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The Two Hundred and Ninety-Fourth Session of the Board of Trustees of the University of Cincinnati was opened at 11:20 a.m. on Tuesday, September 22, 2009, in the Russell C. Myers Alumni Center 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.

H.C. Buck Niehoff, Chairperson of the Board of Trustees, presided. Mr. Niehoff asked that roll be called.
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- Gary Heiman

**ALSO PRESENT:**
- Monica Rimai, Interim President;
- Anthony J. Perzigian, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost;
- Michael W. Carroll, Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs;
- Mitchel D. Livingston, Vice President for Student Affairs and Chief Diversity Officer;
Mitchell D. McCrate, General Counsel;  
Carlo Montemagno, Chair for Council of Deans;  
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(Prior to the Board Committee Meeting and the Regular Board Meeting, Chairman Niehoff began the proceedings at approximately 8:30 a.m.)

Mr. Niehoff:

Good morning. I would like to welcome B. J. Zirger as a new faculty representative to the board. Dr. Zirger is an Associate Professor in the College of Business and teaches corporate strategy and technology management. She’s been at UC for 18 years and has served on the Faculty Senate in a number of different positions since 2005. Professor Zirger, is that correct?

Dr. Zirger: It’s Zirger, but that’s close.

Mr. Niehoff:
Dr. Zirger works extensively with other UC colleges including collaborations with Biomedical Engineering, Medicine and the College of Design, Architecture, Art and Planning. She received her PhD in Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management and a MBA from Stanford University. Her Bachelors of Science in Industrial Engineering is from the University of Florida. Prior to her academic career, she worked for Procter and Gamble. I would also mention that she was very instrumental in our exciting Solar House Decathlon Competition in Washington two years ago. We welcome you. Now I’d like to call upon President Rimai.

Report of the Interim President

President Rimai:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning everyone and let me also welcome Dr. Zirger to the board. I have had the privilege of working with B. J. on a number of committees and I know that she will be a terrific addition and we are very pleased to have you.

We have an incredibly full agenda once again this month so let me just briefly touch on a few of our Good News items. As it now has become our practice, we’ve got a list of those things at your table. I’d encourage you to take a look at all the great things that are happening at UC, really too numerous to mention in today’s meeting, but of course, I’d be remiss if I didn’t identify as our #1 best news ever—the identification of Dr. Williams as the 27th President of the University of Cincinnati. Once again thanks to the Search Committee for a terrific job and to the Board for moving us along so quickly, my personal thanks on that last note. *(Laughter)*

Of course, there is great news in the football arena. Three wins is not only great for athletics and the football team, but frankly the entire team has been wonderful ambassadors for the university as a whole. Word is certainly getting out all over the country what a great place the University of Cincinnati is.
In August we announced the formation of UC Health and that is the first step in what will be a number of steps in moving along our Athletic Health Center. I’ll say more about that later in the presentation. I would like to take a moment, in terms of good news, to thank all those who participated in an incredibly successful faculty and staff campaign that raised over $10 million this year. Given everything that is happening out there in the world of campaigns, it is really quite remarkable that we continue to give to ourselves in such a substantial way.

Finally, we recognized our record-setting class on Sunday through Convocation. Thanks to the trustees who were able to attend. It was pretty amazing to see the arena filled by just freshman and it was a great event and we are very excited to start the academic year. So those are the highlights Mr. Chair.

Mr. Niehoff:

The first item on our agenda is a presentation on Financial Aid, Retention Strategies and their Impact on Diversity.

President Rimai:

Well we can go right to that and do the report after it. So, I will introduce that and then…

Mr. Niehoff:

I’m sorry, let’s do the Report Card first.

President Rimai:

You want to do that first?

Mr. Niehoff:

Yes.
We can be nimble.

(Monica Rimai, JD, Interim President of the University of Cincinnati, gave a presentation on the UC|21 Report Card: 2009 Update utilizing the report card website at http://www.uc.edu/reportcard/Sept09/Sept09.htm).

President Rimai:

Well it is, once again, time that we take a look at our numbers to gauge our progress on UC|21, the university’s strategic plan. In light to the timing, I also thought it might be appropriate that at the end I just take a few minutes to update on the board on the six Maintaining the Momentum resolutions that you all passed back in March. So as a part of this report I will do that briefly.

