the Departments of Teacher Education and Counseling and Higher Education. It is unclear if outcomes from this committee affect the programmatic practices of the department.

Accreditation by NCATE requires that the department demonstrate that students have required coursework in diversity, have proficient diversity related proficiencies that are systematically assessed, and have experiences interacting with diverse faculty, P12 students, and other fellow ES students. It should be noted that according to the NCATE accreditation report, “The unit does not ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice with P-12 students from at least two ethnic/racial groups and English language learners. However, it should also be noted that the department offers new the Diversity Studies Certificate which requires students to take a minimum of five courses from any department in the areas of race/ethnicity, social class, gender, sexual orientation, and disability.

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

The departmental accreditation process required evidence of scholarly activity, but a comprehensive list is not available. During the period of the review, the department has received approximately 900K in extramural funding each year.

Resources

The department had indicated that adequate resources are available to fulfill its mission. The department employs one full-time administrative associate, an administrative assistant who serves five departments, and one hourly student who works 20 hours per week.

The department is located in McCracken Hall, which is equipped with distance learning classrooms, conference rooms, and faculty and staff offices. McCracken Hall has the Curriculum and Technology Center (CTC) which includes curriculum materials and a variety of multimedia equipment as well as two computer labs available to faculty and students throughout the university. A number of software programs are available for use on the computers in the lab. Classrooms are outfitted with a variety of technology tools including an instructor’s computer cart, DVD/VCR players, and an LCD projector. Instructors have access to mobile laptop carts (64 computers) to use in classrooms. A full-time Director of Distance Learning and Online Resources and a number of graduate assistants are located within the state-of-the-art Curriculum and Technology Center (CTC) on the Athens campus for candidate and faculty assistance. Grover Center also houses some teacher education faculty.

Undergraduate Program Review

As noted in the self study, the curriculum supports the various undergraduate teacher education programs, meets the requirements and expectations from our national accreditation body, NCATE, and prepares our students for teacher licensure in Ohio as set by the Ohio Department of Education.

During the review, the department underwent some significant enhancements. Academic restructuring resulted in the Early Childhood Education program being housed in the Teacher Education department. The Patton College now has an Office of Field Experiences and Professional Internships and hired three full-time academic advisors. The Patton College started
an Honors Track for undergraduate education majors and in summer, 2009 piloted the Early Childhood Education Generalist Endorsement, offered online which is designed for licensed early childhood education graduates who wish to extend their licenses from P-3 to include grades 4-5. The department piloted and implemented the Rural-Urban Collaborative.

Shown in the tables below are demographic data and alumni data from the undergraduate program.

**Demographic Data for Undergraduate Students- Data from Institutional Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Major</th>
<th>White/Caucasian</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic American</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity Unknown</th>
<th>Foreign/Non-Resident Alien</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Childhood Education</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA Integrated Science</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA Physical Science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA Life Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA Earth Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA Integrated Social Studies</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA Integrated Language Arts</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA Integrated Mathematics</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages-Spanish</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
German

Modern Languages-French  8

Intervention Specialist-Mild-Moderate  117  4  2  1  2  2  2  1

Intervention Specialist-Moderate-Intensive  57  1  2

Alumni Profile-Provided by Institutional Research

These data are from the Career and Further Education Study sent to alumni by the Office of Institutional Research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Area</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care/Social Welfare</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate Program Review

The department offers four graduate programs: Special Education (M.Ed), Reading Education (M.Ed), Curriculum & Instruction (M.Ed), Curriculum & Instruction (Ph.D). Program enrollments range from 27-127 for the 2010 academic year. Non-Caucasian student enrollment was below 10%, although the Curriculum and Instruction programs have a significant number of international students.

Institutional research indicates that the majority of graduates enter into careers in their majors. This is consistent with the mission of the department.

Data provided by the department indicate that only a few (<10) students received at least one quarter of graduate assistantship support during the 2009-2010 academic year, far less than students in other departments in the College.

The department reports that the anticipated time to complete the Special Education degree is 2.6 years with an 85% completion rate.
The department reports that the anticipated time to complete the Reading Education degree is 1.3 years with an 89% completion rate. The department reports that the anticipated time to complete the Curriculum and Instruction degree is 2.6 years for the M.Ed and 4.4 years for the doctoral program. The completion rate for the M.Ed. degree is 69% and 58% for the Ph.D.

