

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE
ONE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SEVENTH MEETING
OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Columbus, Ohio, November 6, 1992

The Board of Trustees met at its regular monthly meeting on Friday, November 6, 1992, at The Ohio State University Fawcett Center for Tomorrow, Columbus, Ohio, pursuant to adjournment.

**

**

**

Minutes of the last meeting were approved.

**

**

**

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

The Chairman, Mr. Barone, called the meeting of the Board of Trustees to order on November 6, 1992, at 10:05 a.m. He requested the Secretary to call the roll.

Present: John J. Barone, Chairman, Deborah E. Casto, John W. Kessler, Milton A. Wolf, Leslie H. Wexner, Alex Shumate, Theodore S. Celeste, Michael F. Colley, George A. Skestos, Kristen Cusack, and Hiawatha N. Francisco, Jr.

--0--

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Gee:

Undoubtedly, the excitement and activities of the past few weeks have captured our collective attention. The challenge of fierce competition, national polls and rankings, criticism, commentary, and mudslinging. . . . but enough about football!

While the election is over, our concerns regarding the future of higher education are not. As our national agenda is being set, as our federal and state governments convene a record number of new faces, it is imperative that we assert the necessity of a high priority on education for the future.

Ohio's Managing For the Future Task Force Report has prompted considerable discussion of higher education around the state. Today Ohio State's Managing For the Future Task Force will present its report. It will be directly following this meeting for those of you who will be able to stay and attend. I will receive the report from the task force chair, Gerry Mayo, and all of you are invited to attend.

It is of vital importance that we look beyond the fiscal crisis of this year and prepare ourselves for the challenges and opportunities occasioned by the climate of change in our society. Our university-wide planning process is in place. Today the members of the Board of Trustees have received a draft mission statement for the institution. It has been the product of much discussion and debate -- and I hope that we can bring it to a final conclusion next month. It is imperative that this institution have a clear definition of its mission and a strong sense of vision to guide and inform our decision making and our actions that follow. I see this as a dynamic time in the life of this university. We must seize the window of opportunity and take a new look at ourselves and all that we might become.

When I look at the new freshman class, about whom you will hear more in this meeting, I am very excited for the future. This, ladies and gentlemen, is the best class since we have been maintaining statistics in the history of this university. Yes, I said that last year, and I hope to say it again next year. This is our best entering class. More than one in four of them were in the top 10 percent of his or her high school class. The freshman class is more diverse than last year; African-American enrollment is up more than 5 percent and Hispanic enrollment grew by more than 14 percent. Once again we have more than 100 National Merit and National Achievement Scholars in the class, that ranking us in the top nine or ten. Today we have about 150 National Merit Semi-Finalists, who are seniors in high school, visiting Ohio State. These outstanding students are attracted to Ohio State because of our distinguished faculty and strong academic programs.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT (contd)

President Gee: (contd)

Consider the discovery in Warren County of the State of Ohio's oldest fossils -- 525 million year old fossils -- by Assistant Professor of Geological Sciences Loren Babcock and one of his undergraduate students, Peter MacKenzie. Let me repeat: Professor Babcock made this discovery with a student, and they co-authored a paper and delivered it to the Geological Society of America. I understand that Peter is getting a number of offers from graduate programs across the country. It is this type of opportunity that attracts students to Ohio State.

Ohio State is well recognized as a center for cartoon art, with a very distinguished collection and archive. This month we again hosted the Festival of Cartoon Art. This year's conference theme was "Cartoons and Ethnicity," focusing on the expression of ethnicity and stereotypes in cartoons. The dialogue among many of this country's leading cartoon artists was lively and significant for our students and faculty.

Further evidence of our quality is found in the awards and recognitions we receive. Ohio State has been chosen as the site of a new \$24 million Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education. The clearinghouse provides on-line access to resources and information for teachers across the country. It is part of our high priority initiative in math and science education.

October saw us celebrating the 25th anniversary of University College. Since its opening, University College has served more than 200,000 entering students, helping them make the transition to college life and define their academic objectives. Dean Mac Stewart and his staff are to be congratulated on the good work of the college, building on its foundation of a quarter century of service.

The call for change at this university comes in a variety of forms and from many voices, including mine and those in this room today. Our students, faculty, our dedicated staff all are committed to the notion of moving this University forward. It is a time of strain and also an exciting time, and I feel that together we can make significant progress. Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.

--0--

RESEARCH FOUNDATION REPORT

Mr. Celeste:

I am especially pleased to report on the grants and contracts for the month of September received by The Ohio State University Research Foundation. At Tab 1 we see that the awards for the period July through September have turned the corner and are up 3.77 percent. This was aided by a large award from the Department of Education, which I will highlight later in my report.

At Tab 2 you will find expenditure summaries. Expenditures through September are up 5.3 percent, a modest increase over last month.

RESEARCH FOUNDATION REPORT (contd)

Mr. Celeste: (contd)

Some projects of special interest that were funded in the month of September are listed at Tab 3. A team of professors, Michael Klapper, David Haury, and Larry Buell, received about \$3.5 million from the Department of Education for the Eisenhower National Mathematics and Science Education Clearinghouse. This program's goals are to store and disseminate the latest and best educational materials making it one of the preeminent vehicles for educational reform in the country. This project will total \$23 million over a five-year period.

Professor Furnstahl, one of the recipients of the prestigious Alfred P. Sloan Research Fellowship, was also funded by the National Science Foundation. He will study relativistic field theory models of hadron particle systems.

I would also like to mention that I had the pleasure of visiting the laboratory of one of our eminent scholars, Professor Hamish Fraser. He has recently received major funding from the Edison Materials Technology Center (EMTEC) through the Engineering Experiment Station to develop ceramic-based composites for automotive engine blocks and brake components. This is a joint project with several key industrial companies including Ford, GM, GE, and Cummings Engine Company. They are developing technology for the production of near-net shape cylinder liners, turbocharger compressor wheels, reinforcements for diesel pistons, and brake rotors. EMTEC has provided the framework for a high degree of technology transfer with this project's Ohio-based industrial partners. I might emphasize that this project is a result of having one of our eminent scholars involved in the program and that it is an opportunity to turn the kind of research into some exciting opportunities for jobs in Ohio.

At Tab 4 is the list of all projects funded in September.

At Tab 5 is a table comparing federal obligations for research and development at the Big Ten universities including Penn State University. The table compares data across several academic disciplines for each major federal agency for FY 1990. I hope this information will give the members of the Board of Trustees a better idea of where our external funding comes from and, importantly, how much progress we need to make if we are to be at the top of the Big Ten.

Tab 6 includes a press release issued by University Communications highlighting recent research activity.

REPORT OF RESEARCH CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND GIFTS

Resolution No. 93-

43

Synopsis: The reports on contracts, grants, and gifts and the summary for September 1992 are presented for Board acceptance.

WHEREAS monies are solicited and received on behalf of the University from governmental, industrial, other agencies, alumni, and various individuals in support of research, instructional activities, and service; and

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

REPORT OF RESEARCH CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND GIFTS (contd)

WHEREAS such gifts are received through The Ohio State University Research Foundation, the Engineering Experiment Station of The Ohio State University, The Ohio State University Development Fund, and The Ohio State University Foundation.

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED, That the research agreement between The Ohio State University and The Ohio State University Research Foundation for the contracts and grants reported herein, and the acceptance of the reports from the Engineering Experiment Station, The Ohio State University Development Fund, and The Ohio State University Foundation during the month of September 1992 be approved.

Upon motion of Mr. Celeste, seconded by Ms. Casto, the Board of Trustees adopted the foregoing resolution by unanimous voice vote.

Summary

SEPTEMBER 1992

<u>Source</u>	<u>7/1/91-9/30/91</u>	<u>7/1/92-9/30/92</u>	<u>September 1992</u>
The Ohio State University Research Foundation	\$ 44,512,157.83	\$ 46,190,418.12	\$21,454,508.95
Engineering Experiment Station	\$ 1,888,672.00	\$ 2,365,022.00	\$ 216,427.00
The Ohio State University Development Fund			
Establishment of Named Funds			
The Dortha B. Ten Eyck Cancer Research Endowment Fund (Support cancer research)			\$ 165,306.55
The Margaret P. Cavanaugh and Peter F. Cavanaugh Scholarship Fund in Social Work (Scholarships)			\$ 50,000.00
The Robert Martin Kilian Chemical Engineering Fund (Support outstanding research)			\$ 25,000.00
The Shaffer Family Athletic Scholarship Fund (Scholarships - men's varsity basketball team)			\$ 25,000.00
The Henrietta Fleck Houghton Scholarship Fund (Scholarships - Colleges of Education and Human Ecology)			\$ 24,958.10
The Dorothy M. Kuohn Fund for Cancer Research (Support cancer research)			\$ 21,149.93
The Fawnye M. Kuohn Scholarship Fund (Scholarships - Departments of Animal Science and Agricultural Economics)			\$ 21,149.92

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

REPORT OF RESEARCH CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND GIFTS (contd)

Summary (contd)

SEPTEMBER 1992 (contd)

The Ohio State University Development Fund (contd)

Establishment of Named Funds (contd)

The Richard A. Kuohn Scholarship Fund (Scholarships - Departments of Animal Science and Agricultural Economics)	\$ 21,149.92
The Ruth V. Hawkins Heldt University Scholarship Fund (Scholarships - College of Education)	\$ 15,454.00
The Elizabeth D. Gee Research on Women Endowed Fund (Provide grants to Ohio State University faculty members and Ph.D. candidates to pursue research on women or gender)	\$ 15,000.00

Change in Name and Description of Named Funds

From:	The Donald Jay Brandt Memorial Scholarship Fund
To:	The Donald and Sidney Brandt Memorial Scholarship Fund
From:	The Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee Theatre Research Institute Endowment Fund
To:	The Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee Theatre Research Institute Library Endowment Fund

The Ohio State University Foundation

Approval of Description and Establishment of Fund

The Donald R. Glancy Endowed Fund (Support for WOSU)	\$ 31,921.83
---	--------------

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

REPORT OF RESEARCH CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND GIFTS (contd)

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT FUND

Establishment of Named Funds

The Dortha B. Ten Eyck Cancer Research Endowment Fund

The Dortha B. Ten Eyck Cancer Research Endowment Fund was established November 6, 1992, by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University with a gift to The Ohio State University Development Fund from the estate of Dortha B. Ten Eyck.

All gifts are to be invested in the University's Permanent Endowment Fund, under the rules and regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, with the right to invest and reinvest as occasion dictates.

The annual income shall be used to support cancer research in The Arthur G. James Cancer Hospital and Research Institute as approved by the Director of the Comprehensive Cancer Center-Arthur G. James Cancer Hospital and Research Institute and the Vice President for Health Services.

It is the desire of the donor that this fund should benefit the University in perpetuity. If the need for this fund should cease to exist or so diminish as to provide unused income, then another use shall be designated by the Board of Trustees in consultation with the Director of the Comprehensive Cancer Center-Arthur G. James Cancer Hospital and Research Institute and the Vice President for Health Services in order to carry out the desire of the donor.

The Margaret P. Cavanaugh and Peter F. Cavanaugh
Scholarship Fund in Social Work

The Margaret P. Cavanaugh and Peter F. Cavanaugh Scholarship Fund in Social Work was established November 6, 1992, by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University with a gift to The Ohio State University Development Fund from the estate of Peter F. Cavanaugh (B.S., Social Administration, 1938) of El Paso, Texas.

All gifts are to be invested in the University's Permanent Endowment Fund, under the rules and regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, with the right to invest and reinvest as occasion dictates.

The annual income shall be used to provide scholarships to students in the College of Social Work. The selection of the scholarship recipients shall be made by the Dean of the College of Social Work in consultation with the University Committee on Student Financial Aid.

It is the desire of the donor that this fund should benefit the University in perpetuity. If the need for this fund should cease to exist or so diminish as to provide unused income, then another use shall be designated by the Board of Trustees in consultation with the appropriate college dean, department chairperson, or program administrative officer in order to carry out the desire of the donor.

The Robert Martin Kilian Chemical Engineering Fund

The Robert Martin Kilian Chemical Engineering Fund was established November 6, 1992, by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, with a gift to The Ohio State University Development Fund from the estate of Robert Martin Kilian (B.Ch.E. '51; M.S., Chemical

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

Engineering, 1951).

REPORT OF RESEARCH CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND GIFTS (contd)

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT FUND (contd)

Establishment of Named Funds (contd)

The Robert Martin Kilian Chemical Engineering Fund (contd)

All gifts are to be invested in the University's Permanent Endowment Fund, under the rules and regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, with the right to invest and reinvest as occasion dictates.

The annual income shall be used to encourage and to support outstanding research by the faculty of the Department of Chemical Engineering. The chairperson of the Department of Chemical Engineering will have sole authority to authorize expenditures from the income, as approved by the dean of the College of Engineering. Any unused income from the fund shall be added to the fund's principal.

It is the desire of the donor that this fund should benefit the University in perpetuity. If the need for this fund should cease to exist or so diminish as to provide unused income, then another use shall be designated by the Board of Trustees in consultation with the appropriate college dean, department chairperson, or program administrative officer in order to carry out the desire of the donor.

The Shaffer Family Athletic Scholarship Fund

The Shaffer Family Athletic Scholarship Fund was established November 6, 1992, by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University with gifts to The Ohio State University Development Fund from Phil C. Shaffer, Columbus, Ohio.

All gifts are to be invested in the University's Permanent Endowment Fund, under the rules and regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, with the right to invest and reinvest as occasion dictates.

The annual income shall be used to supplement the grant-in-aid scholarship costs of student athletes who are members of the men's varsity basketball team pursuing undergraduate degrees at The Ohio State University. Recipients shall be selected by the Director of Athletics in consultation with the University Committee on Student Financial Aid.

It is the desire of the donor that this fund should benefit the University in perpetuity. If the need for this fund should cease to exist or so diminish as to provide unused income, then another use shall be designated by the Board of Trustees as recommended by the Director of Athletics in order to carry out the desire of the donor.

The Henrietta Fleck Houghton Scholarship Fund

The Henrietta Fleck Houghton Scholarship Fund was established November 6, 1992, by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University with a gift to The Ohio State University Development Fund from the estate of Henrietta Fleck Houghton (Ph.D., Education, 1944).

All gifts are to be invested in the University's Permanent Endowment Fund, under the rules and regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, with the right to invest

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

and reinvest as occasion dictates.

REPORT OF RESEARCH CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND GIFTS (contd)

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT FUND (contd)

Establishment of Named Funds (contd)

The Henrietta Fleck Houghton Scholarship Fund (contd)

The annual income shall be added to principal until the fund reaches \$30,000 at which time the fund shall be divided into two equal but separate funds. One fund shall be known as The Henrietta Fleck Houghton Scholarship Fund in the College of Education and the second fund shall be known as The Henrietta Fleck Houghton Scholarship Fund in the College of Human Ecology. Income from these two funds shall be used for scholarship awards to benefit students in the College of Education and the College of Human Ecology respectively. Selection of the award recipients shall be made by the deans in these two colleges in consultation with the University Committee on Student Financial Aid.

It is the desire of the donor that this fund should benefit the University in perpetuity. If the need for this fund should cease to exist or so diminish as to provide unused income, then another use shall be designated by the Board of Trustees in consultation with the appropriate college deans, department chairpersons, or program administrative officers in order to carry out the desire of the donor.

The Dorothy M. Kuohn Fund for Cancer Research

The Dorothy M. Kuohn Fund for Cancer Research was established November 6, 1992, by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University with a gift to The Ohio State University Development Fund from the estate of Richard A. Kuohn (B.S.Agr. '41) of Toledo, Ohio, in memory of his wife, Dorothy M. Kuohn.

All gifts are to be invested in the University's Permanent Endowment Fund, under the rules and regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, with the right to invest and reinvest as occasion dictates.

The annual income shall be used by The Arthur G. James Cancer Hospital and Research Institute to assist with research efforts into a cure for cancer. Funds may also be expended on preventative measures or toward efforts to alleviate the cancer patient's suffering. Special consideration is to be given to projects demonstrating innovative thinking in these areas. All expenditures of said funds will require the approval of both the dean of the College of Medicine and the director of The Arthur G. James Cancer Hospital and Research Institute. At such time as these funds are no longer needed for cancer research, the income may be used for other medical research efforts.

It is the desire of the donor that this fund should benefit the University in perpetuity. If the need for this fund should cease to exist or so diminish as to provide unused income then another use shall be designated by the Board of Trustees in consultation with the appropriate college dean, department chairperson, or program administrative officer in order to carry out the desire of the donor.

The Fawnye M. Kuohn Scholarship Fund

The Fawnye M. Kuohn Scholarship Fund was established November 6, 1992, by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University with a gift to The Ohio State University Development Fund from the estate of Richard A. Kuohn (B.S.Agr. '41) of Toledo, Ohio, in memory of his mother,

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

Fawnye M. Kuohn.

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

REPORT OF RESEARCH CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND GIFTS (contd)

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT FUND (contd)

Establishment of Named Funds (contd)

The Fawnye M. Kuohn Scholarship Fund (contd)

All gifts are to be invested in the University's Permanent Endowment Fund, under the rules and regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, with the right to invest and reinvest as occasion dictates.

The annual income shall be used to provide one or more scholarships to students enrolled in the College of Agriculture. Awards shall be made to students in the Department of Animal Science and the Department of Agricultural Economics who have demonstrated academic ability and a need for financial assistance. Selection of the award recipients shall be made by the dean of the College of Agriculture and the chairperson in the Department of Animal Science and the Department of Agricultural Economics in consultation with the University Committee on Student Financial Aid.

It is the desire of the donor that this fund should benefit the University in perpetuity. If the need for this fund should cease to exist or so diminish as to provide unused income, then another use shall be designated by the Board of Trustees in consultation with the appropriate college dean, department chairperson, or program administrative officer in order to carry out the desire of the donor.

The Richard A. Kuohn Scholarship Fund

The Richard A. Kuohn Scholarship Fund was established November 6, 1992, by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University with a gift to The Ohio State University Development Fund from the estate of Richard A. Kuohn (B.S.Agr. '41) of Toledo, Ohio.

All gifts are to be invested in the University's Permanent Endowment Fund, under the rules and regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, with the right to invest and reinvest as occasion dictates.

The annual income shall be used to provide one or more scholarships in the College of Agriculture to students in the Department of Animal Science and the Department of Agricultural Economics. Awards shall be made to those who have demonstrated academic ability and a need for financial assistance. Selection of the award recipients shall be made by the dean of the College of Agriculture and the chairperson in the Department of Animal Science and the Department of Agricultural Economics in consultation with the University Committee on Student Financial Aid.

