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The Two Hundred and Sixty-First Session of the Board of Trustees of the University of Cincinnati was opened at 10:07 a.m. on Tuesday, January 24, 2006, in Tangeman University Center (TUC), Room 400B&C, on the Uptown West Campus of the University of Cincinnati. Notice of this meeting was given in accordance with Section 121.22 of the Ohio Revised Code. The proceedings of the Board, when not otherwise provided for by its bylaws, are governed by Robert’s Rules of Order.

Phillip R. Cox, Chairperson of the Board of Trustees, presided. Mr. Cox asked that roll be called.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:  
Thomas H. Humes, Phillip R. Cox,  
Anant R. Bhati, Jeffrey L. Wyler,  
H. C. Buck Niehoff, Sandra W. Heimann,  
Gary Heiman, and C. Francis Barrett

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:  
None

ALSO PRESENT:  
Nancy L. Zimpher, President;  
Jane E. Henney, Senior Vice President and Provost for Health Affairs;  
Anthony J. Perzigian, Senior Vice President and Provost for Baccalaureate and Graduate Education;  
Dale L. McGirr, Senior Vice President for Planning, Finance, and Community Development;
Mr. Cox:

We would like to welcome a new trustee, Francis Barrett. Fran is the President and a founding member of the law firm of Barrett & Weber. Fran, we look forward to your tenure, and we thank you for joining us.
Candace Kendle was planning to be here but is not at the present time. I believe you know that Candace has left the Board. She has become a resident of Florida, and we regret her resignation. I have a proclamation to read which, since she is not here, I do not think there is any need for me to read in her absence, but we hope that Candace does come in and, if she does, we will acknowledge her at that time.

Nancy, let me call on you at this point in time to introduce Mike Thomas.

President Zimpher:

I will do so. It is my privilege to introduce our new Athletic Director, Mike Thomas. I will ask Mike to come forward, as he is doing, just to say to you Mike comes to us from the University of Akron, after five years of being Athletic Director there, combined with almost eight years as Associate Athletic Director at the University of Virginia, which gave him adequate BCS experience to combine, having sat in the Athletic Director’s seat for five years, with that great experience in the kind of conference that is represented by the Big East.

You are going to love Mike and you are going to even like Jeni Thomas better, his partner. I cannot wait for you to meet Jeni. She is a great ambassador for the University of Cincinnati already. They have four children, one of whom is here now at Moeller High School. It takes a lot of courage for a high school junior to come mid-year to a new high school, and his father is guiding in that transition. I have impressed on Mike the preferred brevity, nonetheless I think you should hear him speak. Mike Thomas, welcome to our table.

Mr. Thomas:

Thank you, Nancy. Thank you for the opportunity to be here today and, more important, thank you for the opportunity to serve as your next Athletic Director. Today is day 55 for me. We will not do the play by play on the first 54, but it has been fast and furious, non-stop action, and I would not prefer it any other way. We are making a lot of
progress and are having a lot of fun. I look forward to working with each and every one of you and competing with Mr. Barrett for “Rookie of the Year” honors.

President Zimpher:

Thank you, Mike. We appreciate it.

Mr. Cox:

Dr. Zimpher, I would like to call on you for the President’s address, if you would.

**Report of the President**

President Zimpher:

Thank you, Phil. It is my privilege to join Phil Cox and the Board in welcoming our new Trustee, Fran Barrett. Fran and I have already had a lengthy conversation—one of many that we will have over time—and, Fran, we are excited about your service as an alumnus of the College of Law. We know that you carry the University of Cincinnati in your heart and head. So, thank you very, very much.

I also want to join in the recognition of Candace Kendle’s service, and with any luck, we will get to do that yet this morning. So, with that, on to our good news.

As you survey the officers of the institution, many of them will be donning today, as they do on most days, a UC|21 lapel pin. I want to tell you if they do not have it on, it means that they gave it away this morning to someone on their way to work. This happens at Starbucks, gas stations, and UDF. This is what we do. I left a number of them in China. So, think of it—someone is walking around in Beijing sporting a UC|21 pin. Of course, it is in recognition of our now not-so-new, but still pervasive, strategic plan which we affectionately call UC|21.

We are increasingly going to draw your attention to our progress, and in the relative terms of “how are we doing on those six goals,” I feel a little bit like Vanna
White. But, yes, we have posted these goals to my right and to my left and, frankly, almost everything we do seeds these goals. We do not always make it, perhaps, as explicit as we should, so today as I introduce good news, I am going to do it in the context of our six goals.

We often say about our first goal of “Placing Students at the Center,” that this is first among equals. We are moving on all six fronts but, clearly, we have made yeoman’s progress on “Placing Students at the Center.” We are enabled by the very strong role our students play in university governance. And, so, I want to compliment two successes and a third underway. I think you know that by listening to our students and assisting them in achieving their goals, we are making progress.

So, this year the university provided planning, purchasing, and legislative support to launch a student-voted, student-funded shuttle system, and to adopt changes to our smoking policy following a student referendum. Now we have moved on to improve lighting in the neighborhoods around the Uptown Campus. So, Andrew, with your leadership and the fine governance team that you have at the undergraduate level, and Jim Masterson at the graduate level, and Nick’s representation from the Board, we are very proud of the way that we are “Placing Students at the Center.”

I think you know—because you were there to see it—about the addition of the Autumn/December commencement. We have done that to make sure more students can participate in that celebration. And, we have launched an experiment in podcasting for seven classes, keeping the convenience to our students in mind. Where this will all lead we know not, but we know it is innovative and it was in demand.

In terms of “Growing our Research Excellence,” we have a planning process going forward that includes a review of our research institutes and centers. That is why today we will begin—after sharing comments from each of our deans, which was the wonderful idea of our Chairman Phil Cox—to start talking about our research centers and
institutes as a way of growing our research excellence and familiarizing you with what we are doing.

What are the signs, the good news, about research excellence? One would be the recognition of our faculty by the announcement of four earned Fulbright honors to travel abroad. Vanessa Kay Allen-Brown of the College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services is off to Cairo University in Egypt. Katharina Gerstenberger in the College of Arts and Sciences studied in Germany this past summer. These are under the Fulbright umbrella. India will be the destination of Daniel Oerther of the College of Engineering and, right now, Janusz Suszkiw of the College of Medicine is working in Warsaw.

Also, on the research front, according to the Ohio Board of Regents latest performance report, which they issue annually in constant dollars, the University of Cincinnati has increased the value of its research portfolio more than any other of Ohio’s research universities, public or private, over the past five years by 168 percent, a larger increase than any of our colleague research universities.

Our third goal is “Achieving Academic Excellence,” and we could give you no better indicator of how we are doing there than to cite Design Intelligence magazine. This, you know, is the ranking system for a number of our programs in DAAP, the College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning. I know that you know that Design Intelligence ranked our design program first in the nation this year. It ranked our graduate architectural program at No. 2 in the nation and our over-all architectural program No. 1 among the top ten most innovative programs. And, for the first time this year, Design Intelligence ranked our industrial design program nationally and, therein, UC ranked No. 2. I have not laid eyes on her, but if Dean Judith Koroscik is in the audience, please stand so that we can acknowledge these wonderful accomplishments.

I know when we opened our “University Galleries on Sycamore,” which displays a number of the artifacts of our collection, and had an open house, it was on the night
when *Design Intelligence* had produced its findings, and I was getting information on a phone call in the car. And, what I did at the opening, Judith, was just say I am not sure which ones got what, but it was one, one, two, and two. So, you pick the program, and you will be in the ballpark.

In March, in order to stimulate cross-disciplinary incubation of creativity and innovation, our colleges of DAAP, Business, Engineering, Arts and Sciences, and Medicine, along with our Office of Research are planning an Innovation Imperative Symposium that will be held somewhere in the vicinity. You will receive an announcement in the mail if you do not have it already. This is providing an audience for a select group of business and government leaders to participate in a day-long summit about innovation. It was, as well, the focus of my State of the University address in October and will continue to be a focus in the State of Ohio if we expect to advance the welfare of this state and our nation.

We do a lot on Goal No. 4—by the way, we took the numbers away from our goals, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6—until somebody in a parking lot yelled across the lot that he was working on No. 4 and, of course, I knew that immediately to be “Forging Key Relationships and Partnerships” with our community. We think we have really embraced the spirit of partnership both on campus and in the community.

This past year in 2005, when looking back, we had donations of $448,000 from our employees to support United Way, Community Shares, the Fine Arts Fund, Katrina Hurricane Relief, and Tsunami Relief. This is a very special way in which we give of our treasure. We also give of our time. For the first time ever, we are tabulating the volunteer work of our faculty and staff, contributing more than 7,300 hours a month in community service, totaling more than 300 employees involved in nearly 800 activities in more than 590 organizations in this community, and that is just the ones we could find this last year. Now that we are reporting, believe me, I think that number is going to grow exponentially. So, partnering with the community is our business.
I am very pleased that the Goering Center for Family and Private Business has premiered a weekly TV Show on WCPO in partnership with Fifth Third Bank, Zone Communication Group, and the Business Courier, another way in which we partner with the community.

I know you see that we have unveiled the new design for what used to be called Horizons, and now going forward will be called the University of Cincinnati Magazine. We do not want anybody to mistake the source of this magazine, and this is what keeps us building relationships with alumni and friends of the University of Cincinnati.

We are moving on the establishment of a “Sense of Place.” That has been a fifteen-year drive toward creating a residential experience for our students, faculty, staff, and friends. Soon, you will be hearing a presentation on the campus Rec Center that was cited in the Los Angeles Times, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, and the Chicago Tribune. Already, two eating venues have opened, the Stadium View Café and CenterCourt Dining Center, both of which you will hear more about this morning and, hopefully, see.