Commendations

The Department of Teacher Education is to be commended for achieving continuing CACREP accreditation. The department is commended for its diverse faculty and student population, both of which are well above the average for Ohio University. The department is to be commended for encouraging participation in a college-level mentoring program for pre-tenured first and second year faculty and for the $1000 travel support and $500 technology support that each faculty member receives.

Concerns and Recommendations

The department faculty productivity in scholarship is difficult to ascertain because accreditation requires evidence, not a comprehensive list. Future reviews should include comprehensive details on faculty productivity. According to the NCATE accreditation report, “The unit does not ensure that all candidates have field experiences or clinical practice with P-12 students from at least two ethnic/racial groups and English language learners.” It should be noted that the Patton College now has an Office of Field Experiences and Professional Internships which may help alleviate this concern. For future reviews, completion rates should be monitored and compared to those reported in this review.
Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, Counseling and Higher Education

Date: December 1, 2011

To: University Curriculum Committee Program Review Committee

From: John Henning, Chair, Department of Teacher Education
       David Moore, Chair, Department of Educational Studies
       Tracy Leinbaugh, Chair, Department of Counseling and Higher Education

Re: Department Chairs’ Response to Academic Program Reviews

The Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education within the Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education appreciate the work of the University Curriculum Council’s Program Review Committee for its review of our departments.

First, we greatly appreciate the committee’s willingness to utilize the national accreditation reports from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) as part of the materials submitted and reviewed for the academic program review process. Both NCATE and CACREP require us to provide evidence of meeting numerous standards related to (a) student performance as measured by student learning outcomes, (b) the collection, maintenance, and utilization of student and unit data to inform and improve programs, (c) field and clinical experiences including professional practica and internships, (d) faculty qualifications, (e) diversity experiences, and (f) governance issues including budget, technology, library resources, etc. As part of our daily work, we expend a great deal of effort to both maintain these standards and to collect evidence that demonstrates our effectiveness.

In addition to the standards, both NCATE and CACREP team members meet with all faculty members, current and past students, and relevant administration during their site visits. They are provided a tour of both Ohio University’s and the Departments’ resources as they relate to each of the three departments. The site teams vary in size from 3 to 9 members. Maintaining both NCATE and CACREP accreditation is an arduous, yet rewarding experience and we believe in the value of national accreditation.
In response to the only concern brought forward by the Program Review committee, that all probationary faculty were not able to meet with the NCATE and CACREP reviewers without tenured faculty present, the Patton College followed the accreditation protocols and site reviewer requests in scheduling meetings with faculty. Their requests were based on the number of programs under review by NCATE and CACREP as well as the relatively short onsite visit (2-3 days).

I would like to conclude by thanking you again for your thoughtful review of the Patton College’s Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education.
Date: November 14, 2011

To: University Curriculum Council Program Review Committee

From: Renée A. Middleton, Dean

Re: College Response to Academic Program Review for the Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education

The Gladys W. and David H. Patton College of Education and Human Services would like to thank the University Curriculum Council’s Program Review Committee for its review of the Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education.

The three departments in the Patton College are nationally accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Maintaining national accreditation by NCATE and CACREP is an ongoing process by which programs systematically collect, analyze, and use data to inform program and department improvements. We appreciate the committee’s willingness to allow the Patton College to provide our national accreditation documentation as a part of the Ohio University Academic Program Review process.

In response to the only concern brought forward by the Program Review committee, that all probationary faculty were not able to meet with the NCATE and CACREP reviewers without tenured faculty present, the Patton College followed the accreditation protocols and site reviewer requests in scheduling meetings with faculty. Their requests were based on the number of programs under review by NCATE and CACREP as well as the relatively short onsite visit (2-3 days).

I would like to conclude by thanking you again for your thoughtful review of the Patton College’s Departments of Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and Counseling and Higher Education. If I can be of any further assistance, please feel free to contact me.
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General History and Overview
General History and Overview

- Security breaches cost Ohio University ~2.4 million dollars
- Several months of investigations and delays
- National headlines
General History and Overview

• Brice Bible hired as Chief Information Officer
• OIT formed from 4 separate IT areas
• Matthew Dalton hired as Director of Information Security
General History and Overview

• Work on Vision Ohio
• Infrastructure Stabilization Began
• Vulnerability Management Program Began
• First Annual IT Security Seminar
General History and Overview

• Trustee Resolution on IT and Security issued
• Presidential Directive: Unification of IT Services
• Began Server Re-Alignment Initiative
General History and Overview

- Formed Identity and Access Management (IAM) Area
- Began deployment of Snort Sensor Array for Network Monitoring
- Began use of FAIR model for Risk Assessments
General History and Overview