It is the desire of the donor that this fund should benefit the University in perpetuity. If the need for this fund should cease to exist or so diminish as to provide unused income, then another use shall be designated by the Board of Trustees in consultation with the appropriate college dean, department chairperson, or program administrative officer in order to carry out the desire of the donor.

The Ruth V. Hawkins Heldt University Scholarship Fund

The Ruth V. Hawkins Heldt University Scholarship Fund was established November 6, 1992, by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, with gifts to The Ohio State University Development Fund, from Ruth V. Hawkins Heldt of Toledo, Ohio.

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

REPORT OF RESEARCH CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND GIFTS (contd)

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT FUND (contd)

Establishment of Named Funds (contd)

The Ruth V. Hawkins Heldt University Scholarship Fund (contd)

All gifts are to be invested in the University's Permanent Endowment Fund, under the rules and regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, with the right to invest and reinvest as occasion dictates.

The annual income shall be used to provide one or more merit scholarships for Ruth V. Hawkins Heldt Scholars in the College of Education. Recipients of this scholarship shall be students preparing to be teachers who qualify as Presidential, Distinguished, Medalist or University Scholars.

These scholars may be continued for up to two years of post baccalaureate work to complete certification requirements. In any year that a Presidential, Distinguished, Medalist or University Scholar is not available, this merit scholarship may be awarded to another student in a teacher certification program.

This merit scholarship initiative is the result of recommendations from the 1990 University Task Force on Undergraduate Recruitment and the 1990-1991 Undergraduate Recruitment Implementation Steering Committee to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Students shall be selected based upon the criteria sanctioned by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and administered by the College of Education in cooperation with the University Honors Center and in consultation with the University Committee on Student Financial Aid.

It is the desire of the donor that this fund should benefit the University in perpetuity. If the need for this fund should cease to exist or so diminish as to provide unused income, then another use shall be designated by the Board of Trustees in consultation with the appropriate college dean, department chairperson, or program administrative officer in order to carry out the desire of the donor.

The Elizabeth D. Gee Research on Women Endowed Fund

The Elizabeth D. Gee Research on Women Endowed Fund, a Critical Difference for Women program in conjunction with the Center for Women's Studies, was established November 6, 1992, by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University with gifts to The Ohio State University Development Fund from friends and admirers of Elizabeth Gee.

All gifts are to be invested in the University's Permanent Endowment Fund, under the rules and regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, with the right to invest and reinvest as occasion dictates.

The annual income shall be used to provide one or more grants to Ohio State University faculty members and Ph.D. candidates to pursue research on women or gender. The selection of recipients shall be made upon the recommendation of a University-wide Research on Women Committee under the direction of the Center for Women's Studies.

It is the desire of the donors that this fund should benefit the University in perpetuity. If the need for this fund should cease to exist or so diminish as to provide unused income, then another use shall be designated by the Board of Trustees in consultation with the director of the Center for Women's Studies.

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

REPORT OF RESEARCH CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND GIFTS (contd)

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT FUND (contd)

Change in Name and Description of Named Funds

The Donald and Sidney Brandt Memorial Scholarship Fund

The Donald Jay Brandt Memorial Scholarship Fund was established May 7, 1973, by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University with a gift to The Ohio State University Development Fund from the family of the late Donald Jay Brandt (B.A., Sociology, 1972) in his memory. The name of the fund and description were revised November 6, 1992, to include his father, Dr. Sidney Brandt (D.D.S., 1938).

All gifts are to be invested in the University's Permanent Endowment Fund, under the rules and regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, with the right to invest and reinvest as occasion dictates.

The annual income shall be used to provide one or more scholarships for undergraduate students of average achievement or ability in the Humanities who have demonstrated a need for financial assistance. The selection of the recipients shall be made by the dean of the College of Humanities in consultation with the University Committee on Student Financial Aid.

It is the desire of the donors that this fund should benefit the University in perpetuity. If the need for this fund should cease to exist or so diminish as to provide unused income, then another use shall be designated by the Board of Trustees in consultation with the appropriate college dean, department chairperson, or program administrative officer in order to carry out the desire of the donors.

The Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee
Theatre Research Institute Library Endowment Fund

The Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee Theatre Research Institute Endowment Fund was established December 6, 1990, by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, with gifts to The Ohio State University Development Fund from Jerome Lawrence (B.A., English, 1937), Robert E. Lee, and friends and supporters of the Institute. The name of the fund and description were revised November 6, 1992.

All gifts are to be invested in the University's Permanent Endowment Fund, under the rules and regulations adopted by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University, with the right to invest and reinvest as occasion dictates.

The annual income shall be used to provide support for (a) the position of curator, (b) acquisition and preservation of the collection, and (c) the operation and administration of The Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee Theatre Research Institute. Funds will be administered by the director of University Libraries and the chairperson of the Department of Theatre in consultation with the director and curator of the Theatre Research Institute.

It is the desire of the donors that this fund should benefit the University in perpetuity. If the need for this fund should cease to exist or so diminish as to provide unused income, then another use shall be designated by the Board of Trustees in consultation with the appropriate college dean, director of University Libraries, department chairperson, or program administrative officer in order to carry out the desire of the donors.

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

REPORT OF RESEARCH CONTRACTS, GRANTS, AND GIFTS (contd)

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION

Approval of Description and Establishment of Funds

The Donald R. Glancy Endowed Fund

The Donald R. Glancy Endowed Fund was established November 6, 1992, by the Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University through funds received by the University from The Ohio State University Foundation, which has established an endowed fund with gifts in support of WOSU from the late Donald R. Glancy, Associate Professor Emeritus in the Department of Theatre.

Net income provided by the Foundation, after payments described in paragraph 3 and including any income not paid in regard to paragraph 3, shall be distributed to WOSU, at least annually, to be used solely for its television and radio programming needs. WOSU shall publicly acknowledge periodically the monies received from this fund in such manner as determined by WOSU.

Up to \$7,000 in income, including principal as needed, shall be distributed annually to St. Anne's Anglican Church in Columbus, Ohio, to provide salary support for a part-time or full-time resident ordained minister, provided St. Anne's Anglican Church matches these funds, does not merge with another church, and remains a charity under Section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code. The Church's failure to meet these conditions in any given year shall not prevent the Church from meeting such conditions and receiving such payments in subsequent years.

--0--

HOSPITALS BOARD COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Celeste:

The Hospitals Board had very good attendance at an all-day strategic planning retreat on Thursday, October 29. During the day we looked at the current environment and healthcare reform measures anticipated at the state and national levels. Dr. St. Pierre presented indicators that will help the Hospitals and College of Medicine measure progress toward our goal of becoming one of the nation's "top ten" academic medical centers by the year 2000. Associate Provost Edward Ray discussed the University's mission and vision statements, planning process, and action agenda. Cathy Bruno reviewed environmental forces which have an effect on the medical center and projected several scenarios for the future. Finally, we discussed strategies to help the medical center toward our goal.

During the afternoon the Hospitals Board held its October meeting. After reviewing the committee reports we received updates on medical staff issues from the Medical Director and the Chief of Staff. The Hospitals' September financial report was favorable. We were pleased to note that net days in receivables have been reduced to 66, compared to 100 the previous year, and a goal of 85 set by the Hospitals Board.

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

HOSPITALS BOARD COMMITTEE REPORT (contd)

Mr. Celeste: (contd)

The day concluded with a joint dinner meeting at which the Hospitals Board and Cancer Hospital Oversight Committee learned more about the new standards by which both institutions will be measured next year by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations. This concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

--0--

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT

Ms. Cusack:

The Student Affairs Committee met yesterday at the Ohio Union. The format of our meeting was a round-table discussion with undergraduate students. We gathered nine students from different years of school, different parts of campus, and different backgrounds. The purpose of our meeting was to find out what is really happening in the general population at Ohio State.

The information we gathered was both interesting and exciting. Students have a lot to say about their experiences at Ohio State. Although all students seemed to agree that this is a huge place, that comment held both positive and negative connotations.

As far as comments for improvements, students mentioned a need for greater cultural and lifestyle sensitivity from teachers and students alike, and improvement in our system of advising. A variety of other topics were brought to light which will be used to format future Student Affairs meetings. We heard many positive comments -- you will be pleased to hear that students really like their university. Many teachers do take the time to make this a smaller, more comfortable place for students and many of the University's services aid in that task. I must point out that Disability Services was mentioned quite often and described as a very well run system at Ohio State. Several students gave positive testimonials about that office.

Overall, this meeting was very positive and productive. You will be hearing more about these issues at future Student Affairs meetings. Next month the graduate and professional students will have the same type of round-table discussion and a chance to air their ideas and comments about Ohio State.

Yesterday in the meeting we heard comments from John Hilbert, President of the Undergraduate Student Government. He mentioned their Freshman Internship Program which is a great opportunity to get 18 freshman involved early in USG. He also mentioned three resolutions which were discussed in USG: 1) was to support the rape education demands; 2) a negative comment against the regional campus guidelines outlined in the Managing For the Future Task Force; and 3) backing the Human Ecology Internship Program.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT (contd)

Ms. Cusack: (contd)

John also mentioned that USG is working on a tuition payment plan with the Office of Fees and Deposits. They thought this would help students by allowing them to pay their fees throughout the quarter instead of all in one lump sum. USG also has a new student outreach program which tries to reach students all over campus to let them know what USG is doing and to get them involved.

Next, Greg Gorospe, President of the Interprofessional Council, mentioned some issues such as helping non-traditional students and fee waivers. The professional students are also very much in favor of a fee payment plan.

I would now like to call on Karen Duncan who has asked to address the full Board on behalf of graduate students. Karen --

Ms. Karen Duncan:

Thank you, Ms. Cusack, and good morning. I have asked for the opportunity to address you directly today for a couple of reasons. One is that we are far enough into the academic year for me to give you a good sense of graduate student life at OSU this year and to answer any questions that you might have. Secondly, I understand that it has been about three years since any of the student government presidents have addressed the full Board. I just figured that was a record that needed to be broken, so I am going to break it today.

The Council of Graduate Students is also known as CGS, and we are the student voice for Ohio State's 11,000 graduate students. One of the brochures that was distributed to you this morning -- it is a gray one with a red and black logo on it -- is one that we published this year as a way of reaching some of our new graduate students and telling them a little bit about the Council and its works. I will refer you to that for further information. About one of every five students at the OSU campus is a graduate student, and graduate students earn about one in every three subsidy dollars that the University generates. In addition to being good, quality students, we tend to be rather nice people, too. So I am thrilled to be here today to talk to you about some of our efforts.

I think that it is rather easy to think of students at OSU as being 18 to 24 year olds, away from home for the first time, supported by their parents, maybe living in a dorm, or a sorority or fraternity house. That model really doesn't fit graduate students at all. We tend to be older students. In fact, our median age is 29 and many of us have been away from home for a good long time. Some of us are continuing on with our degrees, others are coming back after several years out in the work force. We are self-supporting and many of us are married and starting families of our own. So while we share similar concerns to our undergraduate and professional counterparts, we do have some needs and concerns that are a little different.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT (contd)

Ms. Duncan: (contd)

I think that one that comes immediately to mind is the need for affordable, accessible child care. Graduate students are really rather vital in realizing the mission of The Ohio State University. Graduate students support the teaching and research efforts, we also support the service effort of the University, both in the community and on campus. In fact, one of the most important things that the Council of Graduate Students does is appoint graduate students to serve on many of the committees across campus. We are active and involved participants in the University governance process. The second important thing that the Council does is act as a voice for graduate students on campus, providing an important forum for the discussion and examination of the issues that concern graduate students.

I would like to give you an example of just some of those issues that we have been dealing with. First, this fall we passed a resolution which requested that the University look into the idea of offering a payment plan for tuition. We feel that it is difficult for students and their families to come up with tuition in one lump sum at the beginning of each quarter and at the same time having to come up with money for books, health insurance, and for all those other beginning of the quarter expenses. Giving students the option of spreading that tuition payment out over several months could be a real service to students and their families. We are real pleased that the Undergraduate Student Government has joined us in that effort, and the professional students are also considering it. While I haven't heard anything specifically from any of the University offices, I have heard rumblings that such a plan is under consideration, and I am very pleased to hear that.

Another example of something that we have been looking at is the Report of the President's Commission on Women. Last Sunday, the Council approved a statement in support of that report. We commended the Commission for its work and highlighted several of the recommendations that we thought were of particular interest to graduate students. We will be distributing our reaction to that report widely throughout the campus.

Those are just two of our most recent efforts, but perhaps the most important issue in the minds of all graduate students at OSU is the effect of state mandated budget cuts on our education. Like everyone else at the University, we are concerned over the inadequate state support for higher education in Ohio. We've participated in rallies, we have written our legislators, and we have written letters to the editor. Some of us have even marched in parades to protest the budget cuts and we have done that because graduate students really are hit doubly hard by the cuts in higher education. We face reduced resources in the classroom. We suffer because our departments can't hire the faculty that they need to hire to do the teaching and the research. There are fewer graduate assistantships available and about half of the graduate students at OSU fund their education through those assistantships. We note with some concern that while graduate enrollment is up 2 percent nationally, it is down 16 percent at Ohio State this year, and part of that is due to fewer positions being available. Also as costs for health insurance, housing, and other living expenses go up, our stipend levels have remained stagnant for a year. So graduate students do feel squeezed on all sides, and we understand that it is part of the larger problem that the University is facing with its funding.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT (contd)

Ms. Duncan: (contd)

While the University is clearly facing a fiscal challenge, we find that one of the options that is being examined by the University, as a way to deal with the financial difficulties, is an option that we find rather unacceptable and that is the option of differential fees. I want to spend a few moments talking with you about that right now. As you may recall, last spring CGS expressed its opposition to differential fees and we remain opposed to differential fees, including the engineering computing fee which will be coming to you for approval. Although we have serious reservations, we do accede to this fee on a trial basis. We recognize that computing facilities in the College of Engineering have been allowed to decline appreciably and we recognize the funds the College has allocated are not sufficient to meet the needs.

Why does the engineering computing fee make graduate students so uneasy? Our concerns are not limited to the budget being balanced on the backs of students -- although certainly that is a concern -- we have other concerns with this fee as well.

First, what appears to be the subversion of the normal budgeting process at OSU. That is, if computing is a priority, and graduate students do believe that it is a priority, why then is it not included in the general funds budget and considered along with other priority items? Are computers any different than libraries and other resources that are necessary to keep the University operating? By allowing the College of Engineering to charge a computing fee, the University sends a message that the needs of the College of Engineering are more important than the needs of other units on campus and we wonder if this is the message that the University wants to send.

Second, for various reasons decisions have been made in the past that have left not only the College of Engineering, but much of the University behind the times in computer support. The unsatisfactory conditions we now face are the result of decisions made by faculty and administrators in the past, they are not the result of student decisions. Rather than holding decision makers accountable for those decisions, students are being asked to bail out the College of Engineering and the University through this differential fee.

Third, we believe that such a fee sets a dangerous precedent -- possibly opening a "Pandora's box" of fees at this University. No doubt approval of the engineering computing fee will prompt other colleges and departments to propose fees of their own to meet their own needs. There is not a unit on this campus that does not need money, but students and their parents do not have bottomless pockets. One of the goals in the Board of Regents' Managing For the Future Task Force Report is that higher education should be accessible and affordable to all. This is a goal that we highly support. We do not believe that students should be choosing their major or career based on what they can afford. We do not think that the decisions to change majors should be guided by the amount of fees charged in that major, and we do worry about the implications for student financial aid.

Fourth, as a university we appear to be ignoring a larger question, "Is it not time that we, as a university, ask the state why is it willing to give us money to build buildings, when it is not willing to give us money for libraries, computers, laboratories, and other resources that are necessary to run a world-class university?"

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT (contd)

Ms. Duncan: (contd)

Let me reiterate that CGS reluctantly accepts the University engineering computing fee as a pilot project of limited duration. We do not endorse a permanent computing fee for the College of Engineering, nor do we excuse the flawed decisions of the past that have led us to this state. We believe a university-wide academic computing plan is critical and should be implemented. The College of Engineering fee is bitter medicine for the decisions of the past, but it is medicine we will swallow on a temporary basis on the clear understanding that this fee will be subject to comprehensive review within a year.

In closing, I deeply appreciate this opportunity to come before you today to share with you some of the issues in graduate student life at this University and to express the support of graduate students for the University during these challenging times. I would certainly be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

President Gee:

Karen, thank you, very much. We were going to discuss the computer fee today, although it is on the agenda for December, and I will ask Dr. Ray to come forward to discuss that proposal. Are there any questions that the Board may have for Karen regarding this or any other issue that she has brought forth? I might say on a very positive note, that we have been blessed with great leadership in our graduate students. Sean Tipton, over the past several years, and now Karen have done an outstanding job. Karen, you are certainly welcome to continue in this discussion with Dr. Ray as we talk a bit more about the computer fee in a more comprehensive context.

Dr. Ed Ray:

Let me make a personal observation -- and Karen is excellent testimony to it -- I have served on a number of University committees where we have had undergraduate and graduate student representation and these are first-class people. They raise the right questions and concerns. Karen expressed it quite eloquently when she said that -- and I think this expresses fairly the views of the University Fee Committee that proposed to bring the computer laboratory fee forward for your consideration -- this is a preliminary discussion. We want you to think hard about the pros and cons of this particular issue before you are asked to vote on a resolution. I will point out that the resolution that you will be asked to consider -- in fact embodies the caveats that Karen has already mentioned -- is viewed as a pilot effort. It will be a differential fee to provide a critical service to an academic unit that has a strong desire to move forward even in the worst budget times and to try to maintain state-of-the-art technology for its students in the learning process.

The resolution that you will be asked to vote on asks you to consider this as a pilot project and requires that it be reviewed annually until and unless alternative means of providing these resources to students are found. I think the committee would also endorse the idea that the University needs to get on with the very serious business of considering reallocations of resources within the University to match priorities more clearly perhaps than has been the case in the past. We must press the case forward with the state to get appropriate funding to provide the kind of

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT (contd)

Dr. Ray: (contd)

quality higher education that the state insists it wants. Those who have looked at the issues clearly understand it must have that funding if it is not to become a third-rate state in the 21st century. I think that we have had a number of discussions on that issue.

The proposal is to have a charge of \$120 per quarter for engineering majors. The understanding is that the money will go into a specific account targeted to provide laboratory space, computer equipment, and software to be used for the purpose of training graduate and undergraduate students in the College of Engineering. The need for computer services throughout the University is substantial and serious. There is an academic computing plan that involves many more millions of dollars of very necessary expenditures than we are able to provide funding for at this time. The understanding in moving forward with the College of Engineering proposal was: 1) that this is a proposal that the College has been working on for two years - - they weren't just picked out of a hat; and 2) there is a specific need within engineering training for high-end technology computer equipment that they need to make available to their students. That makes it a little more specialized need than the computing needs for the University community as a whole. Again, I want to stress that this is being viewed as one of the more urgent priorities -- within a very important priority for this University -- and that is upgrading and expanding the quality of computer resources available to all students and researchers.