We have also been providing more events for the families of our University of Cincinnati employees, and this year over 1,600 employees have celebrated various holidays with us where they can bring their families to campus and enjoy this wonderful “Sense of Place.”

I close with “Creating Opportunity,” our sixth goal. We think that is in large part about bringing more young people to our campus from around the country and around the world. We have launched thirty alumni recruitment teams in a network of cities in Ohio, Indiana, Florida, New Jersey, California, Georgia, Missouri, Illinois, South Carolina, Washington, D.C., and, just for good luck, Japan.

Furthermore, when we played Pittsburgh in football, we spent three days and had twenty staff members recruiting Pittsburgh students to the University of Cincinnati. We called this the Big East Roll-Out, and today we have a 26 percent increase in applications
from the Pittsburgh area. So many cities, so little time, but this is our strategy and it is working.

New data from the Ohio Board of Regents Performance Report for 2005 also gives you another glimpse into access. Thirty-nine percent of our students on the Uptown Campus represent first generation enrollees of the University of Cincinnati. Thirty-eight percent of Uptown students are from families with household incomes below $50,000. This is echoed on our Raymond Walters and Clermont Campuses. We are still a university of opportunity and excellence, and we are very proud of that.

To summarize all that we are doing, we are going to try to keep in front of you our report card. Quite frankly, we gave this to you on our web site. It is a very elaborate document, but just to help you along the way, we crossed over one of our rules to try to be paperless, just to say to you, look, we have this on-going report card. It is our effort at implementing the score card. There are arrows that go up; there are C-Paws which mean we have absolutely gotten this thing launched, and there are arrows that go side-ways to indicate emerging initiatives; but in each of these six goals, we have some very hot commodities on the market, and we want you to feel attuned to the progress of UC|21 as we continue to grow.

As I mentioned, we are going to continue to bring forward our research excellence by sharing with you our centers and institutes. Today, you will hear from Beth Honadle, describing the Institute for Policy Research, and Thomas Mantei, who will discuss the Institute for Nanoscale Science and Technology. So, to get the pattern, we have exhausted for the moment our Deans’ Reports. We are moving now into Research Institutes and Centers, and we will lead with Beth Honadle. Beth, welcome.

(Beth W. Honadle, Ph.D., Professor and Director, Institute for Policy Research (IPR), gave the following presentation, utilizing PowerPoint slides. A handout, consisting of a folder of information on the IPR, was distributed to the members of the
Board and others seated at the meeting table. A copy of the handout and a copy of the PowerPoint slides are on file in the Office of the Board of Trustees.

Dr. Honadle:

Thank you, President Zimpher. Good morning to members of the Board of Trustees and colleagues and guests. I appreciate this opportunity to have a chance to give you a very brief overview of the Institute for Policy Research. My goal is to give you sort of a tour, if you will, of the Institute—a virtual tour—without being able to actually be there. I am going to cover three main areas in my remarks. One is going to be the Institute for Policy Research as an institution—our vision, mission, our structure and staff, our target clientele, that kind of thing—so you have an idea of who we are and where we fit within the university.

The second area that I will be talking about has to do with the Institute for Policy Research or IPR services and programs. One of the things that I want to leave with you from that part of the presentation is that, while we are known for certain programs that we have had for a long time—I call them our signature programs—we do a lot more than just that, so I am going to try to give you a feel for the breadth of the research that we do at the IPR.

Then, third, I want to talk about some recent activities and some initiatives and accomplishments, and where I think we are going. So, that is my plan for this morning.

In your packet, incidentally, you should have three handouts, which you do not have to look at while I am speaking. I will tell you what they are really briefly. One is a one-page strategic plan that we worked on. I have only been at this university for about a year and a half, and so we went through an elaborate process with a facilitator with our senior staff and developed a strategic plan, and there is a one-page version of that in your packet.
There is also a one-page sheet called “IPR at a Glance,” which I developed when I went to Washington a couple of months ago and I met with legislative staff and agency people, just to give a brief overview.

On the right is our UC|21 alignment document. So, for each of those six goals that Dr. Zimpher just talked to you about, it tells what the IPR is doing to align themselves with each of those goals.

The IPR wants to be recognized as a national and international leader in public policy research. Our mission is to be—and this is very important to us—a leading academic organization that engages in objective public policy research that informs decision making through innovations, partnerships, and research excellence.

One of the things that I would like you to know about the IPR is that we report to the Office of the Provost. The reason I mention this is that we are not a research center that is in one college or school, or represents just a particular discipline. We work across the university, and we have partnerships with researchers from a variety of disciplines. Because we are placed at this more central level, I think it makes it easier for us to do that than if we worked within a particular college. So, I happen to like that.

We have a professional research staff. This is how we are staffed. I happen to be the only faculty member at the IPR. I am a professor in the Political Science Department. We have senior researchers with PhDs in Political Science and in Sociology, and I would like to see more disciplines represented over time, but we do partner with a number of others. We have about ten professional staff members at the IPR in a variety of capacities, and then every year we have somewhere between 70 and 100 students who work at the IPR. Without the students, we could not do what we do. They are in every aspect of the operation. One of the things that we do is a lot of survey research, and we have something called a computer-assisted telephone interviewing lab, a CATI lab, and that is largely staffed by students.
The students are involved in the development of research projects. They work with us on proposals; they work on reports, all kinds of things, and they come from across the university. In fact, what will happen is we may get a few students from the College-Conservatory of Music, and word travels that this is a great place to work because you learn about communication, team work, research and so on, and we will start having a group from there—so, we have graduates, undergraduates. It has also been a career path—I promoted one person to Associate Director in the last year who was a senior researcher at the IPR and started as a graduate student working there. To give you our location, we are located in the Edwards Center, which is on the south-east part of campus.

I want to give you a little indication of our primary clientele and who we try to reach out to. One is an academic audience, including the University of Cincinnati itself, the institution, whether it is doing reviews of deans when they are coming up for renewal or reappointment, or maybe it is doing a study for campus services or something like that. All of these things are paid for, by the way. We do things under contracts and grants and that sort of arrangement. We do not just do them to help out. We cannot do it that way.

We work with other social scientists and medical researchers, providing data from our archives and as team members on research projects. Government, at all levels, is an important part of our clientele—federal, state, counties, cities, school districts. I was working with Sycamore School just the other day and non-profit organizations, large and small—everything from museums, youth groups, groups for aging, United Way. Some of these are established and some are new. These are our clientele by and large.

We do full service customized research in the area of public policy research and from design and methodology to data collection—all kinds of data collection. Just within surveys alone, we do telephone, mail, web, in-person surveys; we do a lot of focus groups; we do observation studies. One example of that was a couple of years ago, members of the IPR staff actually went to day care centers and observed the use of child car seats, surveying about it, so it was an observation type study. We do both primary
and secondary data analysis. In other words, we come in and collect the data ourselves and analyze them. Sometimes we take data that already exist and analyze those data.

We are especially well known for two programs, and I sometimes call these our signature programs, because when I go around the community, often people will know it is for one of these, but they do not know about the rest of what we do. So, I am going to talk about these a little bit.

There are a couple of different terms that we use to describe them. Here I am calling them Cost Shared Surveys. They are sometimes also called omnibus surveys. This is an opportunity for several different clientele who would like to have a survey done to contract with us for just a certain number of questions, and then we can scientifically collect the data, do the analysis, and write a report and give that to them. And, in the case of the Greater Cincinnati Survey, those data are proprietary. So, you may be the Museum Center or the Nature Center or United Way, or whoever you might be—Water Works, the Police Department—these are a number of the clientele that we have had, and that is how it works. So, it is a very cost effective way and also a way of getting high quality research without trying to gear up internally to do this on your own.

Now, Ohio Poll also works this way to an extent. We have a client part of the poll but we also do—because the university puts in some resources to do polling—we also do some research that is internally driven by the IPR, looking at public opinion, what are key issues that are facing the state and that kind of thing. It is a survey of approximately 600 to 800 adult Ohioans. One of our claims to fame in some independent validation of our accuracy is that we have projected winners in 31 out of 31 of the last statewide elections in Ohio.

Part of the publicity campaign that UC had featured the Ohio Poll, and I know you cannot read it, but at the bottom it is saying that we were accurate in 28 of 28; but that fall, we correctly projected the senate race and the presidential race and another one. And, what I was especially proud of was that we were not just correct, but we were very
precisely accurate in how we projected that. So, it was very, very gratifying and confirming.

But, as I say, we do a lot more than just surveys, for those who may be familiar with our survey work. We have a couple of data archives that are run at the IPR so we are a good source of data sometimes for projects. And we have something called the Online Analytical and Statistical and Information System, OASIS. It is funded by the Health Foundation of Greater Cincinnati, and if you went to the IPR Web Site, you would be able to actually click on OASIS, and go in there and pull out data and do some analysis along maybe demographic lines. Soon you will be able to do mapping, looking at, perhaps, something like inoculations among kindergartners, or some topic like that. If there is a study out there, we are likely to have it in the database. It has been really useful for non-profit organizations and government if they want to pull together a little overview data on health types of things.

Now in the third area, I want to talk about some recent initiatives. I have talked about our structure and who we relate to, and I have talked about our programs and services. I want to talk a little bit about some recent initiatives since I came here. One was last fall. I was very pleased that we were able to bring from the United Kingdom, Dr. Jenny Harrow, who is the Director of The Center for Charity Effectiveness at the Cass Business School in London. She came here and gave a lecture at the Taft Research Center. We had support from the United Way of Greater Cincinnati and the Greater Cincinnati Foundation and the Charles Phelps Taft Research Center, and not only did she do a lecture on research, having to do with knowledge management in non-profits, but she worked and spent time in groups with some of our faculty and students sharing her knowledge, and she also went with us to Over the Rhine and met with a youth organization. It was a really good community activity as well as a campus activity and a research lecture, so we really got a lot out of this one particular event.