• Adoption of NIST 800-53 as standard
• Scanning of Shared storage for reduction/protection of sensitive information
• Default deny firewall for ResNet Network
• Replacement of legacy IAM and Guest system with new IAM system
General History and Overview

- Refined and fully developed priority based vulnerability scanner
- Started rolling out Desktop Encryption
- Began SANS Training Initiative
General History and Overview

• Replaced Anti-Malware with Sophos
• Finalizing Data Classification Policy
• Two-Factor Authentication Capability
General History and Overview

• Full Implementation of NIST 800-53
Structure/Function of the ISO

• ISO exists to manage information risk and compliance through:
  – Adopting and communicating standards
  – Establishing and reviewing controls
  – Developing training and awareness programs
  – Developing policy
  – Performing security monitoring
  – Performing incident response
Structure/Function of the ISO

- **All**
  - Policy Development
  - Security Consulting

- **AR – Architecture and Response**
  - Security Architecture
  - Security Response

- **IAM – Identity and Access Management**
  - Identity Management
  - Access Management

- **ABA – Awareness, BCP and Assessments**
  - Security Awareness and Training
  - Business Continuity Planning
  - Security Assessments
NIST 800-53

• “Security and Privacy Controls for Federal Information Systems and Organizations”
• Maps to many of the major standards (ISO 27001, COBIT, HIPAA, etc.)
• Required of Federal Agencies by law (FISMA)
### NIST 800-53 Control Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Family</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC  Access Control</td>
<td>Access Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT  Awareness and Training</td>
<td>Awareness and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU  Audit and Accountability</td>
<td>Audit and Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA  Security Assessment and Authorization</td>
<td>Security Assessment and Authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM  Configuration Management</td>
<td>Configuration Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP  Contingency Planning</td>
<td>Contingency Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA  Identification and Authentication</td>
<td>Identification and Authentication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR  Incident Response</td>
<td>Incident Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA  Maintenance</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP  Media Protection</td>
<td>Media Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE  Physical and Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Physical and Environmental Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL  Planning</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS  Personnel Security</td>
<td>Personnel Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA  Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA  System and Services Acquisition</td>
<td>System and Services Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC  Systems and Communications Protection</td>
<td>Systems and Communications Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI  System and Information Integrity</td>
<td>System and Information Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM  Program Management</td>
<td>Program Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP  Authority and Purpose</td>
<td>Authority and Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR  Accountability, Audit and Risk Management</td>
<td>Accountability, Audit and Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI  Data Quality and Integrity</td>
<td>Data Quality and Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM  Data Minimization and Retention</td>
<td>Data Minimization and Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP  Individual Participation and Redress</td>
<td>Individual Participation and Redress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE  Security</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information Assurance and Privacy Advisory Group

Charges:
1. conducting information risk management exercises
2. reviewing all information assurance compliance initiatives for effectiveness
3. providing policy and procedure guidance for information assurance and privacy concerns
4. prioritizing University efforts for information assurance control development and implementation

Membership:
- University Information Security Officer (Chair)
- Chief Information Officer
- Safety and Risk Management
- Audit
- Legal
- Enrollment Management
- Faculty
- Financial
- Research
- Human Resources
FAIR (Factor Analysis of Information Risk)

• Based on model by Risk Management Insight and CXOWare
• Provides quantitative and qualitative risk assessments
• Risks range from Low to Critical
Policy Roadmap

Final Stages:
- Data Classification
- FIPS 199
- RA-2 Security
- Categorization

Coming Up:
- Acceptable Use Refresh
- PL-4 Rules of Behavior
- PS-6 Access Agreements

Incident Response
- IR-1 – IR-10

System and Services Acquisitions
- SA-1 – SA-22
- AP-1 – AP-2
- AR-1 – AR-8
- DM-1, DM-3
- SE-2
- TR-1 – TR-3

Data Privacy

Coming Up:
- Data Classification
- FIPS 199
- RA-2 Security
- Categorization

Acceptable Use Refresh
- PL-4 Rules of Behavior
- PS-6 Access Agreements

Incident Response
- IR-1 – IR-10

System and Services Acquisitions
- SA-1 – SA-22
- AP-1 – AP-2
- AR-1 – AR-8
- DM-1, DM-3
- SE-2
- TR-1 – TR-3

Data Privacy
Data Classification Process

- **Review**: Identify the sensitivity of your data
- **Reduce**: Securely destroy the data that you don’t need, or is past your retention schedule
- **Protect**: Secure the information you must have according to Ohio University Standards
- **Redact**: Try to reduce the classification of your data by removing sensitive elements
Glossary (from Wikipedia)