In any event, the proposal asks for \$120 per quarter fee for majors in engineering. For this year that represents approximately a 13 percent increase in tuition payments, on top of the 9 percent that students are already faced with. The College of Engineering has been discussing proposals for the last two years. Students and faculty have had a lot of input into designing the package itself and in discussing the pros and cons of it. The College of Engineering intends to borrow against future receipts in order to go as far as it can to put the computers and software in laboratories and available for students the day they walk in, with the understanding that they are now paying fees for such services. The idea is to defer implementation of this fee structure until Spring Quarter, so that over the course of the next several months the College of Engineering will be able to do the work that needs to be done to have the resources available for students at the time they are asked to begin paying for it.

There is also the understanding that all funds collected in this fashion will go for the specific uses that we have been talking about here. You need to understand that the College of Engineering is now spending about \$2.2 million a year on computers and computer-related resources. This fee structure would generate approximately \$1.5 million a year on top of that which would be used for the specific purpose of training undergraduate and graduate students. The College estimates it would have to spend on the order of \$9 million a year to achieve a steady state-of-the-art technology for the kind of training that their students need.

Karen has already, rather eloquently, expressed some of the downside concerns, including this notion of differential fees within the University. I think some would find that unpalatable -- the notion that students in a public institution would face differential costs to one kind of education versus another. That may have an impact on students' career choices that many would find quite inappropriate. There

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT (contd)

Dr. Ray: (contd)

is also this issue of who gets the differential fee as opposed to others to meet their specialized needs.

I have tried to explain that this is a project that the College of Engineering has been looking at very seriously for two years with a lot of participation. They happen to be first in the queue because they have recognized the urgency of their needs and the fact that the University didn't seem to be responding effectively. So they have tried to move forward with a proposal that made a certain amount of sense. But there is this other danger and that is we could start down the road where we have every college, department, or program coming forward with user fees. The user fees would be a way of essentially circumventing the reality we find ourselves faced with -- that we are underfunding higher education in Ohio and at Ohio State. The quality degradation that that process entails is going to show up systematically in some areas before it does in others. We need to figure out how we are going to get our act together to deal with it. The Committee's sense was that we would prefer to see the University reorder its house internally, and make its case more effective externally to get the resources that we need where we need them to provide the highest quality possible training for our students. As painful as the possibility is of going forward with a charge like this is, it is not responsible to walk away from the fact that if we do nothing, there will be a very quiet, but a very real degradation in the quality of resources available to our students, and that is not acceptable. We have to address this and we have to address it as quickly as possible.

Mr. Celeste:

Of the \$1.5 million, how much would go for the lab space, the equipment, and the software?

Dr. Ray:

The intention is that all the money that would be generated from this would go toward the computers and the computer software. The facility adaptations or renovations that were required for this would be part of the expenditures that the Engineering College would make. The College would not divert sums of money for physical space creation or renovation at the expense of having learning resources directly available to students.

Mr. Celeste:

Is the computer equipment you anticipate having there accessible only by coming to the location or is there remote access?

Dr. Ray:

It will be by having secure laboratory facilities available. What we are talking about here is high end, some work stations that can handle fairly sophisticated software. So we are not talking about things that we could substitute lap top computers for, at least at this time. We are really focusing on high-end technology at this point

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT (contd)

Dr. Ray: (contd)

and in the foreseeable future would not be possible to provide except within a laboratory environment.

Mr. Shumate:

Certainly we are all committed to quality at this University, but, as you also indicated, as a public university we are committed to the concept of access. What has been the analysis or thinking on what steps we can take to try to minimize or avoid this type of procedure having a chilling effect on access?

Dr. Ray:

Well the answer is easy, getting there is hard. The answer is that we get our act together and we redirect resources internally. We do everything that we can to generate those external resources and to get the level of funding up to where it needs to be so that we can meet specific, targeted, quality needs without simply dumping additional costs on the students. I think that the way we proceed to that point is to get on with the business that we will be talking about later this morning -- what are we doing about planning and getting our act together and redirecting resources. I think that we adopt something like this very cautiously and with the understanding that we view this as an intermediate measure, that we are doing this on a pilot basis, with the understanding that it is going to be reviewed regularly. There should also be the understanding that we are going to explore alternative ways of providing these services, rather than presume that this is something that we want to stay in place long-term, or that it is something that we want to invite other units to view as the only way to get on with resource acquisition.

The University Fees Committee in its report -- before the engineering proposal came forward as a pilot possibility in May of 1982 -- specifically indicated that the Committee preferred university-wide fees if such measures were needed. They preferred to get along with the very large and expensive agenda of computing on campus and not have differential fees either on a course or by college or by major basis. So the University Committee that had to review this specific proposal is on record as preferring not to have a structure like this. I think Karen's statement about acceding to the adoption of this as a way of not simply walking away from the fact that these people have a particular problem that they are willing to try and deal with reflects the sentiment of the committee.

Mr. Shumate:

The point I am trying to make is that as a part of the evaluation of the pilot project, there should be an effort to evaluate or measure whether or not this has had a negative impact on access for students being able to enter and succeed in the Engineering Department.

Dr. Ray:

I think there has been some very serious soul searching within Engineering. The faculty seem to have a fairly clear sense that the feedback they are getting from the external community is that there is genuine concern about whether the students

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT (contd)

Dr. Ray: (contd)

that they are turning out are in fact trained on the best available research and operating materials available. They are beginning to get nervous that they are going to fall behind very quickly if they don't move now. That is really where the impetus comes from. They understand what it takes to be effective teachers and they don't feel they have the tools needed to do the best job possible. They understand from the students and from potential employers that they need to move ahead with this matter.

Ms. Cusack:

Since it is supposed to be effective Spring Quarter, have there been any special provisions made for students on financial aid or students who are on scholarships? That is a pretty good chunk of money to throw at someone.

Dr. Ray:

There are really a couple of aspects to this that have to do with making the transition from doing nothing to trying to get on with doing something. The Engineering College has made it clear that they expect to provide their own resources for students who have particular financial needs and to help them deal with the financing of this add on charge. So they are intending to work with students on an individual basis to make sure that any damage of this sort -- in terms of what they can afford, what they are able to do, or career choices that they would make -- is minimized.

There are some more technical complications with graduate students, in terms of whether or not they are on projects where add on fees might be picked up immediately, or they are on their own resources and it hits them as a charge. Their intention for the first year is to basically underwrite those costs for graduate students, to avoid inequities in how they are treated by this add on fee. In the course of this academic year they hope to figure out what represents a fair way of levying this charge so that they don't pick on some people relative to others. But the need question is a real one.

President Gee:

I think that Alex's question is a very specific one that we wrestle with a lot. Every time we raise one of these fees or every time we raise tuition, what impact does that have in terms of access to this institution? As committed as we are to merit, we're committed to it on the basis of access and not on the basis of someone's ability to pay. Of course, again, we may not have all the structures that show that our tuition is among the lowest and a variety of other things, but the impact has to be dealt with. You are saying that the Engineering School in the short-term will have --

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT (contd)

Dr. Ray:

Engineering will do what it can to try and minimize the hardship that individual students face as a result of these added charges. We are, as we all know because we have seen the statistics, low relative to other institutions in the state and nationwide in terms of tuition charges. But \$2,800 is still \$2,800, and for a lot of young people that is a very severe barrier to getting the kind of education they hope to get. So none of this is something that we would do on a whim. I think people are pretty sensitive to the problem.

Mr. Skestos:

In response to Alex's question -- you had mentioned that if we don't do this, it could result in a number of students not coming here because we don't have the facilities to serve them in their education. President Gee raised a question of the negative access from the standpoint of, "Are we going to drive some students away and cut down our enrollment in the future?" Hopefully, during this period of experimentation we can take a look at that. Then, you can come back to us and give us a report on whether this is really having a negative impact. Are there students not enrolling because of the added fee? Those are the kind of figures I would like to see.

Dr. Ray:

That is exactly right. That is why we proposed this be viewed only as a pilot project and that it be monitored regularly until and unless we find alternative ways to provide these services.

President Gee:

I think it is important to try to put one thing in context here. Karen, you raised a very important question -- are we doing this as an ad hoc issue? In other words, we get a budgetary problem and so we go and put it on the backs of students, or have we tried to think this thing through more long-term. The answer is yes. That is the reason that when it was initially proposed rather than us saying fine we will do it -- because Engineering has made a very persuasive case -- we said no we won't do it until we have thought through the impact and what the University wants to do. I believe this and this is my view -- not expressing it as the University's view - - a university in today's world has the responsibility, particularly on the technology side to provide a minimum sense of support for all students whether they be in dance or engineering. The reality is that when we try to meet the needs of engineering, we start charging dance students to meet that need at some point. If you were to vector this at some point, they cross the line and there is a fairness issue that is on that side of it. I believe that what the committee is trying to do is wrestle with this. By accepting the academic computing plan and a variety of other proposals, and having set up the Vice President's Task Force, we are going to move forward in terms of technology in a way that provides a level of support for all of our students and faculty at this institution. But at the same time, there are pockets within the institution that have very voracious needs and those needs could consume everything that we have. The question is how do we pay for that? And isn't it perhaps fair for those who are the ultimate users pay some share or cost for that? That is a broader philosophical issue that could go all across the board.

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT (contd)

President Gee: (contd)

Should our dancers pay for our physicians? That is another way to put it, and I think that the answer is that we do need to have some differentiation.

Ms. Duncan:

I wonder why computers are any different than libraries. I think that students in different disciplines may make different differential use of many different services on campus. As you say, there is a larger philosophical issue that we need to discuss.

President Gee:

And we need to ask the question about libraries and other things. I would contend that perhaps with very specialized library resources we do charge differentiated approaches to them. You asked the question, but you can answer it the other way, too.

Mr. Barone:

Has anyone exploited -- and I like to use the word "exploited" -- contacting other engineering firms which can lease this equipment? Maybe we could lease it back for \$1.00 a year or something . There are industries and companies that have done this. I know Dana Corporation in Toledo does this frequently. They will buy certain equipment and lease it to the University and to the students in order to help. It does help the community in employment and knowledge.

Dr. Ray:

Yes. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the College of Engineering intends -- with the money that is advanced to it -- to work on leasing arrangements to maximize the resources for each dollar that is used.

--0--

INVESTMENTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Amb. Wolf:

The Investments Committee met yesterday afternoon to perform our annual review of the Endowment Funds Equity Managers. We heard presentations from the Student Investments Management class, the Chicago Corporation, Wood Island Associates, Nicholas-Applegate, Wells Fargo, R. Meeder and Associates, and the University Office of the Treasurer, which manages part of the portfolio.

It is reported that for the twelve months ended June 30, 1992, we had a total return of 24.3 percent versus the 13.4 percent return for the Standard and Poor 500 index. Also, outperforming the S&P 500 were the Office of the Treasurer, which administers part of our account, and two investment advisors, Nicholas-Applegate

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

INVESTMENTS COMMITTEE REPORT (contd)

Amb. Wolf: (contd)

and R. Meeder. I am pleased to announce that the student investments class recorded the best performance.

The Investments Committee also reviewed additional investment performance information and discussed topics including asset allocation, broker commissions, and manager fees. Recommendations regarding the allotment to our managers were made and will be presented as a resolution to the next full meeting of this Board.

I would also like to report that the market value of the University's Endowment Fund as of October 16, 1992 was \$411.1 million. This concludes the Investments Committee report, Mr. Chairman.

--0--

FISCAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEETING

REPORT ON ENROLLMENT

Mr. Shumate:

Our first item of business this morning is a report on enrollment from Vice President Shkurti.

Mr. Shkurti:

Thank you, Mr. Shumate. This is an annual report that I provide every fall on 14th day enrollment. With us today is Jim Mager, Director of Admissions. Jim is really the soldier in the trenches who handles a lot of this, so if I get stuck on answering any of your questions, he will be delighted to assist.

The issues to be reviewed are: 1) What is our current enrollment? 2) What is the composition of the student body? 3) What is the quality of the incoming class? 4) What progress has been made in increasing minority enrollments? and 5) What are the implications for the future, including the financial implications?

Let me start first with the current enrollment and that is the page headlined 1A. Our total enrollment this fall is 58,585, down 2,000 in terms of head count from last year. This is the lowest enrollment for the University as a whole since autumn 1987. We will talk about why in a minute. The decline was substantially on the Columbus main campus, the lowest enrollment since the fall of 1982.

Next if you turn to page 2A, we talk a little bit more about the Autumn 1992 enrollment on the main campus. Actually the number of new first quarter freshmen we attracted has remained at the desired level, which is 5,300 -- so we did hit that target. I might add that the retention of new students from last fall is up from last year's rate to 82.2 percent. This is one of the things we hoped to accomplish when we moved to selective admissions. The question is, "Where did we lose students if we picked them up as new first quarter freshmen?" There are two places. One,

REPORT ON ENROLLMENT (contd)

Mr. Shkurti: (contd)

the number of continuing undergraduates is down 1,345 from last year's level. And second, we believe we lost part of these students in the summer, and part of them in the fall, primarily because of the bad economy. They simply did not have the financial resources to come back to school.

In addition, the enrollment of new graduate students decreased by 16 percent. While we kept the graduate students we had -- which has been kind of the reverse of the undergraduates -- we didn't bring in a lot of new students and Karen referred to this in her testimony. We believe the reason for this is in dealing with the budget cuts -- we have been cut so many times, we don't have too many more places to turn, especially in the academic departments. The money is just not there to sponsor graduate students. The departments rightfully are trying to protect and keep the students they have before they bring on new students. So without the financial support that is needed, we are unable to attract as many graduate students as we had hoped.

If we turn to 3A, we talk about the quality of the incoming class or the new first quarter freshmen. As the President mentioned in his opening remarks, autumn 1993 represents one of our best freshman classes ever. The improvements have been realized in almost all quality measures which are on the following page. For example, the number of University scholars is up 19.8 percent and the number of high school valedictorians is up 15.9 percent.

The next set of figures on page 4A, deals with minority enrollment. Even though our overall enrollment is down, the autumn 1992 minority enrollment is up -- up 4 percent from last year and is the highest on the Columbus campus ever. So minorities now represent 10.9 percent of the student population on the Columbus campus. In addition, which I think is an equally significant statistic, not only are we bringing minorities to the campus, but our retention, particularly of Black new first quarter freshmen, is now 70.8 percent. That is the second highest level ever achieved by the University.

On page 5A, is a summary of the information I have just covered. I think it is fair to say that the University continues to attract quality students at all levels.

Mr. Wexner:

The class decrease in size -- how does that match with national experience or the Big Ten experience? Do we know?

President Gee:

We have some data -- it is mixed across the country. Much of it is related, again, to the economy and also institutions that have had dramatic budgetary reductions. California and a variety of other places have had huge decreases in the numbers of students. We can provide that data, though I am not certain that we have that readily available. We can get that data, but we fall somewhere in the middle in terms of that roll-off. Of course, our numbers are so big that anytime we lose a percentage that is a substantial number of students for us.

REPORT ON ENROLLMENT (contd)

Mr. Shkurti:

I would also add, Mr. Wexner, although all the other Ohio public four-year colleges and universities are not necessarily comparable to us, because they are not comprehensive research institutions, we do have figures for elsewhere in Ohio. The pattern has been for every four-year main campus in the state to suffer some sort of enrollment problem. So we think, in part, that this reflects the economy and the tuition increases from the reduction of state aid. We don't have all the figures yet across the country, but as the President indicated that record is somewhat mixed.

Mr. Wexner:

If I were looking at it on a regional basis or a national basis, I would take out of my statistical base, say California, because it is unique and it would distort the average. For this discussion about fees, tuition, and minority enrollment, I would like to see more information presented so that we are seeing ourselves in a comparative universe. For example, 10 percent down may be very good or it could be catastrophic. Another example is -- and I am only talking about myself -- I can run a mile in 9 minutes. But if that is the only knowledge I have, if I don't know that there are Olympic athletes that can run a mile in less than 4 minutes, I have no standard of comparison. Relating to the discussion earlier about planning, budgeting, and charges, I don't have a frame of reference -- maybe other Trustees do -- but I think the University in total has to see itself in a national competition against similar universities for students and for resources. We always have to see ourselves that way.

Mr. Shkurti:

Mr. Wexner, I agree with you. Let me state two things: 1) we do keep regular comparisons of our fees and charges compared to other public comprehensive research institutions, and I will be glad to provide that for you; and 2) we will try to provide you comparative enrollment information, to the degree we can get it, that addresses the same issue. If this is the kind of information that you feel would be helpful --

Mr. Wexner:

I am not saying this on a personal basis, I'm trying to say this is a policy issue for the Board, the faculty, and certainly for the President to consider. The question is if we have a vision, as the medical school and the Hospitals have expressed, in terms of being at the top ten level, then you always have to know where the top ten are and where we are. If the University is going to advance in all areas, whether it is support from the state or tuition or the caliber of resources, I think we have to know where we are and where we are advancing to.

President Gee:

You are absolutely correct. We have all those comparative data, particularly on our planning side, which we will provide. In the Managing For the Future Task Force report today, we will provide a lot of comparative data. We cannot make decisions about whether we are moving forward or not in a vacuum. We have to know how we compare to a variety of sources. Second of all, I think it is very important --

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

REPORT ON ENROLLMENT (contd)

President Gee: (contd)

and the point is well made and has been made several times -- when we provide these kinds of data we should not just be comparing ourselves, in terms of this discussion, with ourselves. We do want to know what has happened to us over a trend line, but also what is happening nationally to get some sense of our overall context. We'll start to do that. Even though we have the data and we use it in our planning process, it needs to be more widely distributed.

Ms. Casto:

Is the enrollment down purposely?

President Gee:

Some of it is down purposely. As you know, we targeted 5,300 -- let me just make a point here, 5,300 freshmen, the best class in the history of the University and that was by design. But there were some parts of it that weren't by design, and Karen made the point in terms of the loss of graduate students. Our intent, frankly, was to start moving the other direction. Remember we have talked about this -- a slightly lower number of undergraduate, and a slightly higher number of graduate students. Instead we got a slightly lower number of undergraduates by design and a lower number of graduate students not by design, but by impact. That is a very serious problem for us. The other thing is on the retention side -- we are going up steadily and that is very good, but a number of students didn't return, about 1,300 this year. We are trying to determine why. We think the majority was related to the economy and not, in this instance, to the University being unable to provide resources, or that they failed out, or a variety of other things.