I also wanted to mention that when I came here the institute did not have an independent or outside advisory group, and I felt that we needed that. I understand that
maybe many years ago they had one, but none that I was aware of in recent times. I have appointed twenty-two people from the business community, government, and non-profit to serve on the advisory council, as well as the university, incidentally, and so our first meeting was actually in a part of this room that we are in today. We met for the first time in November, and we will meet again as a group in March, and then again in June; but in the meantime, we have been having informal tours at the IPR. We had our first one last week and this was kind of an optional thing. We said, would you like to come and see what we do, and see what we look like, and come in and informally ask questions and learn more about us so that we can have more productive meetings. It was a wonderful meeting. Incidentally, if anyone would like to come to the IPR and learn more about us and see how we do what we do, I would be most happy to host a group to do that.

Dr. Zimpher often talks about “Big Hairy Audacious Goals,” but it is really good to have those kinds of things. It is something where you are kind of going out and saying well, we may or may not do this, but this is a really great goal. One of my goals—an IPR goal—is to bring a national conference in the area of public policy research to Cincinnati. This would be a great opportunity to highlight what we do, but also for our faculty, staff and students to have an opportunity to be right here at a National Conference in our field of public policy research.

So, we put in a bid with Ohio State University to host the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, APPAM, which is the leading organization in this field, to have their fall research conference here in Cincinnati in 2010. We put the bid in and in April, a woman from the Convention and Visitors Group and I are going to go and we are going to make a five-minute presentation in Washington to the board. We are going to give it our best shot, and I hope that we will be successful; but, if nothing else, we certainly made our presence better known within this organization and within that profession.

In terms of civic engagements, this is something that happened just before I came to IPR, but I think it is an important on-going project. When the United Way of Greater
Cincinnati wanted to form a research arm to look at the status of the community and to look at trends and data, they came to the IPR and engaged in a long-term contract called the Community Research Collaborative to kind of retain our services for a few years, and this is what we are working on now.

So, from our strategic plan, here are our goals for the future. One is to build on our foundation. We are very proud of the Ohio Poll and the Greater Cincinnati Survey and OASIS, and all of the things that we have done, and our relationships with federal and state agencies for which we do research on organ donation and a number of things. We want to build on our foundation, and we want to expand and enhance our engagement beyond the traditional clientele and reach out to other groups, both on and off campus. We need to increase and diversify our revenues through a whole variety of sources—different sources of contracts and grants, but also gifts and other possibilities. Then, we would like to work on building our capacity, and this could include such things as incorporating different disciplines at the IPR and working on some space issues.

That is the end of my presentation, so if there are any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

Mr. Cox:

Thank you very much, Dr. Honadle. We find ourselves a little behind, so if you have any questions, you can catch up with Beth afterwards. Thank you.

Dr. Zimpher:

Tom Mantei, Nanoscale.

(Thomas Mantei, Ph.D., Professor and Interim Director, Institute for Nanoscale Science and Technology, gave the following presentation, utilizing PowerPoint slides. A handout consisting of copies of the PowerPoint slides was distributed to each member of the Board and others seated at the meeting table. A copy of the handout is on file in the Office of the Board of Trustees.)
Dr. Mantei:

Good morning. Thank you for having me here. This talk is about the Institute for Nanoscale Science and Technology. About two years ago, it was thought wise to form the Institute for Nanoscale Science and Technology. We house three centers of excellence, the Center for Nanomaterials, the Center for Nanophotonics, and the Center for BioMEMS and Bionanosystems.

What do we want to do—four simple but, possibly, challenging goals. We want to stimulate collaboration across the university—not a person or department or even a college—the university, both campuses. We need to generate large interdisciplinary funding. We want to expand nanotechnology education here at UC, and we want to increase UC outreach and visibility. It sounds easy.

It might be worth taking a moment to ask, what is this nanoscale that we are talking about? When I teach this, I will ask a student, any student, to take out one human hair, not a handful, just one hair, and I will say, would you hold out the end of that hair towards the class. Over here is a circle representing the diameter of a human hair. That is 100 micrometers, which is about four thousands of an inch. That is what you can see unaided at arm’s length.

Over here, we have an eight point font period. To scale, that represents the nanoscale. You should be able to put one thousand of any nanoscale device across the end of a human hair, and that is what we are dealing with. Why would you do this? You do not go small, just to go small. It is often difficult and it is often expensive.

There are three examples up here. Our gold electrodes—they are one micrometer wide and that is one hundredth the width of a human hair. Crossed between them are two carbon nanotubes, and those have a diameter of one/hundredth of this white line.
The intersection is a switching area. If this pans out, it should lead to extremely fast and extremely compact computing beyond anything we have today.

Over here are red blood cells. A red blood cell has a diameter from here to here of about eight micrometers. That is about one hundred times larger than nanoscale. Here at UC, we have researchers developing nanoelectrodes and nanocensors, which means that it should soon become feasible to go in and diagnose and treat, say, this cell, but not that cell.

Down here, this is the surface of a silicon carbide layer that was grown right over in Rhodes Hall on the 9th floor for jet engines. It was then put into an atomic force microscope and imaged. These bumps are atoms. You can see a beautiful crystalline line of atoms. What does this mean? It means that we can now make something, and go in and literally image the atoms in what we have made. Unless you do this for a living, it is hard to realize how amazing this is.

How are we doing? We currently have researchers from Engineering, Medicine, and Arts and Sciences. The initial support is from the Office of the Vice President for Research. We do need to become self-supporting. We currently have about $6 million in nanoscale funding. There is more than that, but pertaining to nanoscale, about $6 million, and about $16 million in pending funding from national agencies.

Research collaboration—each year, we award $25,000 grants. A condition on these grants is that the researchers must span at least two colleges at UC and the expectation is that each grant will lead to much larger collaborative funding. We are not going to talk about these, but just to give you the flavor, here are three that we funded—New Polymer/DNA Nanomedicines for Treatment (with Chemistry and Pharmacology), Synthesis of Nanotube Sensor Arrays for Medical Applications (Engineering, Chemistry, Oncology, Neurology), and a Nanoparticle Gene Delivery System for Cancer Screening (Engineering and Children’s Hospital), and there are a half dozen others.
It does take equipment, and for better or for worse, the equipment is complicated and expensive. We are particularly proud of this gadget here. What that does is take an electron beam, focus it down to the nanoscale, and we write nanoscale patterns directly on materials. We went to the National Science Foundation about a year and a half, almost two years ago, and we got this on the first try. In fact, I think we beat out Ohio State. By expensive, I mean that that particular instrument cost $1.5 million, but it is used by researchers from across southern Ohio about eighteen hours a day at this point.

Education—Small Times magazine, the trade journal, ranked UC No. 2 in nanotech education in 2005, probably because we took some time on the survey. The education exists; however, most of that education is at the graduate level. There is little nationwide at the undergraduate level. Undergraduates do not know that this exploding field exists, so in April we went to the National Science Foundation and requested funds for undergraduate nanoscale education, and we got that on the first try. This is the course flyer we publicized for the students. We have cross-listed it. It is available to Engineering students and all of Arts and Sciences, as well as Medicine, if they want it. It has been cross-listed as a physics course, a chemistry course, and an engineering fundamental’s course.

We are teaching the first lecture course this quarter. We are team teaching. My turn is coming up soon. We have students enrolled from the sophomore to the senior level. They come from Engineering departments, Physics, and Chemistry. In spring, using university matching funds, we are going to do an absolutely cutting edge laboratory. This is an undergraduate laboratory with atomic force microscopes, multiple stations, electron microscopy, laser spectroscopy—all multiple stations for undergraduates.

The university has provided us with some outreach funds, and we will go to national education conferences having done this and report on it. This is exportable. I
might also add that we have now contacted teachers in high schools, and we are going to introduce this to Cincinnati high schools. That is a given; we are going to do it.

   Outreach—four days ago, last Friday, we co-sponsored a wonderful event—Nanoscale Science and Technology in Medicine. It was co-sponsored by the Department of Biomedical Engineering, the Institute for Nanoscale Science and Technology, and Randall Wolf’s Center for Surgical Innovation. We had about 100 participants, split about equally between East Campus and West Campus. We had teams of speakers. One speaker was from East Campus; one speaker was from West Campus, and I have been told that people have identified potential collaborators because of that event.

   Again, Outreach—the Ohio Nanotechnology Summit took place last year in Dayton. It will take place this year in Columbus. This one is important simply because it is on the Governor’s radar screen, introduced on his radar screen and Frank Samuel’s, because the emphasis is on taking these discoveries, leading to development, and then to commercialization. What that translates to is jobs. Thanks to Sandra Degen, we are now co-sponsors of the event, along with other institutions, and we will be there in full force in April.

   The IEEE, Institute for Electrical and Electronic Engineers, is the major technical, professional organization in this field. They have an international conference each year on nanoscale work. It was held in Nagoya, Japan, last year. This year it is going to be in Cincinnati in July and we are co-sponsoring that. We will make sure that Cincinnati and UC get maximum visibility during this event. We intend to bring attendees to UC.

   If you would like more information, we do have a Web site, http://www.eng.uc.edu/ucnanoinstitute/ or you can contact me directly at tmantei@ececs.uc.edu, and I will be glad to answer any questions here.

Mr. Cox:

   Thank you very much. Very interesting.
President Zimpher:

As promised, we have a presentation on our Campus Recreation Center, a unique facility that combines fitness space with student residential space, classrooms, a convenience store, and two dining facilities. Presenters are Mitchel Livingston, Vice President for Student Affairs and Services; Dale McGirr, Senior Vice President for Planning, Finance, and Community Development; and Jim Tucker, Vice President for Administrative and Business Services. How many vice presidents does it take—a partnership of three. I am proud to report that Ken and I were early applicants to the Rec Center, and as soon as it opens, we plan to get in shape. So, thank you all very much.