In an era of increasing accountability in higher education I think that it is only appropriate that we every year go back to our metrics and our report card to understand how we are doing and that we do it in a very public way. I should note that our report card has started to get tremendous national attention. Our willingness to rate ourselves on so many different areas and to share it and have a web presence about that has certainly gotten lots of folks attention wondering how we do it. Perhaps most significantly President-Elect Greg Williams has complimented us on our willingness to rate ourselves, so to speak, and to do it in such a transparent manner. It couldn’t be done without the efforts of our Office of Institutional Research led by Lee Mortimer. So thank you so much Lee for your efforts and the efforts of your team and also Marianne Kunnen-Jones who is driving the presentation today, but really is the driver behind us getting this done every year and this presentation.

As it has become our tradition, we have a web version of the report card, but at your place today is the full report. We couldn’t possibly go through all of the eighty metrics that we evaluate our performance on so I will spend time just on the highlights in all six goals, but at the end we will have time for some questions so if you see something that you are interested in and would like to know more, we can get to that as well.
So let’s go to Goal #1. I encourage you to follow along there on the slides if you like:

Placing Students at the Center – We continue to show great improvement in the area of student satisfaction. On the national survey of student engagement, what we call the NSSE survey, our scores from freshman in all categories combined shows marked improvement. I think Marianne is navigating there for us the latest rankings are in white. The chart also shows senior ratings on the right side of the chart as well so you can see that not only are we examining the experiences of freshmen, but also sort of checking back to see how those experiences are doing then when they graduate. So, good news on that front.

One of the areas that we are focusing on increasingly is with regard to retention. Retention really is at the core of our mission and it’s a driver of that all important indicator, graduation rates. We have made slow, but steady progress in this area of 7% since the inception of UC|21. Our retention rates are now at over 84%. I understand from a conversation with Dr. Miller yesterday that a few more students will get us to 85% retention. So Caroline is going to, after this meeting, call each of those students today and make sure (laughter). But this is really quite remarkable even at the over 84%, we are up a percentage point from last year. This is both in retention and graduation rate. This isn’t in an area where you necessarily see big jumps in one year, because the amount of effort in time and understanding to move the needle. The fact that we have done so well so consistently speaks volumes on our commitment in this area.

When we switch to the six year graduation rate which is the metric that we follow very closely, we are holding steady at 55%. But again, just want to say that the longer we experience our time with improved retention rates this will absolutely factor into graduation rates.

I’m going to move very quickly now to Goal #2:
Growing Our Research Excellence – Let me just say that in November, Dr. Sandra Degen who is the Vice President for Research here at UC will be presenting her full report on our research activity including a presentation on the strategic plan. I’m not going to take time here to delve into these statics, but the one that jumps right out at you and the one I would encourage all of you to memorize and share at various family events and cocktail parties is that we have jumped to #23 in research activity among all public research universities in the United States. That is quite remarkable, particularly when you consider that increased funding for research for academic research has only been really in the last eight months or so. A lot of credit goes to our researchers there.

Moving to Goal #3:

Achieving Academic Excellence – A couple of items I would like to highlight here that don’t often get our attention but are very much drivers of the academic quality and experience. The first has to do with graduate student enrollment. Our graduate students are the drivers of our research as well as in many cases how we are viewed in terms of prestige by the rest of the country. So the fact that we have made significant progress in this area and I understand that we are expecting 8,000 graduate students this year which is quite remarkable and so remarkable in fact that I asked Marianne to double check that statistics. Since 2003 our graduate student body has grown over 19%. That speaks volumes on what’s happening frankly at the colleges. That is where the bulk of the strategy for growing research excellence and for attracting more graduate students takes place. Congratulations to all our deans in this area.