Ms. Casto:

I have asked for that data before. I am hoping that it is not due to quality, because we had cut so many student services at that time. I pointed out to Bill Shkurti that there is a magic 400 number here, and that is the number of students that we predicted could be budgetarily affected in the Graduate School. We looked back and, in fact, it was. So I think we need to look into this further as to why all these things happen.

Mr. Shkurti:

We will have a more detailed budget impact study for the Board at the next meeting, which will detail numbers. We are still guessing at what numbers we lost for this or that. We will know exactly how many undergraduate student positions have been lost, how many graduate teaching positions have been lost, how many other positions have been lost, and this will give you a better feel for the impact of these budget reductions.

Ms. Casto:

Also, what is the difference between a continuing student and a returning student?

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

REPORT ON ENROLLMENT (contd)

Dr. Mager:

A continuing student is a student who was here either summer quarter or spring quarter. A returning student is a student that was gone spring or summer, but was enrolled previously in 1992 -- they stepped out and now they are returning.

Mr. Skestos:

Do we do any kind of exit poll on these non-returning students to get an idea of why they are not coming back? There are a lot of answers possibly out there -- maybe some students realize that college is not the place for them, or maybe they should be going to a technical school or some other place. Do we do anything at all to determine why these students are not returning?

President Gee:

The answer is yes and we do it in a variety of ways. Jim, you may want to answer this question.

Dr. Mager:

The best thing that we can do is a sampling, because many students are enrolled one quarter and do not return and they leave no forwarding address. The sampling that we have done for people who identify themselves on the way out is that many of the students have personal or financial reasons. Financial problems would be the number one reason. Now, again, none of the reasons are more than 50 percent -- 20 percent or so are financial reasons, other personal reasons, and some students, academically, are finding it very difficult. So, I am saying financial reasons and personal change reasons, such as having to do with a marriage or something like that. Then all of these reasons would add up to 100 percent.

Mr. Shkurti:

Let me conclude by summarizing, again, that we feel in terms of attracting quality freshmen, that is good news. In terms of recruiting quality minority students, that is also good news. The bad news has been that we haven't been able to meet our expectations on continuing undergraduates and on attracting new graduate students. The implications of these numbers for subsidy and fee income -- because as you know the Regents' funding formula is primarily enrollment driven -- we predicted when the budget was put together last spring and early summer we feared that there would be some enrollment decline and tried to build that into the numbers. So even though enrollment is down by a large number of students, we don't feel that we need to change our projections at this point. We won't know for sure what our subsidy income will be until December. Right now we are estimating that the final numbers we will have for you in the middle of the year will be within plus or minus \$2 million of the estimates that we gave you earlier in the summer, even taking into account this 14th day enrollment loss.

REPORT ON ENROLLMENT (contd)

Mr. Shkurti: (contd)

The second implication deals with resource allocation. This is a rather large institution, but I think what we are finding is not imperious to the budget problems and reductions in state aid and some of the other elements of the national economy. Another resource allocation decision we will have to face is what do we do with limited funds regarding closed courses. We have students coming in, paying fees, and drawing subsidies, and however bad or however disappointing these enrollment numbers are, it scares me to think of what they might have been had the Board not supported the proposal to reallocate \$1.5 million to take care of closed courses and keep additional sections open this fall. I think we did the right thing last year, and we will probably be faced with a very similar, difficult budget decision in the budget that we put together this spring in terms of where we put our limited resources. This is all connected and we need to make sure that we are keeping our courses open and having students coming in. The thing we want to avoid is what is called in higher education, "the death spiral." This is where we cut out courses and classes so fewer students come here, and because fewer students come here we have less tuition and less state support so we reduce more courses which means even fewer students come here. This is something that we need to avoid at all costs when making our resource allocation decisions.

Ms. Casto:

Bill, in this budget that we are going to look at will the amount of moneys that have been lost be reflected?

Mr. Shkurti:

Ms. Casto, I think if I understand your question correctly, the money we think we have lost because of the drop in enrollment this fall, we predicted pretty closely, within plus or minus \$2 million which will come out. So if that is what you meant by your question the answer to that is yes. If the question is what will be the impact next fall, we are not yet at a position where we are able to project that. We will have to discuss that when we put the next budget together.

Ms. Casto:

In other words, with the \$7.5 million that we have to take in reductions, we could have another \$2 million in reductions on top of it?

Mr. Shkurti:

It could be as much as another \$2 million, which would mean \$9.5 million, but it also could be as low as \$5.5 million, that is the plus or minus \$2 million. My expectation and my hope is that it will be fairly close to the \$7.5 million. I was hoping that we would have better results with enrollment than we expected in July. What would have been a \$7.5 million problem may have become a \$6 million, \$5 million, or a \$4 million problem. It now looks less likely that that is going to happen because enrollment is not over what the projections were.

REPORT ON ENROLLMENT (contd)

Mr. Shkurti: (contd)

Then the final point deals with the question Mr. Wexner asked earlier. One of the things we as an institution have to grapple with, in terms of our long-range planning, is what size of an institution we want to be. Whether we want to try to grow every fall, or whether we want to deliberately reduce enrollment, and if we do, what are the enrollments we deliberately want to reduce. So that will be one of the issues facing our planning process in the months ahead.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my presentation. I will be glad to answer any additional questions.

Mr. Shumate:

Are there any questions on the enrollment report? If not, the report is received.

--0--

BUDGET UPDATE

Mr. Shkurti:

This is the first quarter budget adjustment and is not a report we spend a great deal of time on because it reflects only those actions that have taken place in the first 2 or 3 months after the budget was approved. You will have a more detailed report, which I hope will encompass the final numbers from these enrollment changes, when we do the mid-year review in February. The two number changes that you see in this report are the ones resulting from the tuition cap being increased by 2 percent after the budget was passed and also the adjustment of 1.5 percent in classified employee salaries that was made. Those are both reflected in that first quarter report.

Mr. Shumate:

Are there any questions? If not, that report is received.

--0--

**REPORT ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING, MISSION, AND
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

Ms. Casto:

I would like to call on Dr. Ray for his report.

Dr. Ray:

Bill Shkurti will have some more to say about the contents of the book that was distributed to you. I would like to ask you to turn your attention to the material that was handed out this morning stamped "DRAFT." The intent of this material is to try and give you a sense of where we see ourselves in the planning resource management process and to provide you with some of the documentation that you

**REPORT ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING, MISSION, AND
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (contd)**

Dr. Ray: (contd)

really ought to have, not simply for purposes of discussion today, but as we move through the future. I would expect that we can provide supplementary material as we go along. What we want to focus on today is an update on the feedback that we've gotten on the mission and vision statements that you have seen earlier drafts of and that were presented to the University Senate by the President on October 3.

What I would like to do before we get into my perceptions about where we are on mission and vision and the issues that you need to think about, is try to put this a little bit more in context. Our sense is that we are trying to proceed with the planning process this year on two levels. At the upper level we are trying to rationalize the planning process and procedures within the central administration. We also feel we are trying to systematize operating procedures within academic units. The idea is that basically we need to situate ourselves both at the top and bottom throughout the University to be able to respond to a number of internal and external pressures that we have to deal with.

In dealing with the rationalization of University priorities, we are talking today a little bit about mission and vision statements. The idea is to focus on what we are about, what are our boundaries, and how do we see ourselves moving through the next 5 or 10 years. Once we have completed that task, we expect to be reassessing current long-term commitments by the University and bringing those in line with our perception of where we want to go long-term. We expect that sense of purpose that we establish during the course of this autumn to help us develop budget themes for the next budget cycle. We need to bring long-term perspectives on where we are going with Academic Planning and Resource Management in line with our annual budget cycle so that people can see that there is a kind of consistency to what we are doing over time as we move from budget to budget.

The restructuring of the planning process within the central administration includes the adoption of openness and accountability by the University in its planning and budgeting processes, as reflected in the publication of budget allocations last summer in the creation of the University Priorities Committee. That committee is intended as a permanent advisory committee to the Provost, President, and the Board of Trustees. Our objective is the use of open access to information and decision making as a vehicle for linking interests to discipline, for the planning budget activities of the University, and to establish accountability. It is a very different way of doing business than the University has been accustomed to in my 22 years here.

When I talk about systematizing operating procedures within academic units, we are talking about articulating how we deal with issues such as work load, which we already have had some discussion of here, tenure reviews, post-tenure evaluation, and other issues on a system-wide basis. I think that what we are trying to do is to lay groundwork for an open, rational system for management, with well-defined responsibilities at every level of the University. I think that if we can get on with the task this year, then next year we will see something that looks more like the traditional planning process with coordination from top to bottom. If you allow me

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

**REPORT ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING, MISSION, AND
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (contd)**

Dr. Ray: (contd)

a more colorful characterization, I think this year is about getting our act together. Essentially, we want to make sure that everyone understands what we need to be doing at every level in this University, and how we need to coordinate with each other so we can move forward.

I said that we wanted to rationalize the planning process within the University and central administration, and the first step of that is to reach some consensus about the mission and vision of this University for the future. If you will turn to the second page of that handout, you will see restatements of the mission and vision statement. These are basically the same statements that President Gee presented to the University Senate on October 3. Since that time, I would judge that in written form to the President and myself, there have been as many as 30 individual suggestions about changes that could be made in the mission and vision statements. I think all of those were very thoughtful, and many suggestions that one could see incorporated in one form or another. I guess at this point I would suggest that the Board look at the mission and vision statements that we have as a package. The vision bullets nicely compliment and clarify the statement of mission.

Look at that as a package -- it gives us a directive for moving into the future. See if there aren't some particular points of emphasis that you think need to be enhanced or perhaps decreased.

The kinds of comments that we have gotten typically have been expressions of concerns by particular constituent interests that perhaps they are not viewed as important as they believe they are, and frankly we often believe they are in the University. For example, there were a number of comments from academic units where people are very involved in extension work or outreach efforts, or continuing education -- or any of the number of other things that are important to what this University is about -- who want to see that word in there and they look and the word isn't in there. In the mission statement it is stated that we are committed to our land grant heritage of creating knowledge, of reaching out to the community, of being a part of people's lives, but there are people who don't see the word "extension" in there and would like to see it in there. One can understand what their concern is. They want reassurance that we are not moving inappropriately away from our traditional commitments. There are other people who have asked, for example, that the word "professional" be added when we talk about undergraduate and graduate students. The terms undergraduate and graduate are certainly inclusive enough and I don't think that anyone in the University would think that professional school students aren't part of the undergraduate/graduate student body. But, again, I think that the request for a specific reference reflects genuine concerns for people and they want to be reassured that we are not overlooking their importance and their interest in the University. I think there is a natural tendency for constituent groups to want to see the right phrase or the right buzz word and to indicate that we still consider them very much on board.

My own perception is that with all the interests and concerns that I have heard expressed, I do not believe that there is anything in the mission or vision statement that excludes the appropriate constituencies as part of the group that we want to move forward with. But, again, this is a matter of honest judgment. Let me stop there, and respond to any questions that you may have.

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

**REPORT ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING, MISSION, AND
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (contd)**

President Gee:

Ed, I do think that it is fair to say that although there were a number of comments regarding a particular word or a phrase, in terms of the boundaries of the statement itself, there seems to have been a general agreement that it does provide the appropriate boundary and definition for this University. Am I not correct about that?

Dr. Ray:

Let me make a personal observation. I was a department chair for 16 years and I can tell you that the nature of academics is such as not to tell you when you got something right, but not to miss a beat when it is not quite right. When something of this sort gets circulated for general comment and there is not a lot of strong sentiment expressed, or some thoughtful suggestions about how you might change a word here or a phrase there, then it tells me you are pretty much on the mark -- that people pretty much see what you are about and find themselves comfortable with it. That is sort of my gut reaction to where we are on this issue.

Ms. Casto:

I am going to ask the Committee to meet before the next Board meeting and discuss this. I think it is an excellent suggestion. Thank you, very much.

Dr. Ray:

Ms. Casto, I don't know if you wanted to pursue one other issue. There was some discussion and it really is not clear to me why the nature and the appointments on the University Priorities Committee aren't clearer. There has been an effort to make this information as explicit as possible. If you turn to the three pages that deal with the University Priorities Committee, it is useful to have people hear one of the paragraphs under the charge for this Committee. "This Committee is an advisory and coordinating body, not an administrative or governance committee. Day to day operational decisions will still be made by the appropriate administrative entity, such as the Executive Committee and reviewed by the appropriate element of the University's governance structure."

There is no effort in the creation of the University Priorities Committee to supplant any of the existing processes or mechanisms for making decisions at this University. This group is really intended to, in a sense, be the eyes, ears, and conscious for a central administration, to make sure that we are constantly in touch with University community members before initiatives are undertaken, before long-term targets are set, and before we find that, in fact, there isn't a consensus for a particular long-term agenda item.

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

**REPORT ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING, MISSION, AND
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (contd)**

Dr. Ray: (contd)

The last page of that three page handout indicates who the individuals are on this committee and I'd only point out that this group includes: three senior administrators, vice presidents, five members of senate committees to get representatives from the various governance bodies, six regular faculty, three students -- undergraduate, graduate and professional school students -- two staff persons, and other resource people associated with it. The idea is to make this group as broadly representative of the University community as possible.

The last few pages of the handout starts with the page entitled, "Long Term Resource Management." Again, we are trying to develop a system of open access to decision making at this University, without allowing anyone to duck responsibility. There are people on this campus who are paid to make decisions, just as you have to make difficult decisions. What we want to be clear to the University community is that this is a mechanism for access, review and consultation of decisions that are made at this University. This group was never intended to take the hit, under the worse of circumstances, for things that may or may not go wrong at this University. It is really intended to provide us with input.

The last several pages consist of a number of questions we need to be asking ourselves such as, "What size should we be? What should be the undergraduate and graduate mix? In what sense do we operationalize our commitment to diversity?", and a number of other issues. I expect we will be sharing this document with the members of the University Priorities Committee and ultimately with the University community at large to get input into the process. We want to make sure we're asking the right long-term questions so as we move forward there is an understanding of where we're going.

Ms. Casto:

Thank you. That's very important and very good that it come to us from within. I think the more people that get involved the better off we are in the long run. I'm glad to see that everybody is moving forward on this.

Mr. Shumate:

Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Barone:

Are there other universities that have followed this procedure? If they have, what has been the effect to date?

President Gee:

There have been several universities that have tried a variety of different planning approaches, several in the Big Ten: the University of Minnesota and the University of Michigan. In all candor, they've gone back three or four times to the beginning because they have failed. I take great pride in the fact that we are much further along than almost any other institution, public or private. I was just with a group

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

**REPORT ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING, MISSION, AND
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (contd)**

President Gee: (contd)

of colleagues -- at Yale where they had three Nobel laureates meet in a private room and say this is the future of the University, the university president is no longer there and this whole planning process is in shambles. We actually allocated dollars on the basis of a very clear set of priorities this year, and it will be absolutely allocated next year. I think it's because we've been enormously open and communicative about it, frantically so. We've tried to get as many people involved, but ultimately we have made some very tough decisions. We know how good we are because we have everyone in the country coming to take a look at us.

Mr. Shumate:

Any questions or comments? I think it is important for the Trustee Planning Committee to meet and thoroughly review and analyze this information. I would suggest that notice be sent to all Trustee members in case others would like to attend that meeting.

President Gee:

That's a good idea.

Mr. Shumate:

Thank you, Dr. Ray.

--0--

**WAIVERS OF COMPETITIVE BIDDING REQUIREMENTS
JULY - SEPTEMBER 1992**

Resolution No. 93-44

Synopsis: Acceptance of the quarterly report on waivers of competitive bidding requirements is proposed.

WHEREAS the Purchasing Policy of The Ohio State University, adopted by the Board of Trustees on September 7, 1984, and revised on February 7, 1992, provides that the President and/or Vice President for Business and Administration may grant a waiver from competitive bidding in the event of an emergency, when a sufficient economic reason exists, or when the goods or services can be purchased from only a single source, with a report on such waivers to be made quarterly to this Board; and

WHEREAS the Vice President for Business and Administration has submitted a report on waivers of competitive bidding requirements granted for the period of July - September, 1992; and

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

**WAIVERS OF COMPETITIVE BIDDING REQUIREMENTS
JULY - SEPTEMBER 1992 (contd)**

WHEREAS during the period covered, the Vice President for Business and Administration, at the requests of the departments making the purchases and upon the recommendation of the Purchasing Department, granted 34 waivers of competitive bidding requirements for annual purchases totaling approximately \$13,575,300.00, including \$8,748,000.00 for publications for the University libraries and other departments, as shown on the enclosed exhibit:

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED, That the report on waivers of competitive bidding requirements for the period of July - September, 1992 is hereby accepted.

Upon motion of Mr. Shumate, seconded by Mr. Celeste, the Board of Trustees adopted the foregoing resolution by unanimous roll call vote.

(See Appendix X for background material, page 333.)

--0--

**EMPLOYMENT OF ARCHITECTS/ENGINEERS AND
REQUEST FOR CONSTRUCTION BIDS**

Resolution No. 93-45

**STORM SEWER SEPARATION, PHASE II;
BEVIS HALL - TRANSGENIC ANIMAL FACILITY**

Synopsis: The Fiscal Affairs Committee recommended authorization to employ architects/engineers and request construction bids for the listed projects.

WHEREAS the University desires to proceed with the second phase of the Storm Sewer Separation for the Columbus campus with the new storm sewer to service the north and west central portion of the main campus; and

WHEREAS the total estimated cost of the second phase of this project is \$1,000,000.00, and the total estimated construction cost is \$900,000.00; with funding provided by University bond proceeds; and

WHEREAS the University desires to proceed with the construction of an approximate 20,000 square foot facility to conduct immune deficiency research in Bevis Hall; and

WHEREAS the total estimated project cost is \$3,700,000.00, and the total estimated construction cost is \$2,750,000.00; with funding provided by University bond proceeds (\$2,500,000.00) and a National Institute of Health grant (\$1,200,000.00):

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED, That the President and/or Vice President for Business and Administration be authorized to select qualified architectural/engineering firms as necessary for these projects and that the fees for these services be negotiated between the firms selected and The Ohio State University; and

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

**EMPLOYMENT OF ARCHITECTS/ENGINEERS AND
REQUEST FOR CONSTRUCTION BIDS (contd)**

STORM SEWER SEPARATION, PHASE II;
BEVIS HALL - TRANSGENIC ANIMAL FACILITY (contd)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the President and/or Vice President for Business and Administration be authorized to request construction bids on these projects in accordance with established University procedures, and if satisfactory bids are received, to award contracts, with all actions to be reported to this Board at the appropriate time.

Upon motion of Mr. Shumate, seconded by Amb. Wolf, the Board of Trustees adopted the foregoing resolution by unanimous roll call vote.