(Mitchel D. Livingston, Ph.D., Vice President for Student Affairs and Services; Dale L. McGirr, Senior Vice President for Planning, Finance, and Community Development; and James R. Tucker, Vice President for Administrative and Business Services, gave the following presentation, utilizing PowerPoint slides. An informational packet that included copies of the slides was distributed to each member of the Board and others seated at the meeting table. A copy of the packet is on file in the Office of the Board of Trustees.)

Dr. Livingston:

Good morning. I have the opportunity to provide a context for our exciting new Campus Recreation Center, placing it in the context of the university’s Master Plan. Dale McGirr will follow by providing a design narrative, and Jim Tucker will conclude by providing a focus on programs and services and operations. I must admit we have not had a chance to rehearse so, gentlemen, I hope I have billed you well for your sections.

The university’s Master Plan was unveiled in 1989 and, as you know, this is a plan with a ten-year planning horizon. The plan was widely celebrated for its comprehensive and integrated approach to campus planning. The initial focus of the
plan, which later became known as the first three imperatives, features the addition of academic and research facilities, the opening up of green space on campus, and the third area focusing on relationships. Connectivity is the word that we used to describe what we were attempting to do—foster better connections on the campus.

The first major upgrade of the Master Plan was initiated when my colleagues and I raised questions in 1995 about the quality of life and services not being addressed in the plan. As a result, discussions began regarding the replacement of the old campus recreation center and the Tangeman University Center. And, I can remember as if it were yesterday when the President and then, Athletic Director, Gerald O’Dell, and I sat down and talked about our respective needs going forward—the Athletic Director’s desire for a new recreation center and myself, focusing attention around an aging Tangeman University Center.

Shortly after that conversation, we hired the firm of Brailsford & Dunlavey, a group that specializes in campus life facilities, to conduct a series of very sophisticated surveys and focus groups to give us a real idea of what our students, primarily, and, as well, faculty and staff, believed were the needs of the campus as it related to the quality of life and services.

Out of those surveys resulted a plan that was eventually approved by the Board of Trustees in May of 2000, and the language that we used to describe the imperative at this point is the fourth strategic imperative featuring a campus recreation center, renovation of the Tangeman University Center, a three-ring housing plan that would essentially over time double the number of students that would live in residence halls, and give specific attention to the borders and in the larger community for housing for our students. And, fourth, our One-Stop Student Services Center.

The fourth strategic imperative evolved over time into what we now refer to as the MainStreet ideal. This was the largest single capital project in the history of the university. To support this initiative, students agreed to pay a fee of $100+ per quarter,
and I want to give specific recognition for the support that students provided throughout this project. Literally from day one they were involved in the decision making with the architects. When asked whether they wanted a Class A, a Class B, or Class C facility, they said if we are going to do it, do it right, and we built a Class A facility.

A year or so ago, there were a series of articles in the Chronicle of Higher Education, addressing the matter of amenities on college campuses and in universities and, essentially, they took a fun-and-games approach to why campuses would engage in this type of construction when the costs of higher education were going so high. But the bottom line in those articles essentially said that it is a matter of competition, if you will, within the higher education market place, and that in order to attract students, it was imperative that these types of accommodations be made available to our students. They help promote student engagements; they build a larger sense of community; they make us more competitive in the higher education market place. The new campus recreation center is the latest in the MainStreet project to be completed, and you will have an opportunity in a few moments to visit this outstanding facility.

If I may summarize, as we looked at our recreation center and the Tangeman University Center several years ago, we realized that we had not made investments in some twenty-five or thirty years in these facilities. Both were very difficult to utilize; both had very negative impacts on our marketing, our recruiting and, indeed, on the quality of student life and services on campus.

The new Campus Recreation Center is consistent with our UC|21 goals, putting students first by actively involving them in the decision-making process from the design stage all the way through to completion, providing a state of the art facility that creates opportunities for recreation and wellness, creating a sense of place on our campus and forging key relationships by opening up memberships to faculty, to staff, to alumni, and to community members.

At this time, I will turn it over to Dale, who will provide the design narrative.
President Zimpher:

Dale has done this so many times before, and Jim knows this as well—we are short on time, but we are going to get there, so thank you.

Mr. McGirr:

I have been recently trying to convince people that I own speed versions of my presentation.

The realization of this concept required world-class architecture, especially since it expanded into not just a recreation center but classrooms, a major dining facility, and student housing. So, we chose an internationally known person who the moment that this opened won architecture’s version of the Nobel Prize—the Pritzker Prize for Architecture—last year. The design was heavily impacted by the students’ input, not just in the surveys, but by an active group that stayed with the design process. We had sessions during the course of an entire year and a half. Students came out once or twice a month for a period of over a year to work with the design team, and the philosophy that you have in your handout.

The result is that we had a five piece project, classrooms, dining, recreation, natatorium, and housing. This cost—and we are focusing today on that which you are going to tour later—this cost is without the cost of the housing wing; but if one were to add the cost of housing wing to this cost, it would be $113 million. The housing wing, of course, is paid for differently—directly out of housing revenues. So, the cost you see here is the cost of what we are touring today.

The recreation center has all of the elements that were required as we talked to the students about what they wanted to do. There are 218 exercise stations. I have a reservation on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday morning at six o’clock on station #204. I am going to get in the gym the same as the President. I gave up a membership to a
community club in order to join this, and I have been anticipating doing that for a number of years.

We had an opportunity with funds from the Athletics Department to create what you know as the North End Zone, which is new seating and home and visiting locker rooms underneath there, which were funded by the Athletics Department.

We had the opportunity to create some very critical electronic classrooms. I do not know if that is part of the tour today. I walked through there the other day and they are heavily scheduled, so there are probably classes in there as you go by, but these are very important classroom additions to our inventory.

CenterCourt—the food court—I know Jim will tell you that you have passes to go to lunch there in your packets. I did the opening lunch two Fridays ago. It is wonderful. I thought it would be hard to top MarketPointe, which has been very popular. I think this one is going to do it.

The natatorium is the only shared facility—shared between general recreation and athletics. This is where we can do both recreational swimming and athletic practice and athletic competitions. This is a recap of that. There you see the housing is 224 beds. Again, that is outside that $99 million cost, but we listed it so that you will understand that the east wing is housing.

We are having a phased opening. The classrooms and housing have been opened since the fall. Dining is now opened and the Rec Center and Natatorium will be next month. I think we are now to the operations side.

Mr. Tucker:

Good morning. It is going to be a hub of activity, and you will see some of that today and, hopefully, you also have two passes in your black folder for not only
CenterCourt dining, but you also have two passes for anytime to go and enjoy the Rec Center yourself and work out.

If you look at the hub of activity—this is going to be the first building on campus and one of the only ones like this in the country where you can live, learn, work, eat, and have fun. Let’s look at live—224 residents; work—we are going to have over 300 new students just working inside this center; eat—we are going to have actually seven different stations in the CenterCourt—it is an amazing place. In Stadium View Café is retail sales; above it is the Zia Juice Bar—you will go right past or actually stop for a healthy drink; Market on Main—that will be our first 24/7 location moving through campus for all the residents, students, etc., as a convenience store of 4,000 square feet. Expanded hours—we will be operating the unit on Monday through Thursday from 6:00 a.m. to midnight. Friday most of the students want to go out by about 10:00 p.m. anyway, so we will close at about 10:00 p.m. on Friday and Saturday, etc., 361 days a year.

Again, as Dale said, we do have actually a working agreement with Athletics with the space on hours for their use and the use of no more than about half the pool during those hours. So, the real thing about the Rec Center is about people. This will be an outstanding place for recruitment of students, letting the parents see that the students have other things to do besides party—they can get fit.

Expanded programs—if Steve Sayers and Kim Schmidt are in the room, please stand. They will be part of the tour today. Steve is the Associate Vice President of Campus Services, and Kim is the Director of the Campus Rec Center, as well as intramural programs. With their staff, they do over seventy different types of group fitness instruction—youth and family and aquatic classes.

Just to mention a few of the classes, that is where you have athletic conditioning, cardio fitness classes, kickboxing, step and sculpt, dance classes from Latin to ballet to belly to hip hop, indoor spinning, mind/body classes, six different types of yoga classes,
Pilates, strength training, gravity training, classes on Taekwondo, jazzercise, flexibility, salsa dance, basic defense, social dance, and karate. There will be intramural sports of basketball, volleyball, softball, dodgeball, walleyball, 6-on-6 soccer, racquetball, flag football, open leagues of squash, badminton, racquetball, volleyball, and basketball. For a long time, with regard to the employees at UC, intramurals have been pretty well set for students. With this center, we will start to have our employees more involved with intramurals, or open leagues, and with community people, as well. So, I think this is going to be a great place to bring in community to work out at the University of Cincinnati.

We have 218 fitness and weight machines, over 20,000 pounds of weights, and you will be able to see that and try them. There is a one hundred pound bar, as well. In the Cardio Fitness Station, we have TVs with transmitters—you bring your headphones, plug in, and watch anything on the seven stations.

Along with UC21, we want to make sure the Rec Center is aligned with the goals, and as you can see there, we are trying to meet every item. In fact, I notice we missed research, and actually one of the goals I did turn in to the President is that we are going to work on a fitness research project with an academic side, too.