The 2\textsuperscript{nd} metric to look and to focus on is the growth in international student enrollment. Not only does this speak to the diversity of the experience here at UC, but it is through bringing all kinds of international experience to this campus that we really increase the robustness of the debate, if you will. This is an area that has had some ups and downs since 2001, but we are pulling close to our target this year at 2,000. It is interesting to add that in our freshman class we have 450 international undergraduate students and that’s up from 280 from last fall. That’s great progress in the area of internationalizing, if you will, the University of Cincinnati.
Moving now to Goal #4:

**Forging Key Relationships and Partnerships** – This is an area that’s always a little bit difficult to measure. How do you put a figure on a partnership? Often times it is far better to look at the quality of relationships so I think you get a better flavor of our strides and go for by reading the achievements that appear under those metrics – I’d encourage you to do that in your printed copy. The one major achievement is the launch of UC Health. This does represent a very significant coming together of University Hospital with our practice plan, UC Physicians, as well as the College of Medicine. This does represent the first step on what I think will probably be a long but very fruitful journey with regard to the positioning of the Academic Health Center. Also as an example of new and/or important improving relationships we opened out second school devoted to the STEM disciplines in partnership with Cincinnati Public Schools and Strive. You may recall that we opened our first school, Taft Elementary School, last year and this year the second opened at Hughes Center right across the street from our campus. When we look at the numbers themselves, I think that if you focus on Service Learning Courses you get a real sense of the commitment the university has to engage with our community. That continues to grow substantially. This year we see 121% growth – we are now up to 126 Service Learning Courses which is quite phenomenal. It takes a dedicated crew of faculty to lead these experiences because they are pretty intense. Something new this year that was added in terms of helping to engage our community is a website that is a special link dedicated to community and business relationships. It’s in its inaugural year and the website has generated, just in this year, more than 81,000 page viewers—obviously of great interest by the business community to engage the great resources of the university.

Moving now to Goal #5:

**Establishing a Sense of Place** – Again this is a metric, another strategic goal here that is a bit difficult to count. We are finding that the number of visitors to Main Street, and in particular the Tangeman University Center and the Campus Recreational Center continues to rise. We are now over 2.1 million people. That’s almost 148% growth since 2003 that have visited these destination sites. Clearly they are a draw to establishing a
sense of community here at UC. Our sense of place is also a consequence, of course, of our web presence. The use of our virtual campus tours online continues to grow and it is interesting to note that we now offer online tours of our campus in multiple languages including Korean, Mandarin Chinese, Spanish, Turkish, Japanese and Italian (that may have something to do with the growth of our international undergraduate students as well). That’s pretty neat.

And finally, Goal #6:

Creating Opportunity – This is a pretty wide category. It includes metrics related to enrollment, our financial situation and diversity. As I alluded to, perhaps earlier with regards to Convocation, when it comes to enrollment there is pretty exciting news. If you saw your newspaper this morning you know that we expect to welcome tomorrow our largest enrollment in 28 years – over 38,700 students. I believe that our folks in Enrollment Services know the names of each and every one of these almost 39,000 students. That represents a 4.4% growth over last year and it includes a record setting freshman class of 6,000 students – the largest in UC’s history – and 1600 more than last fall. I just want to take a moment and acknowledge that our enrollment planning is certainly a university-wide effort. You can’t attract this number of quality students and I should add that if last year was our record setting in terms of the quality of the students, we’ve mirrored that this year. You can’t attract that caliber of student without the efforts of our tremendous faculty and staff, but somebody has to be in charge of herding all of these cats and that task falls to Student Affairs under the leadership of Dr. Livingston and the incredible team that Caroline Miller has assembled. They deserve an enormous amount of credit for this great enrollment story and I would like to extend my personal appreciation for your efforts. Thank you.

So moving on to the financial, it is something that we do focus on quite a lot but it’s worth commenting that there’s lots of different metrics that we can look at, but the one that has become sort of our litmus test for how we are doing as an institution has been our liquidity mark. Here we continue to make very, very important strides. The number that you see in the Report Card is $150 million for our daily cash balance. That’s
on average what we have on hand in cash on a daily basis and that was as of the printing of this Report Card. I thought it was worth checking in on those numbers again and the news is that at the end of August our average daily cash balance stood at $162 million. That’s more than $74 million more than last year at this time. Still a little ways from our goal, but we have made remarkable progress from 2001 or 2003 – something that we all should feel good about.

One final item just to highlight again because it really is about creating opportunity and that has been the successful Faculty Staff Campaign. We experienced a growth of over 14% and in these days that is something also to be very proud of.