- **COBIT** – Control Objectives for Information and Related Technology “is a framework created by ISACA for information technology (IT) management and IT governance”
- **FIPS** – “A Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) is a publicly announced standardization developed by the United States federal government for use in computer systems by all non-military government agencies and by government contractors, when properly invoked and tailored on a contract.”
- **FISMA** – Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 “requires each federal agency to develop, document, and implement an agency-wide program to provide information security for the information and information systems that support the operations and assets of the agency, including those provided or managed by another agency, contractor, or other source”
- **ISO 27001** – International Organization for Standardization, “part of the growing ISO/IEC 27000 family of standards, is an information security management system (ISMS) standard published in October 2005 by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC).”
- **NIST** – National Institute of Standards and Technology – “The institute's official mission is to: Promote U.S. innovation and industrial competitiveness by advancing measurement science, standards, and technology in ways that enhance economic security and improve our quality of life.”
DATE: June 3, 2013

TO: The President and Board of Trustees

FROM: Chief Audit Executive Jeff Davis, CPA, CIA, CFE, CISA

SUBJECT: Chief Audit Executive Report

Below is the Office of Internal Audit’s FY 14 proposed audit plan. It is presented to the Ohio University Board of Trustees for authorization.

**FY 14 Audit Plan**

External Audit Compliance Testing
ICA Compliance Audit
Risk Management and Safety
Voinovich Center
Education Abroad
Bursar
OIT – Information Security
OIT – Applications (SIS)
University College Follow-up
eLearning Ohio Follow-up
Graduate College Follow-up
OIT Lifecycle Management Follow-up
OIT On Base Follow-up
Payroll Follow-up
University Library Follow-up

Internal Audit will also present an update of progress in completing the FY 13 work plan, the audit process and the Audit Committee charter.

I look forward to answering any questions, prior to or during, the Audit Committee meeting.
Chief Audit Executive Report

Jeffrey Davis, CPA, CIA, CISA, CFE
Agenda

- Audit Status Update
- Audit Process
- FY14 Audit Plan & Schedule
- ICA Compliance Audit
- Audit Committee Charter
Audit Status Update
## FY13 Audit Plan Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit</th>
<th>Auditor</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Report Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>Ennis</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>7/6/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Affairs</td>
<td>Ries</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>7/13/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT – Lifecycle Management</td>
<td>Ries/Ennis</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>10/5/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7 Compliance Testing</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA Compliance</td>
<td>Ries/Ennis</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>9/4/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and Marketing</td>
<td>Ennis</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>11/7/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT Applications – On Base</td>
<td>Tong</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>2/4/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>Ries/Tong</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>3/4/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>Ennis</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>4/30/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate College</td>
<td>Ennis/Tong</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Learning Ohio</td>
<td>Ries/Tong</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT Applications - SIS</td>
<td>Tong</td>
<td>Moved to FY14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up Audit</td>
<td>Auditor</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Report Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>Ennis</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>3/8/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Affairs</td>
<td>Ries</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>4/12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Resources</td>
<td>Ennis</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>4/26/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>5/31/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Services/Accounts Payable</td>
<td>Ries/Ennis</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s Office</td>
<td>Ries</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost’s Office</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>In Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT Lifecycle Management</td>
<td>Tong</td>
<td>Moved to FY14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll and Tax Compliance</td>
<td>Ries</td>
<td>Moved to FY14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>Jul-12</td>
<td>Aug-12</td>
<td>Sep-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS Chapter 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Learning Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT - On Base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up Audits:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost's Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement/Accounts Payable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audit Process
Internal Audit Plan Objectives

- Address significant financial, operational and compliance risks
- Assist others to identify, evaluate and mitigate risks
- Promote stronger internal controls
- Provide an independent, objective assessment of management activities to determine if resources are managed effectively
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Units</td>
<td>Colleges, Regional Campuses</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Support Services</td>
<td>President, Provost, Enrollment Management, Facilities, Student Affairs, Accounts Payable, Procurement, Bursar, etc.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Business Operations, Network and Infrastructure, Security, Applications, Customer Service</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliaries</td>
<td>ICA, Residential Housing, Airport, Culinary Services, Printing Services, Campus Recreation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 52
## High Level View of Key Audit Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Handling</td>
<td>Sensitive Data</td>
<td>University Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregation of Duties</td>
<td>Backups</td>
<td>Tax Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll/Compensation</td>
<td>Inventory Control</td>
<td>NCAAA Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Reconciliations</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Privacy – HIPAA/PCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>Change Management</td>
<td>Acquisition/Disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>Segregation of Duties</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Entertainment</td>
<td>Business Continuity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pcards</td>
<td>Disaster Recovery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Acquisition/Disposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Assets and Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audit Process