With that, these are the dates of opening. I would like to say that on February 5 it will be “Friends and Family.” If you are a current member, you will be invited, or if you are a Board member, as well as the Deans and VPs will be invited too. The “Friends and Family” group will be getting a pass, so please either join us today on the tour or take the passes that are in here and come anytime you like after February 6. You can actually go have lunch today at CenterCourt, as well as join us on Sunday, February 5, if you are interested in the “Friends and Family” event. That will be the first time it is open. It is open just for the membership.
On February 6, it opens for the students, so that will be essentially 25,000 full-time students that have the opportunity. So, we start with a large membership. With that, I would like to see you there. Thank you.

Mr. Cox:

Thank you, Jim. Thank you all, gentlemen. I am sure if you have any questions, they can be answered on the tour.

Before we begin our committee meetings, I want to say a word about committee membership. Governor Taft will appoint another new Trustee in the near future, replacing Candace Kendle and, at that time, I will make committee assignments. For today’s meetings, however, I will make two temporary appointments. Mrs. Heiman will be appointed to the Board-Administration Committee; Mr. Humes will be appointed to the Medical Affairs Committee. Sandy and Tom, thank you both for your service today.

The first committee meeting is the Academic and Student Affairs Committee Meeting. Mr. Niehoff is the Chair.

THE BOARD COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(Proceedings of the Board committee meetings are contained in the respective committee meeting minutes, which are on file in the Office of the Board of Trustees.)

The committee meetings began at 9:30 a.m.; the meetings concluded at 10:06 a.m.

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees was convened at 10:07 a.m. and, as noted on the first page (page 133) of these minutes, roll call was taken.
Approval of the Minutes of the November 29, 2005 Regular Meeting

Mr. Cox called for additions, corrections, or deletions to the minutes of the November 29, 2005, Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees. Upon motion of Mr. Wyler, seconded by Dr. Bhati, the minutes were approved as distributed.

Approval of the Items Recommended by the Board Committees

Listed below are the items recommended to the Board of Trustees for approval by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, the Board-Administration Committee, the Medical Affairs Committee, and the Finance Committee at their respective meetings held on January 24, 2006, prior to the Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Academic and Student Affairs Committee Recommendations

06.1.24.01 DEAN APPOINTMENT

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the appointment of Carlo D. Montemagno as Dean and Geier Professor of Engineering Education of the College of Engineering, effective April 1, 2006, through June 30, 2011. It is also recommended that the Board grant tenure as Professor of Biomedical Engineering.

Dr. Montemagno is a major international figure in the field of biomedical engineering. He comes to UC from UCLA where he was named the Roy and Carol Doumani Professor of Biomedical Engineering in 2001, having been hired to create a new department of biomedical engineering and to establish new undergraduate and graduate degree programs. During his productive tenure at UCLA, Professor Montemagno served as chair of the Department of Bioengineering, as Associate Director of the California Nano Systems Institute, and Co-director of the NASA Institute for Cell Mimetic Space Exploration.

Before receiving his Ph.D. in Civil Engineering from the University of Notre Dame in 1995, Professor Montemagno earned his M.S. in Petroleum and Natural Gas Engineering from Pennsylvania State University in 1990 and his B.S. in Bioengineering from Cornell University in 1980. After completing his undergraduate studies, he joined the United States Navy serving in several senior management positions as a civil engineering corps officer from 1980 to 1990. Before returning to Cornell University in 1995 as assistant professor in the Department of Agricultural and Biological Engineering,
he held various senior research positions at Argonne National Laboratory from 1991 to 1995. At Cornell he advanced to associate professor with tenure and served as Director of Graduate Studies in Biomedical Engineering.

Professor Montemagno has amassed a distinguished scholarly record resulting in several patents and appointments to numerous editorial boards and governmental committees. The common theme of his well-funded (USAF, NSF, NIH, NASA, DARPA, USDA, DOE, ONR) research programs focuses on the application of nanosciences and is reflected in topics ranging from the development of microsensors for detection of cancer markers to the engineering of artificial neurons. As a Fellow of the American Academy of Nanomedicine, as recipient of the Feynman Prize for Experimental Work in Nanotechnology, and as a frequent keynote/plenary speaker (Japan, Taiwan, Italy, Mexico, Canada, China, Belgium, Korea, Australia), he is indeed a major international figure in his field.

The College of Engineering is at an important historic juncture. Dr. Montemagno brings to his deanship a keen vision of the great opportunities and challenges facing the College of Engineering especially as the University positions itself through UC|21 as a major urban research university. He appreciates the advantages of the college’s distinguished history, and will work assiduously to promote its advancement in engineering education, in interdisciplinary research, and in service to society.

06.1.24.02 DEPARTMENT HEAD APPOINTMENT

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the appointment of William A. Johnson as Department Head of the Department of Classics in the McMicken College of Arts and Sciences, effective September 1, 2006, through August 31, 2011.

William A. Johnson works broadly in the cultural history of Greece and Rome, with particular interest in ancient books, readers, and reading; and with a general interest in how literary pursuits intersect with cultural context in antiquity. He has lectured and published on Plato, Herodotus, Propertius, Pliny (both Elder and Younger), and on a variety of topics relating to books and readers, both ancient and modern. Some prominent and illustrative examples: “Towards a Sociology of Reading” (American Journal of Philology, 2000) winner of the Gildersleeve Prize; “Reading Cultures, Technology, and Education” (in Reading between the Lines, Yale University Press, 2003); and his book on the book, Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus, a close study of the artifactual remains of over 400 ancient papyrus bookrolls (University of Toronto Press, 2004). Other recent work has focused on ancient music; he produced the editio princeps for two of the very rare papyrus documents containing ancient Greek music (details and sound at his web site, http://classics.uc.edu/music/). He teaches a wide range of Greek and Latin topics to undergraduate and graduate audiences; graduate seminars have included studies of literary papyri:

Pliny and Younger (http://classics.uc.edu/~johnson/pliny/),
Herodotus (http://classics.uc.edu/~johnson/herodotus/), and
Ancient Libraries (http://classics.uc.edu/~johnson/libraries/).

06.1.24.03 DEPARTMENT HEAD REAPPOINTMENT

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the reappointment of Awatef Hamed as Department Head of the Department of Aerospace Engineering and
Dr. Hamed is an internationally known expert in the field of propulsion and power. In addition, she is an award-winning teacher as well as the first female head of an aerospace engineering department in the United States. She is a fellow of both the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics and the American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

She earned a BS degree at Cairo University and MS and PhD degrees at the University of Cincinnati. As a principal investigator, she has had major grants from NSF, NASA, AFOSR and several state agencies, as well as GE, Martin Marietta and others. She has consulted for organizations in Switzerland, Japan, and Italy, as well as US concerns that include aerospace companies, several utilities and many government agencies. Her public service on advisory boards include four National Academy of Sciences panels in the past three years, as well as work for NSF, NASA, ASME, and OAI. She has been the editor of the International Journal of Computational Fluid Dynamics since 1992. Dr. Hamed has held visiting appointments at Wright Patterson Air Force Base, NASA Lewis, and the American University in Cairo.

06.1.24.04 CHARLES PHELPS TAFT PROFESSORSHIP

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the nomination of Robert C. Richardson, Professor of Philosophy in the McMicken College of Arts and Sciences, for the title of Charles Phelps Taft Professor effective immediately.

Dr. Richardson earned his B.A. from the University of Colorado (1971) and his M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Chicago (1977). He has held numerous visiting appointments, including Mercator Professor of Cognitive Science, University of Osnabruck (2005), and Visiting Faculty, Department of Molecular Cell Physiology, Free University of Amsterdam (1993-1994).

Professor Richardson is the author of Discovering Complexity: Decomposition and Localization as Strategies in Scientific Research (1993), considered a seminal work in the area of philosophy of science and biology, and the author of over sixty academic articles in the areas of philosophy of science, cognitive science, philosophy of ecology, history of biology (19th century), philosophy of the mind, and the history of psychology.

Professor Richardson has received awards and grant support from the National Science Foundation, National Research Council, National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Hanse Institute for Advanced Study in Delmenhorst, Germany, and serves on numerous editorial boards for academic journals and presses.

In the near three decades of service to the University of Cincinnati, Professor Richardson has served two terms as Head of the Department of Philosophy, Director of Graduate Studies, and as a member of the Charles Phelps Taft Faculty Executive Board, as well as Taft standing committees.

06.1.24.05 DIVISION NAME CHANGE

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the name change of the Division of Education Studies to the Division of Educational Studies and Leadership in
the College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services. This request has been reviewed and approved by the appropriate authorities.

**06.1.24.06 INSTITUTION NAME CHANGE**

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the name change of The Institute for Learning in Retirement (ILR) to The Institute for Lifetime Education (ILE) effective Autumn Quarter 2006. This request has been reviewed and approved by the appropriate authorities.

**06.1.24.07 EMERITUS STATUS FOR FACULTY MEMBERS**

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the following emeritus status for the faculty members listed, effective upon the date of their retirement from the university. The nominations have been reviewed and positively recommended by their faculty colleagues and deans.

- Terry L. Bullock, Professor Emeritus of Reading and Critical Thinking, College of Applied Science
- Donald M. Meismer, Associate Professor Emeritus of Biology, Raymond Walters College

**06.1.24.08 APPOINTMENTS OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE AND PROFESSOR WITH TENURE**

It is recommended that Maria Teresa Diaz-Meco, Ph.D., be appointed at the rank of Associate Professor with tenure effective January 1, 2006, in the Department of Genome Science; Jorge Moscat, Ph.D., be appointed at the rank of Professor with tenure effective January 1, 2006, in the Department of Genome Science; and Silvana Obici, M.D., be appointed at the rank of Associate Professor with tenure effective October 1, 2005 in the Department of Psychiatry, College of Medicine.