--0--

REQUEST FOR CONSTRUCTION BIDS

Resolution No. 93-46

NORTH RESIDENCE HALLS - CHILLER REPLACEMENT, PHASE II
RHODES HALL - SURGERY SUPPORT HVAC REVISIONS

Synopsis: The Fiscal Affairs Committee recommended authorization to request construction bids for the listed projects.

WHEREAS the Office of Residence and Dining Halls desires to proceed with replacement of chillers in Barrett House, Halloran House, Haverfield House, and Houck House; and

WHEREAS the total estimated project cost is \$450,000.00, and the total estimated construction cost is \$400,000.00; with funding provided by University bond proceeds; and

WHEREAS the University Hospitals desires to proceed with HVAC revisions within the Surgery Support area of Rhodes Hall; and

WHEREAS the total estimated project cost is \$136,000.00, and the total construction project cost is \$110,000.00; with funding provided by University Hospitals:

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED, That the President and/or Vice President for Business and Administration be authorized to request construction bids on these projects in accordance with established University procedures, and if satisfactory bids are received, to award contracts, with all actions to be reported to this Board at the appropriate time.

Upon motion of Mr. Shumate, seconded by Mr. Kessler, the Board of Trustees adopted the foregoing resolution by unanimous roll call vote.

--0--

**REPORT OF AWARD OF CONTRACTS AND
ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTINGENCY FUNDS**

Resolution No. 93-47

MACQUIGG LABORATORY
OARDC - DAIRY MATERNITY AND CALF BARN REPLACEMENT
OXLEY HALL - MASONRY IMPROVEMENTS
ATI - PHASES II AND III, BUILDING IMPROVEMENTS, POLE BARN, AND
LAND IMPROVEMENTS
SOUTH RESIDENCE HALLS - WINDOW REPLACEMENT

Synopsis: Acceptance of the report of award of contracts and the establishment of contingency funds for the listed projects is recommended.

WHEREAS resolutions adopted by the Board of Trustees on May 4, 1989, September 7, 1990, October 5, 1990, May 3, 1991, and June 5, 1992 authorized the President and/or Vice President for Business and Administration to request construction bids in accordance with established State of Ohio and University procedures, and if satisfactory bids were received to award contracts for the MacQuigg Laboratory, OARDC - Dairy Maternity and Calf Barn Replacement, Oxley Hall - Masonry Improvements, ATI - Phases II and III, Building Improvements, Pole Barn, and Land Improvements, and South Residence Halls - Window Replacement projects.

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED, That pursuant to the actions previously authorized by this Board, the report of award of contracts and establishment of contingency funds for these projects is hereby accepted.

Upon motion of Mr. Shumate, seconded by Mr. Kessler, the Board of Trustees adopted the foregoing resolution by unanimous roll call vote.

(See Appendix XI for background and maps, page 335.)

--0--

REPORT - EXPENSES FOR DESIGNATED ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIALS

Resolution No. 93-48

Synopsis: Approval for reimbursement of expenses for designated administrative officials is requested.

WHEREAS, the Fiscal Affairs Committee has authorized the payment of expenses for designated administrative officials; and

WHEREAS, it is deemed in the best interest of the University for the Fiscal Affairs Committee to provide from the unrestricted gifts to the University Endowment Fund on an appropriate basis, to the President and designated University officials, reimbursement for expenditures which are directly and necessarily related to the performance of their assigned responsibilities and in the best interest of the University:

NOW THEREFORE

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

REPORT - EXPENSES FOR DESIGNATED ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIALS (contd)

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Fiscal Affairs Committee be authorized to provide reimbursement to designated University officials from unrestricted gifts to the University Endowment Fund.

Upon motion of Mr. Shumate, seconded by Mr. Kessler, the Board of Trustees adopted the foregoing resolution by unanimous roll call vote.

--0--

AUDIT REPORT

Ms. Pichette:

As you know, the University has a contract with Coopers & Lybrand for annual audits of the University for fiscal years 1991-1995. Coopers & Lybrand has completed the audit for FY 1991-1992, and we are submitting that for your acceptance. You should have two documents with your agenda materials, the Audited Financial Statements and a separate report on Internal Control Structures, the Auditors' Recommendation, and the University responses. The audit was reviewed in detail by the Fiscal Affairs Committee at its meeting yesterday. I also want to point out that the Controller's area, the Auditors, and Internal Audit should be congratulated for having this audit completed by September 18. At this time, I'd like to introduce Mark Hilligoss, Director of Internal Audit.

Mr. Mark Hilligoss:

To be brief, we were asked to capsulize yesterday's committee meeting and I'm going to ask Bill Shkurti to present the financial review, in Janet Achterman's absence, and then Dave Gaston will present the auditor's report.

Mr. Shkurti:

Thank you, Mark. Janet Achterman, the Controller, would normally make this report, however, her father is undergoing open heart surgery this morning so she asked me to fill in. There's probably nothing worse than a non-accountant trying to explain accounting data, but I will give it a whirl.

There are three things to keep in mind regarding the annual audit report of the University: 1) "Is the audit a clean audit?" and Dave Gaston from Coopers & Lybrand will address that issue; 2) "Is the audit a timely audit?" and Mark Hilligoss will deal with that; and 3) "What does the audit show about the financial condition of the University?" and that's what I will summarize very briefly. I will talk about three areas: revenues, expenditures, and the overall financial health of the University and these will be shown on the slides. I will also refer you to specific pages in the audit book.

The first chart, which deals with the composition of where the money comes from, is on page 5 of your books. You'll see a reference throughout this report to E & G costs -- that is education and general. The reason we use that particular designation is it takes the University Hospitals out of the picture -- not because they aren't important, but they substantially support themselves and, in fact, help the University. To get a picture of what's going on in the main campus academic core of the institution -- what this does is compare the percentage of education and

AUDIT REPORT (contd)

Mr. Shkurti: (contd)

general cost covered by student tuition and fees. You can see back in the early '80s the students paid about 25 cents out of every dollar of the cost. Then as state support increased steadily in the mid-'80s, the students' share declined steadily by conscious University policy to about 20 percent. Beginning in 1987 when the state budget started to tighten up and state support to universities started to decline, the University made up part of this loss of support by turning to the students for a higher portion of tuition and fees. Now they are back up to 25 percent, which is where we were about 10 years ago. So one way our revenue picture has changed is that students are back to paying a higher share of their education.

If we turn next to the expenditure side, on page 7 of your books, you'll see current fund expenditures by category. There is a category called Academic and Institutional Support, which is essentially central administration. You'll see that over the last year spending in that area has declined by 6.5 percent, while it has gone up in some other areas. That reflects a conscious decision in the University to protect what we call the academic core. Institutional support, although important to the University, is not the academic core, and that is where some of the burden of the budget cuts have been.

If you turn next to page 9, you will see some of the indicators of the overall financial health of the University. This particular chart is called Education in General Equity Trends and simply is a measure, in layman's terms, of the University spending more than it's taking in. You can see in the early '80s the University's financial health was very good. Then beginning in the mid-'80s it started to decline. Part of the conscious decision was to spend down some balance, so that by 1989 it was very close to zero. So additional spending controls were put on and spending tightened up. The University's financial position started to improve until last year. What you're seeing there is the impact of two things, budget reductions from the State and also a one-time hit from the last round of early retirements. The University appropriately put on its books the entire 5 years of early retirement cost to expend that in one year, because that's appropriate conservative accounting practices. It makes that chart look a little worse than it is. Our hope and goal is to get that line back up into the positive next year and in the years after, but I think you can definitely see the impact. The University's financial situation is going in the wrong direction and we need to get that reversed.

Finally, if you turn to page 14, you'll see a chart that measures the University's expenditures for operating and maintaining our facilities compared to our investment in buildings and land. This shows another area where the University has tightened up on spending and that is in the maintenance of our buildings. This is one of the first areas that always gets tightened up, because you don't see an immediate impact from it. But if it continues over time, where we are not investing in the care of our buildings and facilities, it will cost us more in the long run. So this is another financial indicator we are concerned about. It's not at a crisis yet, but if we don't deal with it over the next couple of years, it will be.

AUDIT REPORT (contd)

Mr. Shkurti: (contd)

Finally, there are a couple of measures on debt service and because of time I won't go into them, I'll just summarize. Essentially what they show is the ratio of plant equity to plant debt and our capacity to take on additional debt. It shows that if you compare it to industry-wide ratios, we still have the capacity to take on additional debt. If you look at the next chart which is the ratio of equity to plant debt, it is a measure of our ability to pay for the additional capacity. So if you view the first chart as how big our gas tank is, it shows we have quite a lot of room left. This next chart shows our ability to pay cash for the gas as we order it. That's a little more constrained, although the figures are still healthy. We have to be careful and very measured in taking on any additional debt.

In summary on page 17, if you look at our revenues, the students' share of our revenues is up and the state's share is down. In terms of expenditures, our spending for administration is down, for instruction, research and student services our spending is up. Also, our spending for plant maintenance and equipment isn't as high as we would like it to be. Finally, if you look at the bottom line measures in terms of equity and debt, our equity is down. We think most of that is the one-time effect of early retirement. Our capacity on debt is good, but our ability to float additional debt is not unlimited. So we will have to be watching our dollars and pennies very carefully over the next year as the full impact of the budget reductions start to show up in the University's financial statements.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my part of the presentation. I will now turn the podium back over to Mr. Hilligoss.

Mr. Hilligoss:

Thank you, Mr. Shkurti. At this time I'd like to have Dave Gaston, from Coopers & Lybrand, explain a few things in his report to the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Dave Gaston:

In the spirit of giving a brief overview, I'll start by saying that as the outside auditors we have given a clean opinion on the University's financial statements. There was an opportunity to include these financial statements in the very successful bond offerings that the University has been involved with in the last month. The items that we did cover with the Fiscal Affairs Committee are on the screen and I won't go into each of them in any detail. We did discuss how the audit is organized, dealt with the formal communications between the auditor and the University, and included our report on the internal control structure. We then came up with a couple of significant recommendations, which I will go through with the Board in a little more detail.

We also indicated the other reports, the compliance and governmental programs that we're involved with -- indicated what those are by the different areas and departments in the University -- and then spent a few minutes on emerging issues -- things that we see colleges and universities facing in the future. We had an opportunity to spend some time with the committee to answer any questions and to discuss things that they had on their mind. Just as a reminder, Coopers & Lybrand are the primary auditors for the University and at the same time we

AUDIT REPORT (contd)

Mr. Gaston: (contd)

subcontract approximately 20 percent of the work to two minority firms. Those firms are Parms and Company, who deal primarily with student financial aid; and Manoranjan and Jayanthan, who deal with WOSU, both radio and TV reporting.

As I indicated, we dealt with two new specific recommendations for the Board's consideration this year. The first recommendation dealt with the external release of what we'll call significant financial information. We recommended that the Controller's office be a switch point or controlling factor for the release of a number of reports that go to the public and represent the University's financial position.

The second recommendation is assisting Judge Duncan and his organization, Legal Affairs, on how we account for and communicate the contingent liabilities for pending litigation. As you know, the University has a number of cases that are always in process and this is a way of coordinating that information for financial purposes.

In addition, we did bring back to your attention two comments from last year. First, on the information technology environment -- indicating the decentralized and perhaps outdated situation that we deal with, and also to indicate that the University has taken steps to address this. The reason the comment is back is just to reemphasize the need for continued involvement. The second comment has to do with the central maintenance of some of the records that apply to vacation and sick leave for the University. We think this should be standardized and brought into compliance with state requirements.

In other areas, the recommendations we made last year were fully implemented and on one, the timeliness of financial information and speaking with one voice on tax issues, we were complementary to the Controller's office for how those had been dealt with. Basically, that covered our presentation and consideration.

Mr. Shumate:

Are there any questions?

**ACCEPTANCE OF THE REPORT OF AUDIT
RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES FOR 1991-92**

Resolution No. 93-49

Synopsis: The report of the audit recommendations and responses for The Ohio State University for 1991-92 conducted by Coppers & Lybrand is recommended for acceptance.

WHEREAS in April 1991, with the approval of the Auditor of State, The Ohio State University entered into a five-year agreement with Coopers & Lybrand for an annual audit of the University for fiscal years 1990-91 through 1994-95; and

WHEREAS the Coopers & Lybrand audit of the University for 1991-92, meeting the requirements of the Auditor of State, has been received and the accounts, records, files, and reports of the University have been found to be in satisfactory condition, but certain recommendations have been included in the audit report; and

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

**ACCEPTANCE OF THE REPORT OF AUDIT
RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES FOR 1991-92 (contd)**

WHEREAS the auditors' recommendations have been studied by the appropriate University offices, and procedures and responses have been developed as a result of the recommendation:

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED, That the report of the Coopers and Lybrand audit for The Ohio State University for 1991-92 (including the report on the audit of the University financial statements; the report on the internal control structure; and the summary of recommendations to management) and the management responses to the recommendations be accepted.

Upon motion of Mr. Shumate, seconded by Ms. Casto, the Board of Trustees adopted the foregoing resolution by unanimous roll call vote.

--0--

**TERM EXTENSION FOR UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION
BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Resolution No. 93-50

Synopsis: One-year term extension for current elected directors of the University Foundation whose terms have expired is proposed.

WHEREAS in order to provide continuity to The Ohio State University Foundation, the Board of Directors requests that the terms of office for current elected directors, whose terms expired at the end of October 1992, be extended by one year:

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED That term extension for Directors of the University Foundation described above be hereby approved.

Upon motion of Mr. Shumate, seconded by Ms. Casto, the Board of Trustees adopted the foregoing resolution by unanimous roll call vote.

--0--

**ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEETING
POST TENURE REVIEW**

Mr. Kessler:

I'd like to call on Nancy Rudd for the presentation on post tenure review.

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

POST TENURE REVIEW (contd)

Ms. Casto:

Jack, I'm going to stall you one more minute. Last month when we had the presentation on the teaching workload, it was excellent and I think that everyone here was pleased with it. I wondered if we are then to draw a conclusion from that and say this is the standard workload that is acceptable for teaching versus research or research versus teaching. Are we going to draw a standard from that?

Dr. Nancy Rudd:

No. The purpose of that session was really to just help you understand the variety of work that faculty undertake and the differences among faculty and their workload. Some faculty teach more, some do more research, some are more involved in service. It was also intended to help you understand the diversity of teaching activities in and of themselves. We are in the process of developing guidelines which will be distributed right after the start of Winter Quarter, to ask departments to develop workload policies of their own. Those will revolve around teaching responsibilities, but they will not preclude the possibility that some faculty will teach more and others will do more research. The department simply needs to rationalize what it is it's doing, so that it is clear that all faculty are carrying their fair share of the load.

Ms. Casto:

I thought that came through in the reports. I didn't know if we were going to, for example, say this is what we're looking towards or we were to draw a conclusion. We will look forward to your report.

Dr. Rudd:

Thank you. The topic for today's Academic Affairs Committee Meeting is that of faculty performance review and the emphasis is on post tenure review. I'd like to make just a few additional comments with regard to background, in addition to those that are in your agenda materials. I also have with me today panelists who are here to talk with you.

As you probably know, the institution of tenure has undergone periodic attacks by those outside higher education probably for as long as it has existed. The magnitude of these attacks seems to be greater now and I think this is part of just the broader scrutiny to which higher education is being subjected.

One of the beliefs underlying these criticisms is that tenure provides faculty with a job for life, regardless of how productive they are. Some seek to remedy this perceived problem by eliminating tenure all together or by weakening it in some way. Others call for what is referred to as a post tenure review. As is indicated in the materials, this term "post tenure review" is somewhat misleading because faculty are subjected to reviews throughout their careers both before tenure and after tenure. In fact, they probably undergo more review than just about any other kind of professional I can think of. But nonetheless, there are faculty -- hopefully a small percentage of the total at Ohio State -- who do become unproductive over time. They do receive little or no salary increases and their non-productivity is usually addressed in that way. But I have to admit that unless they can be encouraged to retire or to leave the institution in some other way, they do remain employed. The concept of a post tenure review which really refers to a very

POST TENURE REVIEW (contd)

Dr. Rudd: (contd)

intensive periodic review about every 5 years -- possibly even involving outside letters such as we get during promotion and tenure processes -- is one that's been designed to address this issue. The notion is that if the review were negative, either efforts would be made to quickly turn the situation around or termination would be sought for the faculty member.

We've considered developing a post tenure review process here at Ohio State, but at least for now potentially serious problems with it are leading us to seek an alternative method for improving our accountability and for assuring that faculty either remain productive or they leave. One of the problems associated with this elaborate process is that most tenured faculty do remain productive. In fact, at Ohio State many of these people are leaders in their fields. If we create a very elaborate periodic review process that everybody has to go through, then we're going to a great deal of effort to address a relatively small problem. This is probably not a very good use of resources and it would probably make our best faculty angry enough to consider whether this is really the kind of work environment they want. Also, if outside letters were solicited from peers at other institutions, that would generate a certain amount of hostility because faculty, in particular the better faculty, are already pretty much burdened having to write these kind of letters for promotion and tenure candidates around the country. The second problem with this kind of process is that if faculty are becoming problematical, they really need to be monitored continuously, rather than every 5 years.

So what we're trying to do for now is address any weaknesses in our review processes that exist and to develop guidelines that will be promulgated from our office for regular reviews, probably annually -- perhaps not quite that often -- which will assure that all faculty receive the kind of evaluation and feedback that they have a right to expect. We also hope to address developing problems in a timely and appropriate fashion.

Four administrators are here today to talk with you about some of the issues involved in carrying out performance reviews and to respond to your questions and comments. They represent four very different disciplines and that is by design, because some of the issues involved with performance review are very different. All these people here are or have been department chairs: Jim Garland, current Dean of the College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences and former Chair of the Department of Physics; Morris Beja current Chairperson of the Department of English; L. H. Newcomb, Associate Dean of the College of Agriculture and former Chairperson of the Department of Agricultural Education; and Jim Naylor, Chairperson of the Department of Psychology. These individuals have prepared brief comments with regard to their perspective on performance review, but they're also prepared to begin answering questions if Board members would prefer to go that way.

POST TENURE REVIEW (contd)

Dean Jim Garland:

Thank you, Nancy. I thought what I would do is to provide some context about the kind of performance reviews that we already do for faculty. I'll limit my remarks to the performance reviews for full professors, which differ markedly from the reviews that we do for the junior faculty. I will also limit my remarks to what takes place in the Department of Physics, which is, of course, what I know about in the most detail.

In December or January of each year, faculty members are asked to fill out a performance and professional activity questionnaire. This is about a five-page questionnaire, which is sent to every member of the faculty and is divided into three parts -- teaching, research, and service. In teaching, professors are asked to fill in information on the courses that they have taught. They are suppose to describe any innovative class materials they have developed, any new curricular ideas they have come up with, and provide copies of the relevant documentation. We provide for them an analysis of the student evaluation of teaching questionnaires that are distributed in the department to students every quarter. We also maintain a file in the office for letters of complaints or praise from students, and sometimes parents, and those become part of the dossier that we collect on each faculty member.