The goals around Creating Opportunity include metrics around diversity. There are more than sixty listed. You will note that we don’t have arrows in this particular section and that’s because we don’t keep particular targets around diversity, but we keep a very close, careful eye on our demographics and I would encourage you at your leisure to go through that information and if you have questions I would be happy to address those.

That is a very high-level, pretty rapid overview of the Report Card. I’m going to switch now, very briefly, to speak on our status on the six Maintaining the Momentum Resolutions and then be happy to take questions that you might have about all of these things.

You may recall that one of the resolutions that we passed was a commitment to performance-based budgeting. I’m a firm believer that actions speak far louder than words and this is an area where we talk about how performance-based budgeting wasn’t simply a commitment to a particular budgeting model, but in fact, a commitment to doing business in a particular way – a very transparent way, an open way, an accountable way in which we would invite the community in to participate. Marianne has gotten us to a portal which happens right now to be a portal into the Employee Self Service. I think at some point we’ll move that, but it is where we go to get into our information about performance-based budgeting. You’ll see there that there is information about primers.
This is basically a tool that folks can use to understand how we do performance-based budgeting at UC. And then we have templates – these were the documents that were used to generate our particular budget that we presented to you in June and ultimately were able to approve in July. The real excitement has to do with the web reports. This is the roll up for where we stand with regard to our budget as of September 17th. What I really like about this tool, and this is a tool anybody could use to see how we’re doing, is that it is really straightforward. It talks about our revenue, our direct expenditures, our indirect expenditures, it presents what the budget proposed, it talks about where we should be at this point, it then compares the budget version to where we think we should be to where we actually are, and then calculates the variance. That is as straightforward a tool to know how we are doing at any given time in our budget as anything UC has ever used. The fact that it’s available in this particular all-university roll up really ought to be available to anyone here at UC. There is a version of this that is also available for every unit on campus. We’re not going to pull that up right now. That access is a little bit more restricted as it should be. But the point here is that everyone can know how we’re doing. I think that is as strong an example of how we are moving forward on performance-based budgeting as any we could give. I am really excited about that and I know that is a little bit weird and I think it is quite remarkable.

Our next resolution, you may recall, was advancing the best interest of the Academic Health Center and I have now referenced several times the creation and announcement of UC Health. I think this is more than just a marketing tool. To some extent that is how it has been portrayed, but really it is a wrapper around an effort to bring about more efficiencies, economies of scale, and cooperation among these three units that is UCP, University Hospital and the College of Medicine. That can only bring great things to our community. But admittedly, it is only a first step on what will be a very long road to better positioning the Academic Health Center and frankly improving the healthcare outcomes not just for the city, but for the region and the state. It continues to be a work in progress.
The next resolution had to do with collegiate restructuring. Dr. Perzigian is going to speak to that a little bit later in the board meeting. We have been very busy and, in particular, Dr. Perzigian will be able to speak to some great progress when it comes to the merger of the College of Applied Science with the College of Engineering. Thanks to your leadership, Tony, for moving this complex process along.

I mentioned to you with regards to our strategic plan around research that Sandra Degen will be presenting that plan to all of you in November. That plan was in draft form sometime around May and has been “making the rounds” in terms of input. I think that anyone who has had any issues at all in research here at UC has had an opportunity to provide input and have that incorporated into the strategic plan. So you will hear that rollout in November so good progress there.

We had two resolutions that really spoke to continued commitment to community engagement. One was related to Strive. Strive, through the great work of our College of Education, has just finished a strategic plan to layout the next steps for those next few years. I think that perhaps some of you may be aware and this is really quite exciting that the Strive concept here in Cincinnati has gotten national attention. Over the last several months there are folks in Houston, Indianapolis, Virginia, as well as New York City that have reached out to the Strive group trying to figure out how we did what we’ve done and to replicate that. So clearly it is a model that is worth sustaining; and, according to other cities, worth pursuing.