**06.1.24.09 APPOINTMENT OF EMERITUS COLLEGE OF MEDICINE**

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees appoint Paul Edward Hurtubise, Ph.D., as Professor Emeritus with the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, College of Medicine, effective March 1, 2006. Documentation to support the recommendation is attached.*

Dr. Paul Hurtubise received his Ph.D. in Immunology/Immunopathology and began his career at the University of Cincinnati in 1976. In 1986 he was promoted to the Director of Diagnostic Immunology. Dr. Hurtubise is a Diplomat of the American Board of Medical Laboratory Immunology.

---

* Filed with Board Papers
Dr. Hurtubise has written over 80 book chapters and peer reviewed publications during his tenure at the university. He has been a principal investigator and co-investigator of multiple grants and contracts and Dr. Hurtubise has served on the review committees for the NIH and FDA.

06.1.24.10 APPOINTMENT OF EMERITI FACULTY – COLLEGE OF PHARMACY

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees appoint the College of Pharmacy faculty members named on the attached list to the Emeriti faculty of the University of Cincinnati. Documentation to support the recommendation is attached.*

Board-Administration Committee Recommendations

06.1.24.11 RECOMMENDATION FOR THE NOMINATION OF JEFFREY L. WYLER TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE HEALTH ALLIANCE OF GREATER CINCINNATI

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees nominate Jeffrey L. Wyler to serve as a University Director on the Board of Directors of The Health Alliance for a term of four years.

06.1.24.12 RECOMMENDATION FOR THE REAPPOINTMENT OF GEORGE L. STRIKE TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL, INC. (UHI)

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees recommend to the University Hospital, Inc., (UHI) Board of Directors that George L. Strike be reappointed to serve as a University Voting Director of University Hospital, Inc. His reappointment will be for a term of three years.

06.1.24.13 MODIFICATION OF RULE 3361:20-31-02 FEES: ASSESSMENT OF FEES

Synopsis: A change in the existing Board rule to more appropriately define full-time student status and overload levels.

We recommend Board of Trustees’ approval of revisions to the Assessment of Fees rule.* The revisions constitute a change in the overload credit hour policy from 19 credit hours per quarter to 18 credit hours per quarter. This policy has been reviewed broadly at the college level and by the appropriate administrative areas to insure viability with student program requirements.

* Filed with Board Papers
A slight change is also requested in graduate student reciprocity in Kentucky since graduate students are no longer included in that program.

**Medical Affairs Committee Recommendations**

06.1.24.14 OPERATING AND AFFILIATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY AND THE HEALTH ALLIANCE

At its September 27, 2005, meeting, the Board of Trustees approved resolutions relating to a reorganization plan for The Health Alliance of Greater Cincinnati (the “Health Alliance”) and consented to certain related amendments to the Code of Regulations of University Hospital, Inc. ("UHI") (the “Revised UHI COR”). The Health Alliance reorganization plan included proposals to amend the Joint Operating Agreement (“JOA”) among the University, the Health Alliance and other Participating entities and the Health Alliance’s Code of Regulations (collectively, the “Proposed Amended JOA”) and to adopt three new agreements:

- An Operating and Affiliation Agreement between the University and the Health Alliance (the “OAA”);

- An Amended and Restated Lease Agreement among the University, University Hospital, Inc. (“UHI”) and the Health Alliance (the “Revised UHI Lease”); and

- An Amended and Restated Master Agreement for Services between UC and UHI (the “Revised UC Master Purchase Agreement”).

The resolutions approving the three additional agreements (collectively, the “HA-UC Agreements”), the Revised UHI COR and the Proposed Amended JOA were made conditional upon approval of the Proposed Amended JOA by all the other Participating Entities. Although the Proposed Amended JOA has been approved by the Boards of the Health Alliance, Fort Hamilton Hospital Holding Company, and Jewish Health System, Inc., it has not as yet been approved by the Boards of The St. Luke Hospitals, Inc., or The Christ Hospital.

The OAA contains provisions that resolve a long-standing dispute between the Health Alliance and the University concerning the Educational Services Payment in the original JOA. Consummation of the OAA would, therefore, eliminate a possible JOA default and thereby remove a significant impediment to the Health Alliance’s moving forward with a contemplated bond financing. Unfortunately, the lack of approval of the Proposed Amended JOA by some of the Participating Entities has held up the financing and, with it, the start of construction of new facilities at University Pointe and University Hospital.

To overcome this difficulty, representatives of the University and the Health Alliance have jointly agreed to “de-link” the HA-UC Agreements from the Proposed Amended JOA by eliminating the requirement that execution of the HA-UC Documents and approval of the Revised UHI COR be deferred until the Proposed Amended JOA is also approved. As part of the arrangement, the parties agreed to a new Transition Agreement to reflect elimination of the condition, agreed to certain modifications to the
Revised UHI COR and the HA-UC Agreements, and also agreed to formally amend the existing lease for the Goodman Garage (the “Goodman Garage Lease”) to document a prior understanding concerning the future use of this property.

It is recommended that the Board waive the condition and approve the Transition Agreement, the revised HA-UC Agreements, the amendment to the Goodman Garage Lease and the Revised UHI COR.* A form of resolution, together with an Executive Summary of the documents, is attached* to this Recommendation.

University of Cincinnati

Resolutions Approving Agreements with The Health Alliance of Greater Cincinnati

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees of the University of Cincinnati hereby authorizes and approves the execution, delivery and performance of the following agreements, in substantially the form submitted to and reviewed by the Board of Trustees, with such modifications thereto as the Chairperson of the Board, or such person designated by the Chairperson, deems necessary or appropriate.

1. Transition Agreement between the University and The Health Alliance of Greater Cincinnati (the “Health Alliance”);

2. Operating and Affiliation Agreement between the University and The Health Alliance (the “OAA.”);

3. Amended and Restated Lease Agreement among the University, University Hospital, Inc. (“UHI”) and The Health Alliance (the “UHI Lease”); and

4. Amended and Restated Master Agreement for Services between the University and The Health Alliance, on behalf of UHI.

FURTHER RESOLVED, in connection with the review, authorization and approval of the agreements referenced above, the Board of Trustees finds and affirms that the contributions by the University pursuant to the OAA and the UHI Lease are fair consideration for the value and benefit to be derived by it from such agreements, and that such agreements will better provide for the health and welfare of the people of the State of Ohio by enhancing the availability, efficiency, and economy of hospital facilities and the services rendered thereby, by providing for cooperation of hospital agencies and the utilization of shared facilities and services to obtain economies in operation and more effective health service, and by providing efficient operation of hospital facilities to be available to or for the service of the general public without discrimination by reason of race, creed, color, or national origin.

FURTHER RESOLVED, PURSUANT TO Article XIV, Section 2, of the Code of Regulations of UHI, the Board of Trustees hereby consents to the adoption by the UHI Board of Directors of the Amended and Restated Code of Regulations of UHI in substantially the form presented to this meeting, with such modifications thereto as the Chairperson of the Board, or such person designated by the Chairperson, deems necessary or appropriate.

* Filed with Board Papers
06.1.24.15 DRAKE REORGANIZATION

As the result of extensive discussions, the Health Alliance of Greater Cincinnati ("Health Alliance"), Drake Center, Inc. ("DCI"), and the Hamilton County Commissioners have reached agreement on a reorganization plan for DCI. DCI operates Drake Hospital under the terms of an operating lease with Hamilton County. The present members of DCI are the individual Hamilton County Commissioners (the "Public Members") and the individual members of the University’s Board of Directors (the "University Members"). Under the DCI Code of Regulations, the Public Members elect three, and the University Members elect six, of DCI’s nine directors. The Code also provides that the President or President Emeritus of the University shall serve as Chairman of the DCI Board.

The reorganization plan is set forth in the attached* Reorganization Agreement among the Health Alliance, Hamilton County, and the University. The plan contemplates that the Health Alliance will assume ownership of DCI, and thereby obtain control of its hospital and other affiliates, at a closing that is scheduled for June 30, 2006. Among the conditions of closing is a requirement that all necessary approvals have been received from regulatory authorities, including any approvals that may be needed as a consequence of the filings that must be made with the Attorney General of Ohio pursuant to his authority to review charitable corporation organizations.

If all the conditions to closing are met, the County and the University will cause the existing directors of DCI and its affiliates to vote to amend, and cause the Public Members and the University Members to approve amendments to, the DCI Code of Regulations so that the Health Alliance will become the sole member of DCI. The provision relating to service by the University’s President or President Emeritus as Chairman of the DCI Board will also be eliminated. The Health Alliance will then elect new directors of its own choosing and take over direct ownership and operation of DCI. The University’s trustees will be asked to sign a unanimous consent form approving the Code amendments in their capacities as Members of DCI. The form is attached* as Exhibit A to the Reorganization Agreement.

As part of the reorganization, the Health Alliance will cause DCI to exercise its option under the existing operating lease to purchase the leased real estate and buildings at an option price to be determined in accordance with the appraisal-based formula set forth in the lease. The Reorganization Agreement further provides that the Health Alliance intends that the DCI will continue as a tax-exempt charity with a mission of operating a long-term acute care health facility with significant emphasis on rehabilitation services, which will admit patients based on medical assessment, regardless of ability to pay or source of referral, and that DCI will perform its mission in a manner that does not discriminate based on race, creed, color or national origin. In addition, the Health Alliance will cause DCI to maintain a directors’ and officers’ liability policy (or an equivalent self-insurance program) covering the Members and all persons who were officers immediately prior to the closing date, and the Health Alliance and DCI will also indemnify such persons against all liabilities arising out of actions taken after the closing date by either indemnitor and for the failure of either indemnitor to perform or observe any covenant or representation contained in the Reorganization Agreement.

In the interim between the date of execution and the closing date of the Reorganization Agreement, the Health Alliance will manage the hospital and other assets under the terms of an Interim Management Agreement between DCI and the Health

* Filed with Board Papers
Alliance. This agreement will terminate on the closing date of the Reorganization Agreement. The University is not a party to the Interim Management Agreement.