1. Notification Letter
2. Entrance Conference
3. Preliminary Review
4. Exit Conference
5. Draft Audit Report
6. Fieldwork
7. Final Audit Report
8. Customer Service Survey
9. Follow-Up Audit
FY14 Audit Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit</th>
<th>Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management and Safety</td>
<td>Ries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voinovich Center</td>
<td>Ennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Abroad</td>
<td>Ries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td>Ennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT – Information Security</td>
<td>Tong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT Applications - SIS</td>
<td>Tong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA Compliance</td>
<td>Ries/Ennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Audit Compliance Testing</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY14 Follow-Up Audits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-Up Audit</th>
<th>Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>Ennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLearning Ohio</td>
<td>Ries/Tong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate College</td>
<td>Ennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Library</td>
<td>Ries/Tong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT - Lifecycle Management</td>
<td>Tong/Ries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT - On Base</td>
<td>Tong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll and Tax Compliance</td>
<td>Ries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Audit Time

- Investigations
- Special Projects
- Meetings/Committees
- Ohio Compliance Supplement testing for Plante Moran
  - Related to establishment of policies, restrictions on use for cell phones, purchasing cards, vehicles and certain equipment (e.g., computers, internet and phone usage, etc.)
ICA Compliance Auditing
Internal Audit began compliance testing in July 2012

Current requirement for a review to be performed every 4 years by an authority outside of ICA

Association of College and University Auditors NCAA Division I Compliance Audit Guide
Year 2 (FY14)
- Camps and Clinics
- Extra Benefits
- Student-Athlete Employment
Audit Committee Charter
Resolution 2009 – 3100 (Internal Audit Charter) was approved by the Ohio University Board of Trustees January 2009

Resolution 2011-3208 (Revised Internal Audit Charter) was approved by the Ohio University Board of Trustees February 2011
Audit Committee will oversee

- External audits of financial operations
- Internal audit function
- Effectiveness of the University’s internal control and risk management system and its compliance monitoring process
- Whistleblower reporting mechanism
Meet with external auditors to review audit scope, approach and coordination with Internal Audit

- Review process to select external auditor
- Review engagement letter
- Review draft audited financial statements
- Meet privately (at least annually) with the external auditor
Review decisions regarding the Internal Audit budget
Review all decisions regarding the Chief Audit Executive (CAE)
Assess impediments to Internal Audit function
Approve audit plan
Review annually work plan performance, budget and staffing
Receive audit reports
Receive management presentations for corrective action
Meet regularly with the CAE to discuss issues deemed appropriate
Through review of external and internal audit reports and communications by management

- Evaluate “control culture”
- Evaluate overall effectiveness of controls

Review implementation of significant audit recommendations
Responsibilities
Compliance

- Obtain updates regarding compliance matters and their impact on financial statements and policy
- Anonymous receipt of complaints
  - Ensure there are effective procedures
  - Review a summary of complaints annually
Questions?
WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees of Ohio University has established an independent, objective assurance and appraisal activity to evaluate and improve effectiveness of risk management and internal management controls, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has approved an Ohio University Internal Office Charter requiring Board of Trustees authorization of an annual audit plan initiated to evaluate internal management controls, and

WHEREAS, the Chief Audit Executive charged with initiating audits pursuant to the plan proposes an annual audit plan for authorization by the University Trustees, and

WHEREAS, the proposed plan will be conducted during the period of July 2013 through June 2014, and

WHEREAS, time for unplanned investigations is separately allotted in the audit plan. Further revisions to the plan will be administratively reviewed and approved by the President and the Chair of the Audit Committee, and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ohio University Board of Trustees does authorize the proposed audit plan.
ELECTION OF PRESIDENT

RESOLUTION 2013-

RESOLOVED that Roderick J. McDavis be elected President of Ohio University for the year beginning July 1, 2013, and ending June 30, 2014.
ELECTION OF TREASURER

RESOLUTION 2013-

RESOLVED that Stephen Golding be elected Treasurer of Ohio University for the period beginning July 1, 2013, and ending June 30, 2014.
ELECTION OF SECRETARY

RESOLUTION 2013-

RESOLVED that Peter C. Mather be elected Secretary for the Board of Trustees beginning July 1, 2013, through June 30, 2014.