With regards to other forms of community engagement, I think the most obvious statement as to what we’ve been up to thus past summer is on the corner of Short Vine and Martin Luther King. There is a construction site that eventually, dependent on construction schedules, will be a new Hampton Hotel that will include some retail space as well as significant parking. This is a product of a joint effort that is sponsored by the Uptown Consortium and so it’s not just UC’s interest and pushing that has gotten this project out of the ground, but rather our partners at the Uptown Consortium including
Tri-Health and Children’s Hospital. So there’s been a lot of good work around community development.

Our work on Agenda 360 continues. Right now, similar to the report card metrics that we have for our strategic plan, Agenda 360 folks through a variety of different committees are trying to develop a series of metrics that can be used to evaluate the progress of economic development in this region. On every single one of those committees there is a UC person who is either leading the effort or is part of the effort. I think that you can see that we’ve been pretty busy since March. A lot of good news, a lot of progress but momentum is something that you don’t just start and stop. In order to continue you have to continue the work. I’m very pleased to say that whether we look at the results of the report card or we look at the work that we’ve done under those six Maintaining the Momentum resolutions, I am very pleased to be able to pass the torch to Dr. Williams in November because the torch is really kind of the head of a train that’s full steam ahead. So with that I’d be very please to answer any questions that you might have.

Mr. Niehoff:
Questions or comments?

Dr. Suidan:
In the budget it shows a minus $15 million for the university scholarships and fellowships. What does that mean?

President Rimai:
Where’s Jim. I’m really bad about pulling out these numbers. Give us a line here and we’ll see if we can’t explain.

Dr. Suidan:
It’s a negative $15 million for university fellowships and scholarships.
Mr. Plummer:

That’s on the revenue side. That’s an expenditure...inaudible...because it’s money that’s used...inaudible...

President Rimai:

Good question and good answer. Other questions? Yes.

Mr. Chesley:

Monica, this increase in enrollment, and the whole report is impressive, thank you. The increase in enrollment is clearly due to two things I think. I want to figure out how we can utilize this to keep tuition steady.

Mr. Barrett:

Stan, can you use a microphone?

Mr. Chesley:

Oh, I’m sorry. Yes. In a meeting on Sunday with the governor, very intrigued with the concept of freezing tuition and we did that and he is very complimentary of that. What I’d like to do with the legislature and the governor is to try to quantify how that has impacted the increase in our enrollment by (very difficult to do but it would be very, very important to show the degree that a combination of the economy, it shows the importance of state schools particularly UC) the reduction of the economy affecting high-priced education in the private sector coupled together with the freeze of tuition and what that meant not only to new students but retention of our other students. And, I’m wondering with all these great things that we could produce a very small, it’s not going to be scientifically correct, but it’s got some impact here particularly with the legislature and the governor where they are in a bipartisan way of why the importance for higher education to keep the freeze on in tuition and why at the end of the day that makes the University of Cincinnati particularly in the state schools much more important and potent. If we could get a small report, I mean I can see what you can do with report cards and numbers, I would love to generate something like that with the understanding and
you could put large footnote on it that it’s very difficult to do it with total accuracy. I think that is a phenomenal package that we could show. I’m sure it’s probably being reflected in other state schools, but that freeze of tuition, I think, is very, very dramatic because we have really been moving toward a Hamiltonian system on education because of costs, particularly when there a multiple siblings in a family. Is it possible that we could generate such a thing and send it to the governor and the speaker of the house and the majority leader of the senate?

President Rimai:

Well we’re a university and we’re the University of Cincinnati so it’s always possible, but you’re right – it’s difficult for us because there are so many components…

Mr. Chesley:

_Inaudible_…those components because the numbers are dramatic. We are talking about in a downside of the economy and there must be some way to reflect the combination of our tuition being stabilized, frozen, so that we could market this concept to this legislature and the governor in 2011 and 2012.

President Rimai:

I think that it is multi-faceted, we know that. To slice out a particular component would be a challenge, but it certainly worth looking at. I think it’s an important point because these individual students also come with significant costs. The tension between increasing enrollment and managing costs is an enormous challenge and we will speak to that later with the resolution that you’ll have before you so I would agree that it’s an argument we need to keep making with the legislature so that state support can offset the impact that freezing tuition has on the university.