To resolve the current dispute concerning the amounts owing to DCI under the Drake Hospital Levy, DCI and the County will enter into a Settlement, Release and Financial Support Agreement in which DCI agrees to accept the levy amounts paid in 2005 ($10,761,966) as full satisfaction of its claims to receiving funding from the levy in 2005, and the County agrees to pay DCI, and DCI agrees to accept, $10,761,966 in levy support funding in calendar years 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009. The amounts for 2006-2009 may be decreased if DCI achieves an operating margin in excess of 3%, or increased if DCI incurs an operating loss, during the period of financial support. The University is not a party to the Settlement, Release and Financial Support Agreement.

The University has no financial interest in the above transactions. However, the University and the University Members do have a duty to determine whether the transactions, if consummated, would further the public interest. By bringing DCI under the control of the Health Alliance, the transactions in question provide Drake Hospital with access to stronger management and greater financial resources, and with the opportunity of achieving economies of scale by participating in the Health Alliance’s accounting, human resources, risk management, information technology and other centrally maintained support functions. This will benefit the public, and will also indirectly benefit the University by providing a stronger and more efficient site for its health care professional teaching activities. The public will also benefit from the resolution of a long-standing dispute between DCI and the County concerning the amount and terms and conditions of funding for the hospital under the Drake Hospital Levy.

It is recommended that the Board approve execution by the University of the Reorganization Agreement. Individual Board members are also asked to sign the unanimous consent form that is attached* as Exhibit A to the Reorganization Agreement in their capacities as University Members of DCI’s Board. A form of resolution and a copy of the Reorganization Agreement and Exhibit A are attached* to this recommendation.

**Resolution Approving the Drake Reorganization Agreement**

RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees finds that the proposed Reorganization Agreement among The Health Alliance of Greater Cincinnati, the University of Cincinnati, Hamilton County, Ohio, and Drake Center, Inc., will further the public purpose of better providing for the health and welfare of the people of Hamilton County and of the state of Ohio by enhancing the availability, efficiency, and economy of hospital facilities and the services rendered thereby, by providing for cooperation of hospital agencies in the utilization of shared facilities and services to obtain economies in operation and more effective health service, and by facilitating the financing of hospital facilities to be available to or for the service of the general public; and

RESOLVED FURTHER, that the Board hereby approves the Reorganization Agreement in the form presented to the meeting, together with such modifications thereto as the Chair of the Board deems necessary or appropriate; and

RESOLVED FURTHER, that the Chair of the Board, or such other person(s) as he shall designate be, and hereby is, authorized to execute and deliver any and all documents necessary or appropriate to effectuate the foregoing resolutions, and the

* Filed with Board Papers.
execution and delivery of such documents by the Chair or designee shall be conclusive evidence that the same has been authorized by this Resolution.

Finance Committee Recommendations

06.1.24.16 LEASE OF STETSON SQUARE OFFICE SPACE LOCATED AT MARTIN LUTHER KING DRIVE AND HIGHLAND STREET

Synopsis: Recommendation to allow the University of Cincinnati to lease office space for the College of Medicine to relocate numerous functions from the Medical Sciences Building. This will be a permanent relocation of staff to the King/Highland office and retail building.

The neighborhood-based non-profit known as Corryville Community Development Corporation (CCDC) is constructing an office, retail and parking facility at the corner of Martin Luther King Drive and Highland as part of the Stetson Square development.

The University will lease approximately 60,000 NSF of office space in this five-story building, along with 200 parking spaces located within a 350 space underground garage. This lease will be for 25 years and cost the university approximately $2.4 million annually. Taxable and tax free bonds are being sold to finance the project.

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the use of this property as office swing space and that said land be used to support the swing space needs of the university community.

06.1.24.17 CHECK SIGNATURE/COUNTERSIGNATURE AND WIRE TRANSFER INITIATION/VERIFICATION AUTHORITY

Synopsis: Update check signature/countersignature and wire transfer initiation/verification authority to reflect recent title and responsibility changes.

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the following resolution updating the list of individuals authorized to sign/countersign checks and initiate/verify wire transfers. The list of authorized individuals reflects recent title and responsibility changes.

RESOLVED, that effective February 1, 2006, all checks (excluding health care/benefits payments issued by third-party administrators) drawn upon the depositories designated by the Board of Trustees of the University of Cincinnati must bear the signature of M. Linda Graviss, Assistant Vice President and Treasurer.

a) This signature may be a mechanical facsimile, the proper affixing of which shall be the responsibility of M. Linda Graviss, or in her absence, Gerald A. Siegert, Associate Vice President Financial Affairs.
b) All checks in excess of $75,000 must bear the countersignature of Gerald A. Siegert, Associate Vice President Financial Affairs, or William L. Doering, Associate Treasurer, or Barry L. Holland, Director of Tax Compliance, or Julie A. Flammer, Director Business Affairs, or Dennis J. Yockey, Director Financial System Implementation, or Ruth A. Ross, Assistant Controller, or James D. Plummer, Chief Financial Officer.

RESOLVED, that effective February 1, 2006, all wire transfers drawn upon the depositories designated by the Board of Trustees of the University of Cincinnati must be initiated by M. Linda Graviss, Assistant Vice President and Treasurer, or William L. Doering, Associate Treasurer, or Gerald A. Siegert, Associate Vice President Financial Affairs, or Barry L. Holland, Director of Tax Compliance, or Jim Birch, Senior Financial Analyst.

a) All non-repetitive wire transfers in excess of $75,000 initiated by one of the authorized individuals must be verified by a second authorized individual.

b) All repetitive wire transfers must be established by two of the authorized individuals.

06.1.24.18  CONTRACT WITH TELECOMMUNICATIONS PARTNER TO PROVIDE EXTENDED CELL PHONE AND WI-FI SERVICES

Synopsis: Request Board of Trustees Approval of Contract.

Cincinnati Bell Telephone currently is the University’s telecommunications partner in several dimensions, from limited cell phone services to local calling and Internet trunk lines. This agreement establishes a partnership between the University of Cincinnati Bell Telephone to provide differentiated cell phone service, one tailored to the needs and requirements of our faculty, students and staff. It also includes extensions to the current Wi-Fi (data service) environment. This agreement is the result of the competitive bid process implemented in December, 2005, resulting from a feasibility study conducted by IBM Business Consulting Services. That process included evaluation by representative members of the University community, review by the Infrastructure Technology Planning Committee and the University Purchasing Department.

This partnership develops a leading-edge telecommunications infrastructure for the UC Uptown Campus and its adjacent environs, including ubiquitous cell phone service and Wi-Fi hotspots throughout the region. This project deploys a common infrastructure which allows us to provide distinctive UC-centric services and mobile applications to our community at prices reflective of our collective purchasing power. The financial model is based on UC providing wireless customers to Cincinnati Bell in return for infrastructure, and has limited financial exposure to the University.

This resolution is to request that the UC Board of Trustees approve the selection of Cincinnati Bell Telephone as the service provider for specified telecommunications services to the University.
Action Items

Mr. Cox:

The Board members have been present at the committee meetings held today and have received the recommendations of the Academic and Student Affairs, the Board-Administration, the Medical Affairs, and the Finance Committees. The items reviewed and recommended by the committees are named in the revised Action Items list at your place. That list includes a revised item on the Board-Administration Committee agenda and the item added to the Finance Committee agenda. I will ask for one motion to approve all of the recommended items. May I have a motion?

Upon motion of Mrs. Heimann, seconded by Dr. Bhati, the Board approved the items recommended by the committees by the following roll call vote:

**Recommendation Nos. 06.1.24.01 through 06.1.24.10 and Nos. 06.1.24.12, 06.1.24.13, 06.1.24.15, and 06.1.24.17**

| AYE: | Mr. Humes, Mr. Cox, Dr. Bhati, Mr. Wyler, Mr. Niehoff, Mrs. Heimann, Mr. Heiman, and Mr. Barrett |
| NAY: | None |
| ABSENT: | None |
| ABSTAIN: | None |

**Recommendation No. 06.1.24.11 (Nomination of J. Wyler/Alliance Board)**

| AYE: | Mr. Humes, Mr. Cox, Dr. Bhati, Mr. Niehoff, Mrs. Heimann, Mr. Heiman, and Mr. Barrett |
| NAY: | None |
| ABSENT: | None |
| ABSTAIN: | Mr. Wyler |
Recommendation No. 06.1.24.14 (UC/Alliance Agreements)

AYE: Mr. Humes, Mr. Cox, Dr. Bhati, Mr. Niehoff, Mrs. Heimann, and Mr. Barrett

NAY: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: Mr. Heiman and Mr. Wyler

Recommendation No. 06.1.24.16 (Lease of Stetson Square)

AYE: Mr. Cox, Dr. Bhati, Mr. Wyler, Mr. Niehoff, Mrs. Heimann, Mr. Heiman, and Mr. Barrett

NAY: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: Mr. Humes

Recommendation No. 06.1.24.18 (Telecommunications Partner)

AYE: Mr. Humes, Dr. Bhati, Mr. Wyler, Mr. Niehoff, Mrs. Heimann, Mr. Heiman, and Mr. Barrett

NAY: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: Mr. Cox

Mr. Cox:

Thank you very much. All items are approved.
Unfinished and New Business

Mr. Cox:

Is there any unfinished business at this time?

There was no unfinished business.

Mr. Cox:

Hearing none, we will move to new business, and that will be the reports from the Board Representatives and Student Trustees. We will call for the Faculty Senate Report—John Cuppoletti.

Dr. Cuppoletti:

Good morning, Mr. Cox, Members of the Board, President Zimpher, and guests.