With regard to research, professors are asked to list papers they have published during the previous 12 months, to provide copies of any papers that have been submitted, and to provide a statement of their work that is in progress. They are asked to give the details of any invited papers or talks they have given at major international conferences and any contributions to conference proceedings. They are asked to supply information about proposals they have written and submitted; about the level of their grant and contract support; and they are also supposed to write a paragraph detailing any significant accomplishments they feel they have made in the research area.

With regard to service, they are asked to explain what they have been doing on department and University committees, such as whether they have served on any national workshops or advising panels, whether they have been organizers of conferences, and whether they have worked on any special projects on behalf of the University or on behalf of their discipline. They are also suppose to describe any advising that they have done for students.

I, as department chair, and my two vice chairs would sit down and review the dossier for each of these professors. The way we did it in Physics was probably more quantitative, as you might expect, than what some departments would do. We actually assigned a numerical ranking for each professor in teaching, research, and service. That person got a plus 2, plus 1, zero, minus 1, or minus 2, in each of the three categories. When this was completed we then actually rank-ordered everybody in the department from first to last. That then formed the basis for making our salary raise determinations. I should also say that before this process began we would send out a letter to each of the faculty members informing them of the criteria we were going to use in making salary recommendations. This criteria had been discussed by the faculty and was broadly approved by the faculty. After the process was completed, I sent a letter to each of the professors telling him or her what their raise was going to be and how that person's raise fell into the statistical profile in the department. I invited that professor to come and talk to me

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

POST TENURE REVIEW (contd)

Dean Garland: (contd)

if there were any questions or concerns about the raise, or if that person wanted me to justify the basis on which the raise was given. I think that all departments have slightly different mechanisms, but I think that probably captures the general sense of what goes on in most of the academic departments.

Dean L. H. Newcomb:

I think Jim captures fairly well the basic pattern in Agriculture. The Department of Agricultural Education is a smaller department than some of the others that are represented here. An additional twist which we add to this -- interestingly by faculty vote -- is a policy that, in addition to student reviews and peer reviews of teaching, the department chair must see each faculty member teach at least once each year.

This was to be followed by a personal conference regarding strengths of the performance and concerns that might be addressed in the future. Another thing in a smaller department that we did follow -- it is very similar to Jim's outline -- we would have a personal conference between the department chair and each of the faculty members. This allowed for some additional face to face feedback, in terms of how I, as department chair, saw their performance in each of the areas of teaching, research, and service, and my qualitative judgment about how they were doing, which would lead to recommendations for varying levels of salary increases.

I would just say to the Board that it is my considered judgment that we have a mechanism at Ohio State which we need to assure is working. That is that every dean and every department chair fulfill their obligation to be sure that each member of the faculty is annually reviewed and provided feedback. If there are people who are not performing -- tenure is not a guarantee for life -- we do have processes that we can follow to detenure people for just cause. We ought to be willing to embrace that. I would not favor a five-year review. That is my personal point of view. It will take enormous amounts of time to do that in terms of clock hours, of all the committees involved and of the preparation time for the individual. And, frankly, I'd like to consider what it can lead to and that is documenting more of that which is easy to document, which I think will produce behaviors that are counter to what I hope this University wants to be about. Namely, it will deemphasize teaching at the cost of overemphasizing research and publication, in my view, because of the documentation distinctions between those two categories.

Dr. James Naylor:

Our procedure is virtually the same. I would say that it is my firm conviction that Ohio State does an excellent job of annually reviewing its faculty at all levels, from the very beginning assistant professor up to the most distinguished full professor. I think we take that charge very seriously, we see it as a developmental issue with our younger faculty, and we see it as a supportive issue with our senior faculty. I think these reviews are very thorough and there is no instance in which I am not fully aware of the performance of every member of my faculty. I do not think the annual five-year reviews that are proposed are something that would add to this process, and I have a serious concern that they would detract from them.

POST TENURE REVIEW (contd)

Dr. Morris Beja:

I guess I, too, would like to stress the fact that evaluations are already constantly going on. Obviously, in some ways it is especially complex in cases of promotion or tenure, but it goes on throughout a faculty member's entire career. For example, when it comes to merit salary increases -- and I sure hope someday that it will come to that -- people have raised the issue of the balance between teaching and scholarship in the ways we evaluate teachers. Several years ago in my department we changed what used to be an annual bibliography, in which faculty indicated what they had published during the last year, to an entire professional report. This included service to the profession, but also service to the University, records of teaching, records of how much dissertation advising they had done, campus service, and M.A. theses. That report is distributed to the entire faculty prior to the chairs receiving recommendations about merit salary increases.

Jim talked about the quantitative nature of a lot of what goes on in Physics. That report I mentioned is obviously a quantitative document, but efforts are also made at qualitative assessments -- evaluating scholarships for example. Yes, I think this is where it is a little different from what L. H. Newcomb said. English is a very large department and it gets particularly complex with a lot of people in very diverse fields. These fields include the traditional literary historical periods, but also non-historical fields like composition studies, rhetoric, folklore, drama, creative writing, and literary theory. Each of which has particular approaches and expectations which may be different from those in other fields. In teaching, too, there can be major differences -- not only from faculty member to faculty member, but even within a given faculty member's diverse responsibilities. In one quarter, for example, she or he may teach a large lecture course and a small workshop, or a discussion class for majors and a freshman composition class, or an honors class for majors and another large lecture course. All the time, by the way, advising undergraduates in their major, advising Ph.D. students, directing dissertations, and so on. All those different kinds of activities have to be evaluated in very different ways.

In evaluating the teaching we rely very heavily on student evaluations, but also on extensive visits by senior colleagues. In our case, we like to read words and we rely on statements of their own procedures and policies, and philosophies and approaches by the faculty themselves. All faculty, including those with tenure, must submit evidence of their teaching effectiveness periodically.

Mr. Skestos:

I have a question for Dean Garland. In your ranking system, do you notify each one of your professors of their rank so that they know where they stand, at least in relationship to the rest of the people in their department?

Dean Garland:

No. I'm not sure what the present chair in the department does, but I did not. I don't think the rankings are that -- they are good for giving you a rough indicator of performance, but I don't think -- I could imagine a fire storm in the department if I told somebody that he was number nineteen and his colleague down the hall

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

POST TENURE REVIEW (contd)

Dean Garland: (contd)

was number eighteen. The system has quantitative overtones, but it is not so precise that this would be prudent.

I realize that what I have just described is this nice clean kind of process. But in fact, the evaluation of teaching and research is actually very hard to do and there are a lot of subjective overtones. You know we can look at these student questionnaires that come in, and we do look at them, but there are many factors that determine a professor's grade on a student course evaluation. It can involve how hard the last mid-term exam was, whether the professor gives partial credit easily or not, it can be affected by the temperature of the room, or whether the course was early in the morning or late in the afternoon when everyone was tired, or it can involve the nationality of the professor. There are all kinds of issues that get folded into course evaluation surveys that makes a precise determination of their meaning very difficult. What they are good at doing, and I really do believe this, is identifying the outstanding extremes -- the very good teacher or the very bad teacher. I think that they are also very good at identifying mechanical faults with a person -- someone who writes large enough or clearly enough on the blackboard, or speaks clearly or maintains eye contact with the students, or whether the person shows up late for class. They are very good at identifying that type of problem, but there is this big area in the middle of the extremes where I think the evaluation becomes very subjective. As a chairman, I found myself relying on the sort of scuttlebutt in the department, "Well, Smith is pretty good, everyone knows he's good." I will fold in my own subjective opinion of how Smith did when he gave a colloquium to the rest of the department, whether he presented his ideas to me in an orderly manner, etc. So there are a lot of subjective elements that go into these, and we try to quantify it as much as we can.

Mr. Skestos:

Suppose that I am teaching in your department and on your list that you make up in rankings, I keep coming up number 40 out of 40 for 2 or 3 years. I assume I am not getting any kind of merit raise, assuming that there are merit raises in effect at that time. Do you call me in and have a long talk with me and say, "Now, George things are not looking too good for you. For the last several years you have not been performing at least at some kind of average that we expect out of someone. We are going to look for you to do better and if you don't, then you and I are going to sit down and we are going to have to do some serious talking." Does that take place or not? How do you do that? Do you ever get rid of anyone that constantly fails to perform?

Dean Garland:

Do you mean do we tell them to go home and not come back?

Mr. Skestos:

Well, I suppose eventually that kind of a situation --

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

POST TENURE REVIEW (contd)

Dean Garland:

I tried to have talks and to work with faculty members whose teaching was not up to par. I found that usually, not always, professors would welcome suggestions. In fact, Leonard Jossem is an Emeritus Professor in my department and some of you may know that he is very interested in improving teaching quality. On his own initiative he would offer to videotape people and play the tapes back to them and critique the tapes. He would try to help them understand how they could be more effective at what they did. I also have to say that I probably didn't do it as systematically as I should have, and I tended to avoid doing it with professors who I felt were simply doing what they could do and weren't really capable of doing much better.

Mr. Skestos:

The review process is time to let you know what is happening out there, at least to get feedback as department chair, but it is also obviously to determine merit raises. What happens to those people who are consistently down at the bottom that get no raise when some are given? Do you have a program? Have you thought this out? Do you take action against them? Do you seek a removal? It is a bad situation when I suddenly become a professor and decide that I have other things on my agenda rather than what I use to do. Is there a process by which you can rid the department of these people and bring in people that are going to be more aggressive and perform above the average?

Dean Garland:

There is a process and fortunately I didn't have to use it when I was department chair because I think that virtually all the faculty members in my department took their teaching responsibilities seriously. That is not to say that they were all excellent teachers, but I think that they took the responsibility seriously. I wasn't aware of any egregious lapses of responsibility of the 50 people in my department. What I did as a practical matter for the professors that I felt weren't strong teachers, I tried to screen them from the critical courses. When we made teaching assignments I would certainly factor in my perceived quality of the teacher. So those courses where the subject matter was particularly subtle and we really needed somebody who was very good at explaining complex subjects, we would try to put the right kind of person into that course. There are other types of courses where the subject matter was quite elementary and what was really important is that the professor be able to establish a good rapport with the students and be enthusiastic and convey a sense of excitement about the discipline. You try to put those people in this core curriculum.

Mr. Skestos:

When you hear complaints from time to time -- even in the mathematics department, more so than any other place -- that there are a lot of grad students having difficulty with the English language. They are teaching a very difficult course as it is, and there is a failure of communication between the graduate teacher and the student. Is that a problem that you are looking into? How do you rectify that?

POST TENURE REVIEW (contd)

Dean Garland:

You ask a very complicated question. Let me try to put it into context -- first about the use of teaching assistants, because I know there is often concern about the number of classes that are taught by teaching assistants. There is a rule of thumb in my area, which is mathematical and physical sciences, we estimate that the most students that a single faculty member can accommodate in a quarter is roughly 30 on average. What I mean by that is if you ask the professor to get to know the students, to take an interest in them, to provide them with some individual attention, you can accommodate about 30 students a quarter. Last quarter in my college we taught 27,000 students, we have about 250 faculty, and that comes out to about 110 students per faculty member. So we are way over that 30 criterion. That gap is basically made up with graduate teaching assistants. If we didn't have the graduate teaching assistants, aside from the other impact on our graduate programs, it would mean that we would need a faculty of about 900 people. So we have to depend, for financial reasons and for a whole variety of other reasons, on graduate teaching assistants.

Now what we do with our teaching assistants when they come to Ohio State? The first thing we do if they are foreign students is give them language tests. As a matter of fact, we don't even admit them until they pass a certain minimum threshold language exam and they are standardized tests of the English language.

Then those who pass that filter when they come to our college are put into a training program. That training program is given on a department by department basis. We basically give them techniques on how to be teachers, we stand them up in front of hypothetical classrooms, we critique them, and give them feedback on how they are doing. Once they pass that, then we are prepared to put them in front of students. Now sometimes our admissions mechanisms break down or it is clear to us that they are not going to make good teachers. We ask those students to be graders, and we don't put them in classrooms. The students who do pass our criteria, get assigned typically to recitation sections or to introductory laboratories. We have about 900 graduate students and I would say about 20 of those, when they become senior graduate students, with four or five years of experience under their belt, we will actually let them lecture sometimes to introductory classes. Now those people usually do an outstanding job.

Amb Wolf:

Can you indeed withdraw tenure from a faculty member? I mean the purpose of post tenure review --

Dr. Rudd:

We have a faculty rule which -- I go around calling 5-04, because I have been working on a revision of it for seven years now and it feels like a part of me -- defines a process by which a faculty member can be detenured for a variety of reasons. That generally falls into two categories: serious incompetence or grave misconduct. It is however a rather difficult rule to use. The process is very elaborate, and to some extent it should be elaborate, because if you are going to detenure a faculty member -- and for the faculty member this almost amounts to capital punishment -- then you do want to make sure that your processes allow for

POST TENURE REVIEW (contd)

Dr. Rudd: (contd)

maximum fact finding and rebuttle by the faculty member. But having said that, it is a very difficult process to use, and it is not used.

I would say that to my knowledge no faculty member has ever been detenured for incompetence. In fact, I believe that rule has only been used three times: once to remove a faculty member who had disappeared, and two other cases recently which did not involve the type of things that we are talking about now. In my view, part of why we have not done this is that our budget situation has not been as tight as it is now. It is so grueling to go through the process, that department faculty peers have been willing to some extent to work around problems. I would rather suspect that things are changing.

Amb. Wolf:

In some institutions do they grant tenure for a certain period of time? Like for a ten year period or --

Dr. Rudd:

Not at the kind of institutions that we compete with. For a research institution, because of the importance of academic freedom and scholarly activities, tenure is considered to be a commitment until retirement, unless it is removed for cause. That cause would be serious incompetence, grave misconduct, and so on.

Dean Newcomb:

I would like to argue to the Board that the tenure for 5 years or tenure for 10 years is not tenure at all. If tenure is going to protect academic freedom, and that is what we are after, it cannot be in little fixed increments at which time some administrator, me or otherwise, can wait out a person and then conveniently wipe the slate clean.

Frankly, I can tell this Board that I have had occasion in my career at Ohio State to be very grateful for academic freedom. Nothing that ever reached any high level administrative offices, but we did have a situation in my department where part of some of our salary was paid for by another state agency. We did have an individual in charge of that budget at one point in time that attempted to instruct me to teach different content in a different way than I was doing. And I would say to the Board, that is the very heart of the matter of academic freedom and responsibility and competence.

As I reflected about that early in my career, I was very grateful that I could not be subject -- and that was before I was a full professor -- to the whims of some individual who happened to think that their judgment was better on a solid academic matter than was my own. So I would be very cautious about 5 and 10-year increments, because I don't think that that is tenure at all. That just says that if you behave for five years and do it the way we want, we may extend it again. If you really want to be pursuing truth that is volatile -- which doesn't happen often, but is the very heart of this issue -- I think that you have to have the protection of tenure.

POST TENURE REVIEW (contd)

Amb. Wolf:

What about when a person is appointed to a chair, do you appoint chairs for term limits?

Dr. Newcomb:

Four-year terms -- to be reviewed by the faculty and dean, and subject to reappointment or not at the pleasure of the dean.

President Gee:

You are looking at the most vulnerable people at the University right now, followed shortly by me. I would like to make a couple of comments. I have been listening to this and these are very insightful questions. The issue of removing someone for cause is an issue of grave importance, but I might note that when we get to that point it shows a failure in our system, and we need to understand that. If this University is doing what it should be, there should never be an instance when we remove someone for cause, because of the fact that we have had a continuing review process. No member of any activity, whether it be a member of a law firm or whether it be a member of any other public or private group, is reviewed more aggressively and continually than our faculty members. The thing that I am concerned about is the other side of the coin. In today's world, as we bring particularly young people into the University, I am concerned that we don't give them enough help, and embrace and mentor them enough. I am afraid that we view this very often as the rite of passage. Many people come to this institution and never get tenure and that in many ways is a failure of our system. Because what happens with that process is that we throw you in and say, "Listen you've got this bright young person with this great degree, thank you, very much. We will see you in seven years and in the meantime we are just going to pound on you." It is a very, very difficult process that they go through. I am afraid that through that process sometimes we create a sense of cynicism and a variety of other things by those who make it through the process.

I'm delighted to hear from several of our department chairs here today, that there is now, and progressively so, an institutional issue in which we are trying to mentor people. Professor Beja's point, I think, was a good one, of trying to bring people in and talk to them and embrace them. George, your point about what happens to number 40. There are many departments in this institution where number 40 is one of the very best people at the University. In other words, what I am saying is that many times 40 out of 40 is still a person who is doing a very good job or an adequate job. What we have to try to do with number 40 or number 1 is to make certain that there is an expectation. The University should also have an expectation of this mentoring and creating an environment in which people really want to progress. The colleagues that I work with across this institution clearly have that sense of commitment. That is the reason they are here. But I often worry about the University's commitment on the other side, of providing the kind of resources, the kind of help in the classroom, and the kind of technology for them to meet that obligation so they no longer are 40. I think that has to be one of our major processes.

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

POST TENURE REVIEW (contd)

President Gee: (contd)

I often hear the story, "Well, do you detenure people?" There are institutions across this country that have had detenuring processes. I would submit to you that those also would be the type of institutions that have never made the kind of commitment up front that we have made, in terms of qualitative evaluations.

Dr. Rudd:

I might add, that as we work this year with department chairpersons and deans to try to assure that the performance review process is what we expect them to do, there will be a very heavy emphasis on the responsibility of chairs and deans to work with faculty in the area of faculty development. That is the primary purpose of this process. It is not to get bad guys and move them out, but to continue to invest in people that we have already invested in considerably and who can be tremendous assets to the institution. That is not only an important way of looking at this process from the perspective of the good of the institution, but it is very important to generate the kind of faculty loyalty that we need to keep our best people. If we create a very hostile environment in which the attitude is simply, "You either produce or we are going to kick you out," we are going to have a very hard time attracting and keeping good faculty.

Mr. Celeste:

Mr. Chairman, are there any other questions for Nancy or the other folks? We thank you, very much, for being here and making presentations and responding to questions.

--0--

RENAMING OF DEPARTMENT

Resolution No. 93-

51

Synopsis: The approval to rename the Department of Judaic and Near Eastern Languages and Literatures to the Department of Near Eastern, Judaic, and Hellenic Languages and Literatures is proposed.