Mr. Chesley:

But the perfect time to do it would be right now based upon the success of our enrollment and let’s at least take the advantage of the frozen tuition together with the continued support of the state so that we can..._inaudible_...because this result, I think,
needs to be reflected...inaudible...with the understanding that there are other considerations. But that this is very, very dramatic and it encourages the legislature and the governor to continue taking the position of the importance of higher education in our state because we had really been lacking in the last few years.

Mr. Niehoff:

Other questions, comments? Thank you. Now we will do the Institutional Aid, Retention Strategies and their Impact on Diversity presentation. Dr. Livingston.

President Rimai:

Well these folks are moving, and as I’m introducing I will make quick work of it. You may recall that at our June Board meeting there were a number of questions about scholarships and financial aid and its relationship to the success of students of color. This presentation is meant to stimulate more conversation and hopefully answer some of your questions. I think that you will conclude as I have that financial support for our students is really very important and a key component, but only one component, to the story of student success. I think something to keep in mind is that we all embrace that notion and that’s very much reflected in our focus in the Proudly Cincinnati campaign. Of the total $1 billion goal for Proudly Cincinnati, $227 million of that – the single largest focus, is on raising our scholarship dollars. That would triple what we currently spend, what we have spent in the recent past, and more than double what our budget is in the general funds for scholarship support. The other good news is that we have already raised about $64 million towards that $227 million. A long road to go down no doubt, but given the numbers that we are going to be presenting to you a significant improvement in where we are in terms of general funds support. We have in front of you in the pile of documents that we’ve put together a Fact Sheet and I’d encourage you to take that with you. You can see that our total amount of scholarship support is at $111 million. We break that down this way. Approximately $67.7 million is from our general fund and goes toward tuition discounting, putting it just behind salaries and debt service as the third biggest component of our general funds budget. You’ll also see in that Fact Sheet that a significant part of our scholarship support goes to graduate support – our graduate
scholarships and graduate stipends. This presentation is not going to focus on graduate support. We could do that if you are interested at another time, we’re really going to focus on the undergraduate component. I do want to emphasize that it is the support of our graduate students that helps those incredible research numbers that helps the quality of the experience, the prestige of the institution and so it is a valuable kind of thing. The last thing that I want to say before turning the topic over to our presenters is that this concept of student success is pretty complicated. Getting more students here and through graduation is something that while finance impacts on it, things like preparedness, the ability to access the institution and other institutions, hard choices between where to put our general funds support, all of those things weigh into the conversation. It is absolutely worth turning our attention to the issue of scholarships, financial aid, and its impact on student success particularly students of color. It’s important that we also step back and understand that it fits into a fairly complicated regime and that it often involves some challenging choices in figuring out what drives the success for any particular group of students. We have three experts, two in particular who spend a lot of time focused on student success here to talk to you about how all of these things fit together. I think that Dr. Miller is going to start us off and give us a general lay of the land. Then Dr. Nelson will follow up with a discussion regarding success factors, and Dr. Livingston will summarize—so take it away Caroline.

(Dr. Miller: Thank you, President Rimai. This is kind of a high level look at where we are with undergraduate scholarship aid. If there were such a thing as an average student, the average undergraduate would receive $1,140 in institutional aid. Of course there is no
such thing as the average student, particularly at UC. 84% of our uptown freshmen receive some sort of financial aid. 51% receive institutional aid.

The roughly $34.2 million awarded to undergraduates works toward the attainment of many goals. This is really an over simplification of the aid picture, but it was one that we tried to present for you to make the position more clear. Approximately $7 million of the $34.2 million is awarded solely on the basis of financial need. That doesn’t mean that these students aren’t also meritorious, but the objectives behind the aid at providing income and financial support to low income students. $10.5 million is directed to targeted populations. I’m not going to speak to the Athletics piece today, but most of the rest is awarded generally around initiatives identified through our STM process as ways to grow our undergraduate population. One of particular note is the UC Global project which is aid directed at international students. The largest piece, $16.7 million, is awarded generally on the basis of merit, though 27% of our students are Pell eligible a significant portion of these dollars also go to needy students. With the exception of the college program based dollars, one can generally categorize these awards as being directed at our crafting the class project. College-based dollars, while some of them are directed at incoming students, are largely directed at rewarding the academic success of our students as they achieve sophomore, junior and senior status. The programs listed in black are generally paid out of general funds although there is some crossover. The ones in red are primarily funded through gifts, endowment, and designated funds.