First, I am pleased to report that the faculty remain in partnership with the administration to make UC|21 our academic plan as a platform for improvement at UC.

Second, my number one directive from the President was to help clarify the decision making process at the university. We have made progress. The President will soon name a working group on committees elected and selected from groups across the university.

Third, we are about to begin our faculty staff fund-raising effort. It was very successful in raising funds and generating solidarity and community across the university last year.

Fourth, we have moved to address the effects of the recent bombing at the Clifton Mosque. We believe that we have helped to calm our students, faculty, and staff and, as
a result, may find new ways for people of different religions and ethnic backgrounds to feel more comfortable here at the university.

Fifth, following a recent Cabinet discussion, the faculty will be playing an enhanced leadership role in diversity issues.

Finally, the Faculty Senate has asked me to welcome to Mr. Barrett as our new member of the Board. Thank you.

Mr. Cox:

Thank you, John. Any questions for John? We will next have the Alumni Association report—Bob Dobbs and Steve Thompson.

Mr. Dobbs:

Thank you, Mr. Cox. I have several pieces of timely good news to share today. This past weekend was a busy one for the Alumni Association. This past Saturday, the Office of Admissions and the Alumni Association hosted alumni for a round of UCART training. You will recall that UCART stands for the University of Cincinnati Alumni Recruitment Teams, which create the opportunity for enthusiastic alumni volunteers to enhance our student recruitment efforts and goes along to support the UC|21 Goal No. 6, Create Opportunities. The group included alumni from Cleveland, Columbus, Indianapolis, Chicago, Jacksonville, Florida, and Cincinnati.

We have been extremely encouraged in our early conversations with our new Athletic Director, Mike Thomas, as we each seek a strong partnership between Athletics and the Alumni Association. Mike has accepted multiple invitations to visit the Alumni Association to share his insights and plans for the future and establish a dialogue with Bearcat Alumni. He and football coach, Mark Dantonio, were with us this past Sunday during our event prior to the UC/Rutgers basketball game. He will return to do the same thing on February 23 prior to the UC/Villanova game. And, he will meet with the Alumni Association Board of Governors next Monday.
In addition, Mike will be with us as we join President Zimpher next month during our annual Florida swing, visiting alumni in Ft. Lauderdale, Sarasota, and Naples and, if time permits, Mike will be scouting potential student athletes who can play both football and basketball.

December was a strong month for donations to the Demakes Legacy Scholarship Fund. This generosity is increasing our ability to touch the families of even more UC alumni and our outstanding UC Legacy students.

I had mentioned in our November meeting that the UC Alumni Association would have a strong presence in Chicago at the annual CASE Conference. That is the Council for Advancement and Support of Education. Our primary presentation was a big success. We essentially told the story of our organizational evolution over the past four years and how we are becoming more strategically aligned with our changing university.

At the conclusion of our presentation, I was approached by Mr. Bob Foreman, who is the former executive director of the University of Michigan Alumni Association and, perhaps, the most respected person in the alumni relations field nationwide. Bob complimented us on our presentation and our work on behalf of UC, and he said he was particularly impressed by such a clear volunteer commitment on the part of our Board of Governors.

We are continuing our work with the Commencement Committee toward enhancing the experience of the UC students who will graduate this coming June. We will again hold the ceremonial dinner for graduates and their parents on the evening before commencement.

And, finally, a reminder that the annual CrossTown HelpOut will take place a week from Saturday, on February 4. We expect about 1200 UC and Xavier students, staff, and alumni to meet in this building at 8:00 a.m., then head out in work groups to
their various worksites around the community to lend their time and efforts. Your UC Alumni Association is proud to coordinate this wonderful community event.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Cox:

Thank you, Bob, for all the good work you all do.

Our next report will be the Student Trustee Report—Jim Masterson.

Mr. Masterson:

Thank you, Chairman Cox. I, too, would like to welcome Mr. Barrett to the Board of Trustees. You and your family have been a most dedicated supporter of the university and, for that, every student has benefited.

Today, I would like to report on GSGA support for student travel, events, and the graduate student trustee selection.

GSGA support for students traveling to conferences to present research has hit an all time high. This past fall, GSGA awarded more than $60,000 for students to help cover the cost of traveling to conferences to present research. For fall quarter of the previous academic year, GSGA supported students with nearly $38,000 which was up only $2,000 from the year before that. We believe through our outreach efforts more students and more departments are becoming aware of our work, and they turn to us to support their research travel needs.

GSGA held a graduate focus forum on November 29. The forum included nearly twenty-five students over the three sessions. From many pages, the responses will be correlated and summed up into reports to be compiled by February 1. A special thanks goes out to the Graduate School, Public Safety, Graduate and Family Housing, and
Parking Services for their support of the forum. Also, thanks goes out to all graduate students who took time out of their evenings to share with us their thoughts and opinions.

On December 2, GSGA held its first graduate mixer at the Catskeller in TUC. More than 250 graduate students showed up for fun and froth at the basement bar. GSGA hopes to hold this every quarter.

The process to select the next graduate student trustee is underway. We have six outstanding nominees from the Law School and the Graduate School. The selection committee, comprised of three graduate students, one Law student, and Professor Lynn Davis, has interviewed half of the nominees and will interview the remaining tonight. Judging from the applications, we are certain to have a most qualified graduate student to replace myself.

That concludes my report. Thank you very much.

Mr. Cox:

Thank you, Jim. We would normally have Nick Furtwengler speak, but I understand he has laryngitis and you will not have the privilege of hearing him this time, but he will be at our next meeting, I am sure.

That brings us to the Student Government Report—Andrew Burke.

Mr. Burke:

Thank you, Chairman Cox. First, let me also welcome Mr. Barrett to the Board on behalf of the undergraduate students. We appreciate your support and we look forward to your service. Thank you very much.

This morning, the Board has voted to approve an increase in overload fee for students. I would not be doing my job if I did not express the displeasure of the students on this issue. I appreciate the fact that my input was heard on every level of this issue,
however, I still do not believe that this issue will achieve the goals outlined in this document. A large portion of honor students have a difficult time double-majoring, and this will force them into an overload situation if they decide to do that. Ohio State has a policy which allows students to take any amount of credit hours over 12 without an overload charge. I would urge that this issue should be revisited if desired results are not achieved. That said, I still think we are making a lot of progress on other initiatives, and the students do appreciate your support on all of our initiatives.

On another note, Student Government has launched Operation Light Up Clifton, in which we hope to raise awareness of poor lighting in the Clifton area. This past Sunday, Student Government members, as well as student volunteers, canvassed the neighborhoods in the Clifton area to collect signatures of Clifton residents. These signatures will be packaged along with case studies and various reports that we are preparing in collaboration with the Department of Public Safety. These reports will then be sent to City Council on behalf of the University of Cincinnati community. Our goal is for the City of Cincinnati to adopt a similar lighting policy to the one that the university has. ‘Operation Light Up Clifton’ has received coverage from various media outlets and we are very pleased with this progress.

Working towards another of our goals to increase the value of every tuition dollar, we have made progress on two different fronts. The first is in a personal money management course which will be available to all students. We hope to have this course available for next fall and, possibly, integrate it into the first year experience.

The second project that we have been working on is through the IUC, or the Inter-University Council, in a partnership with state universities across Ohio. We have been working with the University of Toledo to adopt a state-wide student tuition plan called ‘Think Ohio,’ modeled after a widely successful plan. We hope to provide a unified front for the fight on tuition.
With a little over two and a half months left in my term as Student Body President, I am beginning to plan my transition. Although I do not know who the next Student Body President will be—perhaps I should hire the IPR to predict—I do know what kind of issues that he or she will be facing. These issues are those that affect all students and should be inherent in all Student Government. These are issues of public safety, tuition, and student rights.

We have done an excellent job of laying the foundation this year, and we will do our best to make sure that the success of this year’s student government continues into the years to come.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Cox:

Thank you very much, Andrew.

Is there any other new business to come before the group?

There was no other new business.

Mr. Cox:

I have kind of the bittersweet task of thanking Donna Christos, who is leaving the University of Cincinnati after twenty years. We hate to see her go, but we wish her much success and appreciation for her efforts in her new endeavors. I would like for you to join me in thanking her.

We will now call for an Executive Session. There will be no business conducted at the conclusion of the Executive Session. We expect Executive Session to be brief.

There are two activities planned following the meeting. Jim Tucker and the Recreation Center Staff will give us tours of the new Rec Center, and a reception
welcoming our new Dean of Engineering, Carlo D. Montemagno, is planned at 11:15 a.m. Tours of the new Recreation Center will take place prior to the reception, time permitting, and will also be given after the Reception. We hope you will join us for both of these events.

Our next regular scheduled meeting will be held here at Tangeman Center on March 28. We thank you for being with us today.

**Executive Session**

May I have a motion to enter Executive Session for the purpose of preparing for, conducting, or reviewing negotiations or bargaining sessions with public employees concerning their compensation or other terms and conditions of their employment?

Upon motion of Dr. Bhati, seconded by Mr. Niehoff, the Board voted to enter Executive Session by the following roll call vote:

**AYE:** Mr. Humes, Mr. Cox, Dr. Bhati, Mr. Wyler, Mr. Niehoff, Mrs. Heimann, Mr. Heiman, and Mr. Barrett

**NAY:** None

**ABSENT:** None

The Board prepared for, conducted, or reviewed negotiations or bargaining sessions with public employees concerning their compensation or other terms and conditions of their employment.

Mr. Cox called for a motion to adjourn the Executive Session.

Upon proper motion of and second, the Executive Session adjourned at 10:54 a.m.
Adjournment

There being no further business before the Board, upon proper motion and second, the meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.

___________________________________________
PHILLIP R. COX, CHAIRPERSON

___________________________________________
ANANT R. BHATI, SECRETARY