WHEREAS the proposed change of name of the Department of Judaic and Near Eastern Languages and Literatures to the Department of Near Eastern, Judaic, and Hellenic Languages and Literatures has been approved by the faculty in the Department, and by the College of Humanities Executive Committee; and

WHEREAS the proposed name change will provide visibility to the academic program in Modern Greek and more accurately reflects the programmatic offerings of the Department which include undergraduate and graduate degree programs with concentration in Modern Greek as well as Arabic, Byzantine Greek, Hebrew, Persian, Turkish, and Yiddish; and

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

RENAMING OF DEPARTMENT (contd)

WHEREAS the Council for Research and Graduate Studies has approved the name change for the graduate degree program, M.A. in Judaic and Near Eastern Languages and Literatures to M.A. in Near Eastern, Judaic, and Hellenic Languages and Literatures; and

WHEREAS this proposed change has the approval of the Council on Academic Affairs, and was approved by the University Senate at its October 3, 1992 meeting:

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED, That the proposal to change the name of the Department of Judaic and Near Eastern Languages and Literatures to the Department of Near Eastern, Judaic, and Hellenic Languages and Literatures, effective January 1, 1993, is hereby approved.

Upon motion of Mr. Shumate, seconded by Mr. Colley, the Board of Trustees adopted the foregoing resolution by unanimous voice vote.

--0--

HUMAN RESOURCES REORGANIZATION

Resolution No. 93-52

Synopsis: Amendments to the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees and Rules of the University Faculty are proposed to reflect the organizational changes made within the Office of Human Resources.

WHEREAS the Office of Human Resources and Relations has undergone restructuring and reorganization in order to achieve more flexibility, increased productivity, and effectiveness; and

WHEREAS as part of the reorganization of the Office of Human Resources, amendments to the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees and Rules of the University Faculty are necessary to effectuate the changes proposed outlined below:

3335-3-156 Vice president for human resources ~~and relations~~.

- (A) The vice president for human resources ~~and relations~~ shall be the executive head of the office of human resources ~~and relations~~.
- (B) The major area of responsibility and authority of the vice president for human resources ~~and relations~~ shall be that of the administration of human resources PROGRAMS AND SERVICES FOR FACULTY AND STAFF, ~~training and development, human relations of the university, and affirmative action/diversity~~. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the vice president for human resources ~~and relations~~ shall, under the direction of the president and subject to the approval of the board of trustees, be responsible and have the requisite authority for: human resources, including professional and staff employment services; employee relations, including negotiating with the labor unions; ~~compensation services~~; benefits administration; classification AND COMPENSATION administration, including determining which ~~employees and positions~~ are to be in the unclassified and classified service; PAYROLL; APPOINTMENTS PROCESSING; AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/DIVERSITY; DISPUTE RESOLUTION, INCLUDING CIVIL RIGHTS; PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT; ~~the i.d. center; retirement affairs~~; personnel research and HUMAN RESOURCES INFORMATION systems; ~~and safety and health; training and development~~;

HUMAN RESOURCES REORGANIZATION (contd)

~~including career development and counseling, education and staff training, AND DEVELOPMENT; ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT; faculty/staff assistance; and substance-abuse programs; human relations, including dependent CHILD care; programs, WORK AND FAMILY PROGRAMS; veterans affairs; partner/spouse assistance; recognition and awards; and RETIREMENT AFFAIRS faculty, staff and student advocacy; affirmative action/diversity, including civil rights, disability services (faculty and staff), the commission on women; and research and information.~~

- (C) The principal administrative officials in the office of human resources ~~and relations~~ shall be the associate vice president for EMPLOYEE RELATIONS AND AFFIRMATIVE ACTION ~~human resources~~, the ~~associate~~ ASSISTANT vice president for human RESOURCES SERVICES ~~relations~~, THE ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT FOR HUMAN RESOURCES AND ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT, and such other associates as may be authorized from time to time. (B/T 7/12/91, 11/6/92)

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED, That the proposed amendments are hereby approved and that the Secretary of the Board of Trustees is hereby authorized and directed to incorporate the recommended changes in the applicable sections in the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees and Rules of the University Faculty.

Upon motion of Ms. Casto, seconded by Mr. Shumate, the Board of Trustees adopted the foregoing resolution by unanimous voice vote.

(See Appendix XII for organizational chart, page 347.)

--0--

DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES - AUTUMN QUARTER COMMENCEMENT

Resolution No. 93-53

Synopsis: The Academic Affairs Committee recommended the approval of Degrees and Certificates for Autumn Quarter.

WHEREAS pursuant to paragraph (E) of rule 3335-1-06 of the Administrative Code, the Board has authority for the issuance of degrees and certificates; and

WHEREAS the faculties of the colleges and schools shall transmit, in accordance with rule 3335-9-29 of the Administrative Code, for approval by the Board of Trustees the names of persons who have completed degree and certificate requirements:

NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED, That the degrees and certificates be conferred on December 11, 1992, to those persons who have completed the requirements for their respective degrees and certificates and are recommended by the colleges and schools, and that the names of those persons awarded degrees and certificates be included in the minutes of this meeting.

Upon motion of Amb. Wolf, seconded by Mr. Celeste, the Board of Trustees adopted the foregoing resolution by unanimous voice vote.

--0--

PERSONNEL ACTIONS

Resolution No. 93-54

RESOLVED, That the personnel actions as recorded in the Personnel Budget Records of the University since the October 2, 1992 meeting of the Board, including the following Appointment, Appointment of Chairperson and Director, Leaves of Absence Without Salary, Leaves of Absence Without Salary--Continuation, Professional Improvement Leave, Emeritus Title, and Medical Staff Appointments (The Arthur G. James Cancer Hospital and Research Institute) as detailed in the University Budget be approved and the Medical Staff Appointments/Reappointments (The Ohio State University Hospitals) approved September 24, 1992, by the Hospitals Board be ratified.

Appointment

Name: MARTHA E. SUCHESTON
Title: Associate Professor (The Harry C. and Mary Elizabeth Powelson Professorship of Medicine)
College/Department: Medicine/Cell Biology, Neurobiology, and Anatomy
Effective: October 1, 1992
Salary: \$47,484.00
Present Position: Associate Professor, Department of Cell Biology, Neurobiology, and Anatomy

Appointment of Chairperson and Director

October 1, 1992 through September 30, 1995

Center for Slavic and East European Studies

Allan K. Wildman

October 1, 1992 through September 30, 1996

Geodetic Science and Surveying

Clyde C. Goad

Leaves of Absence Without Salary

WALTER D. NEUMANN, Professor, Department of Mathematics, effective Winter Quarter and Spring Quarter 1993, to work with a research group in the Department of Mathematics at Melbourne University, Melbourne, Australia.

ERNST A. RUH, Professor, Department of Mathematics, effective Autumn Quarter 1992, Winter Quarter and Spring Quarter 1993, to conduct research at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland.

RANDALL L. DOUGHERTY, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, effective Autumn Quarter 1992, to conduct research at the University of Colorado at Boulder.

SUE E. LEURGANS, Associate Professor, Department of Statistics, effective Autumn Quarter 1992, Winter Quarter and Spring Quarter 1993, for personal reasons.

GEORGE J. MAJDA, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, effective Winter Quarter and Spring Quarter 1993, to conduct research at the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton University.

JOHN P. VIMMERSTEDT, Associate Professor, School of Natural Resources (OARDC), effective October 1, 1992, through October 31, 1992, for personal reasons.

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

PERSONNEL ACTIONS (contd)

Leaves of Absence Without Salary (contd)

JAN MOUSING, Assistant Professor, Department of Veterinary Preventive Medicine, effective November 1, 1992, through June 30, 1993, for personal reasons.

ANNE E. NORRIS, Assistant Professor, Department of Family and Community, effective Autumn Quarter 1992, Winter Quarter and Spring Quarter 1993, for personal reasons.

MELANIE STEIN, Instructor, Department of Mathematics, effective Autumn Quarter 1992, Winter Quarter and Spring Quarter 1993, to visit some German universities.

THOMAS B. WARD, Instructor, Department of Mathematics, effective Autumn Quarter 1992, Winter Quarter and Spring Quarter 1993, to continue his current research project at the University of East Anglia in the United Kingdom.

Leaves of Absence Without Salary--Continuation

ROMAN T. SKARDA, Associate Professor, Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences, effective April 1, 1992, through March 31, 1993, to continue work at the University of Zurich.

JOAN F. FITZGERALD, Assistant Professor, Department of City and Regional Planning, effective Autumn Quarter 1992, Winter Quarter and Spring Quarter 1993, to continue research at the University of Illinois.

Professional Improvement Leaves

JEREMY COHEN, Professor (Samuel and Esther Melton Professor of Jewish History), Department of History, effective Summer Quarter and Autumn Quarter 1993.

WILLIAM L. HEWARD, Professor, Department of Educational Services and Research, effective Winter Quarter and Spring Quarter 1993.

Emeritus Title

LUCY D. VENABLE, Department of Dance, with the title Professor Emeritus, effective August 1, 1992.

Rescision of Notice of Appointment

The Notice of Appointment dated July 10, 1992, covering the Academic Year 1992-93 which was issued in error to Associate Professor Blanca Kent is hereby rescinded.

Medical Staff Appointments (The Arthur G. James Cancer Hospital and Research Institute)

August 1, 1992 - June 30, 1993

Starling, Randall Carson, M.D., Associate Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology

Vaccarello, Luis, M.D., Attending Staff, Department of Obstetrics/Gynecology

Eaton, Lynne Antoinette, M.D., Associate Attending Staff, Department of Obstetrics/Gynecology

Bona, Susan J., M.D., Associate Attending Staff, Department of Pathology

Wasielewski, Ray Carl, M.D., Associate Attending Staff, Department of Surgery - Division of Orthopaedic Surgery

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

PERSONNEL ACTIONS (contd)

Medical Staff Appointments (1992-1994) (The Ohio State University Hospitals)

Cohen, Daniel Michael, M.D., Associate Attending Staff, Department of Surgery - Division of Thoracic Surgery

Nelson, James Hissom, III, M.D., Clinical Assistant Professor, Department of Surgery - Division of Urologic Surgery

Agarwal, Anil K., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine--Division of General Medicine

Albers, Henry W., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Baptista Baeza, Jose L., Limited Staff, Department of Family Medicine

Beman, Sandra A., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Bender, Thomas M., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Bevan, Claudia K., Limited Staff, Department of Dentistry--Division of General Dentistry

Bird, Michael W., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Bona, Susan J., Attending Staff, Department of Pathology

Burak, William E., Limited Staff, Department of Surgery--Division of Surgical Oncology

Chan, David P., Attending Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Chattoraj, Mary R., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Clinchot, Daniel M., Attending Staff, Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation

Coccia, Maria R., Courtesy Staff, Department of Internal Medicine--Division of General Medicine

Conlon, Jennifer M., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Dickson, Bradley E., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Gandhi, Anjali K., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Hackshaw, Dawn S., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Heck, Robert W., Attending Staff, Department of Emergency Medicine

Hudson, Hilton M., II, Limited Staff, Department of Surgery--Division of Thoracic & Cardiovascular Surgery

Huffman, Todd A., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Judis, Gary M., Limited Staff, Department of Dentistry--Division of General Dentistry

Kiluk, Andrew K., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Koranyi, Katalin I., Attending Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Lorch, Frank E., Limited Staff, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation

Minnich, Lisa A., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Motarjeme, Steven C., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine--Division of General Medicine (joint with Pediatrics)

Murphy, Brian P., Limited Staff, Department of Anesthesiology

Myers, Laurie A., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Nicol, Steven J., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine--Division of General Medicine

Nunag, Robert D., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Nuss, Kathryn E., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Parry, David E., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Prestifilippo, Rita E., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Rossi, Timothy, Limited Staff, Department of Anesthesiology

Shaffer, James P., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine--Division of General Medicine (joint with Pediatrics)

Singh, Kanwaljit, Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine--Division of Hematology/Oncology

Thomson, Blythe G., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

Tramuta, Daniel A., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine--Division of General Medicine

Waissbluth, Alvaro Daniel, M.D., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of General Medicine

Ward, John J., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine--Division of General Medicine

Ward, Kevin R., Attending Staff, Department of Emergency Medicine

Wittenberg, Ami J., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics

PERSONNEL ACTIONS (contd)

Medical Staff Appointments (1992-1994) (The Ohio State University Hospitals) (contd)

Wren, Joseph E., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics
Wylen, Esther L., Limited Staff, Department of Surgery--Division of General Surgery
Zegarski, Thomas J., Limited Staff, Department of Pediatrics
Beckmeyer, William Peter, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Anesthesiology
Dowling, Todd Michael, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Anesthesiology
Kungl, Martin John, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Anesthesiology
Martin, Michael Allen, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Anesthesiology
Moore, Kevin John, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Anesthesiology
Tourangeau, Steven E., M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Anesthesiology
Persse, David E., M.D., Attending Staff - Department of Emergency Medicine
Kim, John Sang Ho, M.D., Attending Staff - Department of Family Medicine
Lauren, David M., D.O., Limited Staff - Department of Family Medicine
Young, Jeffrey C., D.O., Limited Staff - Department of Family Medicine
Hurt, John Richard, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Cardiology
Lenhart, Michael Blaine, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Cardiology
Lepage, John Charles, M.D., Attending Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Dermatology
Caruso, Daniel Raymond, M.D., Attending Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Endocrinology and Metabolism
De Los Santos, Edith Tiangco, M.D., Attending Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of General Medicine
Bushless, Diana Leigh, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of General Medicine
Gailliot, Christopher Robert, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of General Medicine
Padamadan, Hosi, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of General Medicine
Stock, Kent James, D.O., Limited Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of General Medicine (joint with Pediatrics)
Sumego, Marianne Jacquelyn, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of General Medicine (joint with Pediatrics)
Wolff, Michael Warren, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of General Medicine
Stuart, Darrell Wayne, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases
Diaz, Philip Tomas, M.D., Attending Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Pulmonary Diseases
Marsh, Clay Braden, M.D., Attending Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Pulmonary Diseases
Freimer, Miriam Laura, M.D., Attending Staff - Department of Neurology
Szymanski, David E., M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Neurology
Eaton, Lynne Antoinette, M.D., Attending Staff - Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
May, Susan J., M.D., Attending Staff - Department of Pediatrics
Cannon, Patricia Ann, M.D., Courtesy Staff - Department of Pediatrics
Pole, Michael J., M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Radiology, Division of Diagnostic Radiology
Gooch, Denise Renee, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Radiology, Division of Radiation Oncology
Ribovich, Martin Lee, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Radiology, Division of Radiation Oncology
Wasielewski, Ray Carl, M.D., Attending Staff - Department of Surgery, Division of Orthopaedic Surgery
Gosch, John Robert, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Surgery, Division of Pediatric Surgery

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

Kaplan, Chance Taylor, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Surgery, Division of Plastic Surgery

PERSONNEL ACTIONS (contd)

Medical Staff Appointments (1992-1994) (The Ohio State University Hospitals) (contd)

Dick, Michael R., M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Anesthesiology
Beggin, Bryan Edward, D.O., Attending Staff - Department of Family Medicine
Cole-Sedivy, Deborah Louise, D.O., Courtesy Staff - Department of Family Medicine
Restuccio, Anthony P., M.D., Courtesy Staff - Department of Family Medicine
Alton, Mary Elizabeth, M.D., Attending Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Cardiology
Cottrell, Daryl Ann, M.D., Attending Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Endocrinology & Metabolism
Fassler, John Edward, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Internal Medicine, Division of General Medicine
Austin, David George, D.D.S., Courtesy Staff - Department of Neurology
Nadkarni, Nitin V., M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Neurology
Grogg, Terry W., M.D., Courtesy Staff - Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Thomasgard, Michael Cramer, M.D., Attending Staff - Department of Pediatrics
Jenkins, Catherine L., M.D., Courtesy Staff - Department of Pediatrics
Long, William Walter, M.D., Courtesy Staff - Department of Pediatrics
Thompson, Craig Richard, M.D., Courtesy Staff - Department of Pediatrics
Alkhoury, Razan, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Pediatrics
Holmes, Mary Elaine, D.O., Limited Staff - Department of Pediatrics
Marx, Arlene Cecile, M.D., Limited Staff - Department of Radiology, Division of Diagnostic Radiology
Cohen, Daniel Michael, M.D., Attending Staff - Department of Surgery, Division of Thoracic & Cardiovascular Surgery
Pomarico, Michelle Ann, D.D.S., Limited Staff - College of Dentistry, Division of General Dentistry
Ness, Gregory Mark, D.D.S., Attending Staff - College of Dentistry, Division of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery

Medical Staff Reappointments (The Ohio State University Hospitals)

Schulte, Gregory T., Limited Staff, Department of Anesthesiology
Frale, Larry M., Limited Staff, Department of Anesthesiology
Pippin, William D., Limited Staff, Department of Anesthesiology
Smyke, Norman A., Limited Staff, Department of Anesthesiology
Workman, Mark A., Limited Staff, Department of Anesthesiology
Weiss, Michael L., Attending Staff, Department of Family Medicine
Montalto, Norman J., Attending Staff, Department of Family Medicine
Van Buren, Ronald C., Attending Staff, Department of Family Medicine
Tweel, Charles T., Courtesy Staff, Department of Family Medicine
Washington, William L., Limited Staff, Department of Family Medicine
McNeil, Donald L. (joint with Rheumatology/Immunology), Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Allergy
McDonald, Cheryl L., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Infectious Diseases
Magorien, Raymond D., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology
Nelson, Steven D., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology
Pearson, Anthony C., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology
Real, Margaret A., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology
Ryan, James M., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology
Schaal, Stephen F., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology
Starling, Randall C., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology
Wooley, Charles F., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology
Rome, Michael P., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

Vavuranakis, Manolis, Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology
Palaniappan, Jawahar, Courtesy Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology

PERSONNEL ACTIONS (contd)

Medical Staff Reappointments (The Ohio State University Hospitals) (contd)