Since the request for this conversation started around a presentation that addressed issues around the gap in terms of success in terms of our students of color as compared to majority students, we thought it was important to show you the intersection of how these dollars work. Nationally there is a performance gap. It’s been studied widely by Lumina, by the College Board and many others. There is also a gap at the University of Cincinnati and I am going to show you that on the next slide. But before we go there I would like to talk about this. When we look at this gap we learn two things. First, our students of color who are awarded merit scholarships retain and graduate at
roughly the same levels as white students who are awarded scholarships. We did this by looking both at our Darwin T. Turner program and our Cincinnatus Scholar program and looking at the retention rate of students awarded through both of those programs. But equally important, when we look at our two large centrally awarded need-based programs we find a very interesting phenomenon. Certainly need-based aid helps the retention of all students, but it helps the retention of students of color even more than with white students. So, it is a very important part of our enrollment strategy to try to balance this in terms of achieving an ever improving entering class and meeting the economic needs of our students with financial need.

This is a little complicated. I’m going to start here and you can see this is the retention rate. The red line is white students and the gray line is African American Students. We didn’t put in Asian and Hispanic students into these, both because the ends are low, but they also mask some of the issue around our African American students. I think our performance here in terms of retention is pretty dramatic for our African American students over time. You can see last year there is not a hugely significant difference in terms of retention of African American students and white students. And, we expect that number to be very similar with the class when we cut the numbers in a couple of weeks. The graduation levels have not seen the same dramatic increase. But, before you draw a conclusions in terms of that please note that this graduation rate here relates to this entering class so as we have seen this dramatic improvement in recent years in terms of African American students we fully expect the graduation rate of that cohort to be improved. I’m now going to turn this over to my colleague Kristi Nelson who’s going to talk about the intersection of graduation rates and financial aid and retention.

Dr. Nelson:

Thank you, Caroline. It is important to reinforce our investment in student aid with appropriate best practices in student and academic support services. I’m going to talk about some of these measures here with this slide. Whether it is need-based or merit-based aid, research shows that if you want to help those most at risk, however you define that, you address problematic conditions or implement quality solutions that help all
students. In doing so, those most at risk also benefit the most. With this in mind, we have designed a summer orientation program focused on issues that students most need to understand to start college on the right foot and we made it mandatory. We also strongly encouraged parents to attend. This is most helpful since 45% of our students are first generation. Students are required to enroll in core English and Math students consistent with their placement scores. Starting where one is academically prepared is a critical piece of success. First year experience and great beginnings help students make UC feel more manageable. Thirty percent of our new students are the only students who enroll in UC from their high school. Most colleges now deploy mandatory first year advising and advising for students on probation. This intrusive process helps assure that students enroll appropriately. With 15,000 courses there are a lot of choices. Some of you may be familiar with a phrase that used to be current around here called the UC Shuffle which means being passed from one office to the next. Well, our One Stop Center is our solution to this formerly frustrating bureaucratic behavior. In our One Stop Center we have cross trained university service associates that assist students with registration, billing and financial aid issues. It is in One Stop where we can solve some of our students’ financial aid problems through financial aid guidance and gap aid.

The research also demonstrates that students who integrate or get engaged in their campus communities earn better grades, retain, and express higher levels of satisfaction with their campuses. We also know that different kinds of support are more impactful for some groups of students than others. Our success strategy suggests that all student benefits from these strategies. In general, students at the lower end of academic preparedness scale benefit the most from academic integration strategies and stronger students benefit more through social integration strategies. As we look to improve and refine our admissions criteria we need to keep these two factors in mind.

Sometimes it is important to target student groups specifically. On a predominately white campus, students of color may feel isolated. Thus, BASE is a mentoring program that pairs upper classmen with new students to help them get connected to UC. You know about our Pride Grant being a financial grant, but with it
also comes an advisor who helps these students in many ways much like a social worker. Undecided students are also more at risk than those students who have declared a major and thus we have established a Center for Exploratory Studies which provides resources to students who are searching for a major and an academic home. Transfer students are also at greater risk than native students. In recent years you will remember that we have tried to make UC a destination for transfer students and with this in mind we have established the Transfer and Lifelong Learning Center and this particular center helps our transfer students in adjusting to UC and finding an appropriate academic home.