Polinski, William J., Courtesy Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology
Terry, Richard F., Courtesy Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology
Tzagournis, Manuel, Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Endocrinology
and Metabolism
McCamish, Mark A., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Endocrinology
and Metabolism
Rao, M. Bhaskar, Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Endocrinology and
Metabolism
Walzak, Doris E., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of General Medicine
Murphy, Link R., Courtesy Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of General Medicine
Marks, Jack, Courtesy Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of General Medicine
Pope-Harman, Amy L., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of General
Medicine
Ralston, David R. (joint with Pediatrics), Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of
General Medicine
Trout, Ann M. (joint with Pediatrics), Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of
General Medicine
Whited, John D., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of General Medicine
Sagone, Arthur L., Jr., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of
Hematology/Oncology
Smith, Roy E., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Hematology/Oncology
Ungerleider, James S., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of
Hematology/Oncology
Thornton, Donald E., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of
Hematology/Oncology
Rupert, Robert D., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of
Hematology/Oncology
Middendorf, Donald F., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Nephrology
Pue, Charles A., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Pulmonary Diseases
Weiland, Jeffrey E., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Pulmonary
Diseases
Mendell, Jerry R., Attending Staff, Department of Neurology
Paulson, George W., Attending Staff, Department of Neurology
Slivka, Andrew P., Attending Staff, Department of Neurology
Warmolts, John R., Attending Staff, Department of Neurology
Frappier, Nancy R., Limited Staff, Department of Neurology
Makley, Michael J., Limited Staff, Department of Neurology
Walz, Elizabeth T., Limited Staff, Department of Neurology
Neri, Anthony S., Courtesy Staff, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Newkirk, Ernest M., Courtesy Staff, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Samuel, Mervyn J., Courtesy Staff, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
McGregor, Mary L., Courtesy Staff, Department of Ophthalmology
Richards, Paul F., Courtesy Staff, Department of Ophthalmology
Romeo, Fred P., Limited Staff, Department of Ophthalmology
Mahan, John D., Attending Staff, Department of Pediatrics
Mentser, Mark I., Attending Staff, Department of Pediatrics
Mortensen, Mary E., Attending Staff, Department of Pediatrics
Wheller, John J., Attending Staff, Department of Pediatrics
Zipf, William B., Attending Staff, Department of Pediatrics

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

Richardson, Delphis C., Courtesy Staff, Department of Pediatrics
Taylor, Renee S., Courtesy Staff, Department of Pediatrics
Wadwa, Janak, Courtesy Staff, Department of Pediatrics
Wall, Patrick M., Courtesy Staff, Department of Pediatrics

PERSONNEL ACTIONS (contd)

Medical Staff Reappointments (The Ohio State University Hospitals) (contd)

Matkovic, Velimir, Attending Staff, Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation
Pease, William S., Attending Staff, Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation
Wheeling, Theresa A., Limited Staff, Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation
Nasrallah, Henry A., Attending Staff, Department of Psychiatry - Division of General Psychiatry
Pariser, Stephen F. (joint with Obstetrics & Gynecology), Attending Staff, Department of Psychiatry -
Division of General Psychiatry
Shook, Scott L., Limited Staff, Department of Psychiatry - Division of General Psychiatry
Stockum, Alfred E., Attending Staff, Department of Radiology - Division of Diagnostic Radiology
Sodd, Anthony N., Limited Staff, Department of Radiology - Division of Diagnostic Radiology
Pieters, Richard S., Jr., Attending Staff, Department of Radiology - Division of Radiation Oncology
Redding, Mark P., Limited Staff, Department of Surgery - Division of Neurosurgery
Turner, Richard H., Attending Staff, Department of Surgery - Division of Orthopaedic Surgery
Martin, Edward W., Jr., Attending Staff, Department of Surgery - Division of Surgical Oncology
Walker, Michael J., Attending Staff, Department of Surgery - Division of Surgical Oncology
Nims, Thomas A., Courtesy Staff, Department of Surgery - Division of Surgical Oncology
Schneebaum, Schlomo, Limited Staff, Department of Surgery - Division of Surgical Oncology
Pollifrone, David L., Limited Staff, Department of Surgery - Division of Urology
Wright, James G., Attending Staff, Department of Surgery - Division of Vascular Surgery
Wallace, Douglas W., Courtesy Staff, College of Dentistry - Division of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery
O'Donnell, Francis J., Courtesy Staff, Department of Neurology
Rogers, Gary L., Courtesy Staff, Department of Ophthalmology
Sotos, Juan F., Attending Staff, Department of Pediatrics
McIlroy, Mary A., Courtesy Staff, Department of Pediatrics
Polster, L. Robert, Courtesy Staff, Department of Pediatrics
Mysiw, W. Jerry, Attending Staff, Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation
Carpenter, Denise L., Limited Staff, Department of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation
Olsen, John O., Attending Staff, Department of Radiology - Division of Nuclear Medicine
Pozderac, Rodney V., Attending Staff, Department of Radiology - Division of Nuclear Medicine
Seay, Joseph P., Limited Staff, College of Dentistry - Division of General Dentistry
Olejko, Terry D., Courtesy Staff, College of Dentistry - Division of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery
Stone, Linda C., Attending Staff, Department of Family Medicine
Tutschka, Peter J., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Bone Marrow
Transplantation
Ryan, Joseph M., Honorary Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology
Nichols, Allan J., Courtesy Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Cardiology
Seidensticker, John F., Attending Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Community
Internal Medicine
Williams, Homer E., Courtesy Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Dermatology
Marar, Unni K., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of General Medicine
McGinnis, Jeffrey B. (joint with Pediatrics), Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division
of General Medicine
Rhoades, Chris A., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of General Medicine
Siegel, Randall S., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of General Medicine
Penza, Sam L., Limited Staff, Department of Internal Medicine - Division of Hematology and
Oncology
Shubert, Phillip J., Limited Staff, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
McConnell, Charles T., Jr., Limited Staff, Department of Radiology - Division of Diagnostic

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

Radiology

White, Daniel J., Limited Staff, Department of Radiology - Division of Diagnostic Radiology

Schwarzell, John R., Courtesy Staff, Department of Surgery - Division of General Surgery

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

PERSONNEL ACTIONS (contd)

Upon motion of Ms. Casto, seconded by Mr. Skestos, the Board of Trustees adopted the foregoing resolution by unanimous roll call vote.

--0--

RESOLUTIONS IN MEMORIAM

Resolution No. 93-55

Synopsis: The approval of five Resolutions in Memoriam is proposed.

RESOLVED, That the Board adopt the following Resolutions in Memoriam and that the President be requested to convey a copy to the families of the deceased.

W. Arthur Cullman

The Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University expresses its sorrow upon the death on October 18, 1992, of W. Arthur Cullman, Professor Emeritus in the Department of Marketing.

W. Arthur Cullman was born December 27, 1914, in New York City. He received his Bachelor of Arts from Yale University and his Master's degree in Business Administration from Harvard University. In 1951 he received his Doctor of Philosophy degree in Business Administration from The Ohio State University. He held a number of sales and management positions for Philip Morris, Inc., and for Benson & Hedges where he was Executive Vice President.

In 1947, Dr. Cullman moved from the business world to the academic world where he became a professor in Marketing at The Ohio State University. He had the honor of being named Professor of the Year by College of Business students as well as a recipient of the OSU Distinguished Service Award. While here, he served on a number of committees and councils, including the Faculty Council, Graduate Council, Council on Instruction, Council on Student Affairs, and University Senate. He also served on The Ohio State University's fundraising campaign and the Cullman Symposium Committees.

Dr. Cullman was instrumental in the establishment and development of many business and not-for-profit organizations; he also served on several board of directors for these organizations. He received numerous awards and honors including the Achievement in Marketing Award, the Ohio Governor's Award for contributions that benefitted Ohio businesses, and, with his wife, the Temple Israel's Community Humanitarian Award. In 1988, he was named the Top Entrepreneurial Supporter by the Columbus and Central Ohio Entrepreneur of the Year Committee, and in 1989 he was inducted into the Central Ohio Business Hall of Fame.

Dr. Cullman was a caring, committed person who loved people. He was creative, an over-achiever, honest and fair, gracious, thoughtful, serving, generous, and was concerned about justice and fairness. He will be missed and will be remembered.

On behalf of the University, the Board of Trustees expresses to the family its deepest sympathy and sense of understanding in their loss. It was directed that this resolution be inscribed upon the minutes of the Board of Trustees and that a copy be tendered to the family as an expression of the Board's Heartfelt sympathy.

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

RESOLUTIONS IN MEMORIAM (contd)

Frank M. Fletcher

The Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University expresses its sorrow upon the death on August 17, 1992, of Frank M. Fletcher, Ph.D., Professor Emeritus in the Department of Psychology.

Dr. Fletcher was born in Colorado Springs, Colorado. The family moved to Denver, Colorado where he completed his elementary and secondary education, graduating from Denver East High School in 1931. He attended the University of Colorado studying Psychology and received his B.S. degree in 1935. He began his graduate studies in 1935 in Animal Psychology and received the Ph.D. degree in 1939. During these years he had several part-time positions at Yale, including Animal Research Assistant under Professor Yerkes and a staff position in the Department of Personnel Studies.

In 1940, he accepted a position with the Occupational Analysis Section of the United States Employment Service and in 1941, four days after Pearl Harbor, he was commissioned as a psychologist in the Navy. Following World War II, he accepted a faculty position at the University of Michigan and in 1947 he came to The Ohio State University as the Director of the Occupational Opportunity Service, now the Consulting and Consultation Service, and an additional appointment in the Department of Psychology. He remained Director of OOS until 1962 and served as a Professor of Psychology until 1979, when he retired and was named Professor Emeritus.

Although his Ph.D. in Animal Science was under Dr. Yerkes, he has held positions in the Department of Personnel Studies at Yale, the United States Employment Service, the U.S. Navy during the war, and at the University of Michigan. As a result, he came to The Ohio State University with extensive knowledge and experience in psychology, veterans' counseling, and in other areas such as personnel classification and interviewing.

Dr. Fletcher was nationally known and respected for his work in the field of Counseling Psychology. He worked for the best interests of the individuals and organizations he served, and cared deeply about students. He was a founding member and helped organize the American Personnel and Guidance Association (now the American Counseling Association). He served as the Association's first treasurer and as an early president. He was awarded Fellow status for exceptional contributions to the field of Counseling Psychology, Division 17, the American Psychological Association; and was elected President of Division 17 for the year 1964-1965. He was a founding member of the Journal of Counseling Psychology and managing editor for many years.

His work was instrumental in the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which provided support for the training of high school guidance counselors. He developed procedures for and presided over the counseling of thousands of veterans returning from World War II. With Frank Robinson he secured the first Veterans' Administration training positions for graduate students in Counseling Psychology. He was a consultant to the Ministry of Education, the Government of India in New Delhi, the United States Department of Labor, and the Veterans' Administration. For many years, he was a field selection officer for the Peace Corps.

Professor Fletcher was a major figure in the growth of The Ohio State University's highly regarded Counseling Psychology program. Dr. Fletcher was a pioneer in this field. In 1983 the Fletcher Fund (Robinson, Fletcher, Pepinsky, and Stewart Endowment Fund) was established to support faculty development and faculty and graduate student research primarily in the area of Counseling Psychology.

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

RESOLUTIONS IN MEMORIAM (contd)

Frank M. Fletcher (contd)

Dr. Fletcher will be remembered by students, colleagues, and friends for his 40 year career as an educator and psychologist, for his devotion to them and to the advancement of the field of Counseling Psychology.

On behalf of the University, the Board of Trustees expresses to the family its deepest sympathy and sense of understanding in their loss. It was directed that this resolution be inscribed upon the minutes of the Board of Trustees and that a copy be tendered to the family as an expression of the Board's Heartfelt sympathy.

Philip S. Jastram

The Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University expresses its sorrow upon the death on October 6, 1992, of Philip S. Jastram, Professor Emeritus in the Department of Physics.

Dr. Jastram was born in Providence, Rhode Island, on February 28, 1920, and was a graduate of Harvard University and the University of Michigan, where he earned a doctorate in physics in 1948. He joined the faculty at Ohio State in 1955, and was a remarkably active member of the University community until his retirement in 1988.

Dr. Jastram's influence was felt deeply, and benignly, in a variety of different areas of university and community life. As a physicist he was productive in research, and particularly effective -- and loved -- as a teacher at every level and as research supervisor for numerous graduate students. He was actively involved in university governance at all levels, and made substantial contributions to the American Association of University Professors, with which he was involved at both the local and national levels. In 1982 he was honored by the Ohio State chapter of AAUP with its Lou Nemzer award.

In the community Dr. Jastram was perhaps best known as a lover and patron of the arts. A founding trustee of the Cantari Singers of Columbus, he was also past president of the Jefferson Academy of Music and an active supporter of a number of musical and cultural organizations. He is particularly known in Columbus for playing a critical role in the rescue, at decisive moments in their history, of the Ohio Theatre, Opera/Columbus, and the Columbus Symphony Orchestra.

On behalf of the University community, the Board of Trustees expresses to the family its deep sympathy and sense of understanding in their loss. It was directed that his resolution be inscribed upon the minutes of the Board of Trustees and that a copy be tendered to the family as an expression of the Board's heartfelt sympathy.

Arthur E. Middleton

The Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University expresses its sorrow upon the death on September 21, 1992 of Arthur E. Middleton, Professor Emeritus in the Department of Electrical Engineering.

Professor Middleton was born in Erie, Pennsylvania on June 10, 1919. He received a B.S. degree in 1940 from Westminster College, his M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from Purdue University in 1942 and 1944; all of his degrees were in Physics. The Ph.D. degree was in the rapidly developing field of solid state physics. From 1942 to 1945 he served as Instructor and Research Fellow in the Physics Department of Purdue University.

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

RESOLUTIONS IN MEMORIAM (contd)

Arthur E. Middleton (contd)

In 1945, Dr. Middleton joined Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, Ohio, as Supervisor of the Semiconductor and Dielectrics division. Starting as a subunit of the Metallurgical Physics division, with one assistant, Professor Middleton supervised the growth of this activity to a point in 1951 in which it was a separate division within Battelle, employing 45 people (5 Ph.D.'s) and conducting 20 research projects concurrently.

In 1953, he joined the P.R. Mallory Company, in Indianapolis, Indiana, as Director of Physics and Physical Chemistry Laboratories. In this capacity he directed research on semiconductor materials, device design and device applications, and led Mallory in its efforts to become a prominent supplier of semiconductor and thin film components.

From 1958 to 1959, Dr. Middleton served as Head of the Electroluminescent (EL) Lamp Division of the General Electric Co., in Cleveland, Ohio. In 1959, he joined the Harnshaw Chemical Co., in Cleveland, Ohio, as manager and Director of the Solid State Research and Electronics Division.

Dr. Middleton joined the Ohio Semiconductor Division of Tecumseh Products Company, in 1962, as Chief Scientist and Director of Materials and Long Range Research. Among his other activities, he organized and directed a substantial research activity capable of conducting high level semiconductor research activity.

In 1965, Dr. Middleton joined the faculty of The Ohio State University as Professor of Electrical Engineering and Director of the Department's Electronic Devices Laboratory. In this latter capacity, he continued to pursue fundamental research on semiconductor materials and added to his already impressive list of publications in prestigious journals. At the time of his retirement in 1984, he was accredited with 14 patents on solid state devices. He also taught courses in solid state theory and electronics and introduced a successful upper-level laboratory course sequence on solid state device fabrication.

Following his retirement from University service, Dr. Middleton was Vice President of Ohio Semitronics, in Columbus, Ohio, and also continued his long service as a member of the board of directors of North Pittsburgh Systems, Inc.

On behalf of the University the Board of Trustees expresses to the family of Professor Middleton its deep sympathy and sense of understanding of their loss. It was directed that this resolution be inscribed upon the minutes of the Board of Trustees and that a copy be tendered to the family as an expression of the Board's heartfelt sympathy.

John A. Prior, M.D.

The Board of Trustees of The Ohio State University expresses its sorrow upon the death on October 14, 1992, of John A. Prior, M.D., Professor Emeritus in the Department of Internal Medicine.

John A. Prior was born on April 17, 1913, in Columbus, Ohio. He attended The Ohio State University and received a B.A. degree in 1935 and M.D. degree in 1938. Following graduation from Medical School, Dr. Prior did his internship at Grant Hospital in Columbus, followed by residency and fellowship training in Cincinnati in the Pulmonary Division of Dunham Hospital. He completed this training in 1944.

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

RESOLUTIONS IN MEMORIAM (contd)

John A. Prior, M.D. (contd)

Immediately following training, Dr. Prior was offered a faculty position in the Department of Medicine at The Ohio State University. He was promoted to Associate Professor in 1948 and Professor in 1951. He served as Chief of the Division of Pulmonary Diseases from 1952-61. Later, he served as Assistant Dean of the College of Medicine from 1961 to 1963, as Associate Dean from 1963 to 1970, and Dean from 1970 to 1972. He returned to teaching in 1972 in the Department of Internal Medicine, where he worked until his retirement in 1981. Upon retirement, Dr. Prior was named Professor Emeritus as a result of his long and meritorious service to the medical center.

Over the course of his career, Dr. Prior was awarded the Distinguished Teaching Award, the Alumni Achievement Award and the University Distinguished Service Award. He has authored or co-authored a number of scientific publications and is the author of a textbook entitled Physical Diagnosis which has been published in four foreign languages.

Dr. Prior's contributions to the University have been significant. He played a major role in the development of the Health Sciences Library, a facility which was later named for him in recognition of his achievements in this area. He was an enthusiastic medical educator who energetically worked to develop the new medical center library, for which he was instrumental in acquiring a nearly \$2 million federal grant. In the official Board of Trustees minutes of September 2, 1988, Dr. Prior was described as a person whose "leadership, dedication and energies helped make the Health Sciences Library possible."

In other areas of his professional life, Dr. Prior also excelled. He was a consultant to a number of local agencies such as the Ohio Industrial Commission, the Dayton and Chillicothe Veterans Administration Hospitals, the Ohio Department of Health, and others. He held membership in a number of prestigious medical and scientific societies such as the American College of Physicians, American College of Chest Physicians, American Thoracic Society, and he served on the Board of Trustees of the Children's Hospital Research Foundation and as a member of the Board of Directors of the Ohio State University Research Foundation. He was president of The Ohio State University College of Medicine Alumni Society and was also active in the Rotary Club of Columbus. He is listed in Who's Who in America, Who's Who in World Science, American Men in Medicine, and Who's Who in the Midwest.

Dr. Prior was known throughout his career as a compassionate and caring physician and teacher, as well as an accomplished statesman.

On behalf of the University, the Board of Trustees expresses to the family its deep sympathy and sense of understanding in this loss. It was directed that this resolution be inscribed upon the minutes of the Board of Trustees and that a copy be tendered to the family as an expression of the Board's heartfelt sympathy.

Upon motion of Mr. Celeste, seconded by Mr. Skestos, the Board of Trustees adopted the foregoing resolution by unanimous voice vote.

--0--

November 6, 1992 meeting, Board of Trustees

REPORT - UNIVERSITY'S ENDOWMENT FUND

Resolution No. 93-56

RESOLVED, That the report on the University's Endowment Fund, dated October 16, 1992, as submitted to the Investments Committee of the Board of Trustees, be received and filed with the official records of the Board.

--0--

Thereupon the Board adjourned to meet Friday, December 4, 1992, at The Ohio State University Fawcett Center for Tomorrow, Columbus, Ohio.

Attest:

Madison H. Scott
Secretary

John J. Barone
Chairman