This slide shows our success in our retention efforts and we are very proud of the progress we have made on the retention of our undergraduate students. We believe the combination of targeted financial assistance and quality student support services has to a large extent created this success story. Please remember that this initiation of minimum admissions standards did not happen until 2006. It has also helped that tuition increases slowed and then stopped and that has helped many families as well. We are projecting that the class that started in 2008 will achieve a retention rate between 84-85%. This is just really tremendous progress on the retention effort. With this in mind, I’ll turn the podium over to Vice President Livingston.

Dr. Livingston:

In summary, this success story that we've briefly shared with you today reinforces the results of two national surveys that we participate in. UC participates in the National Survey on Student Engagement also known as NESSE and the Student Satisfaction Survey. NESSE shows increasing levels of student engagement on our campus over time and the Student Satisfaction Survey shows increasing and comparatively high levels of student satisfaction. Contrary to national data, our African American students in particular express higher levels of satisfaction than their white peers. We are indeed creating a culture of success here at UC for all of our students.

As you can see from this slide, student success is complicated and it cannot be attributed to one variable. It is, in fact, the results of a combination of factors. In
institutions retention and graduation rates are largely a function of the institutional and student profile as much a function of what the university is as what it does. As a result, input such as academic preparedness, socio-economic status and the like matter greatly. Likewise, investment in and placement of institutional aid are strategic decisions that have a huge impact on student success and, as well, our campus demographics. Thus, the deployment of aid, absent a commitment to appropriate student and academic services, will diminish the impact of investments that we have made in all our students. There are hard choices that we will have to make ahead and many demands that are placed on limited resources. Given the high level of UC students’ unmet need, growing these kinds of resources through Proudly Cincinnati is absolutely critical. The gains that we have made to create a culture of success are a significant part of the solution that we pursue. In their recent book “Crossing the Finish Line: Completing College at America’s Public Universities” the authors conclude, and I quote, “Institutions that create higher expectations of student success or what we call a culture of success have higher graduation rates and more successful students however you define that.” Our commitment to excellence and diversity and creating a culture of success is the strategy that we have chosen to pursue as an urban research extensive university with a proud history of access and a proven track record of student success. We believe that our future is bright if we can only continue our current momentum. However, current successes will be challenged by funding constraints and thus it will necessitate enhanced support from Proudly Cincinnati. At this point we would be happy to answer any questions that you have.

Mrs. Heimann:

How do our graduation rates compare with the other state schools? Do we have a slide on that?

Dr. Miller:

I don’t have a slide today, but our graduation rate trails Ohio State and Miami and I guess, OU, but it exceeds most of the other public institutions in the state.
Mrs. Heimann:

By a lot? Percentage wise?

Dr. Miller:

Percentage wise in terms of where we trail Ohio State and Miami, Ohio State’s graduation is about 66% and Miami’s is about 80%.

Dr. Livingston:

And, it’s important to note once again that when you control for the inputs, higher levels of activity and the like, you get better outputs as well. We have embarked on an aggressive program increasing our admissions standards and we’ll achieve similar results for us here at the University of Cincinnati. So that gap will close over time.

Dr. Nelson:

As I mentioned in my comments, 2006 was the year that we initiated our admissions standards so 2010 and 2011 we should start to see the graduation rate grow.

Mr. Richardson:

So, are you saying that Miami and Ohio State started their admissions standards longer and they raised them higher than we did?

Dr. Miller:

Ohio State went on an aggressive admission standard change, I think, thirteen years ago. Miami’s standards have been, you know that Miami is known as the Harvard of the Midwest, their standards have been pretty high for a long time.

Mr. Richardson:

What about, and to add another similar question that Sandy asked, getting comparable data to see the amount of scholarships provided as far as the percentage of where we are at with comparable colleges. I think that would be very helpful if we had that and to really try to break it down in measurable, comparable terms the percent of our
general fund, what’s used to provide for students, how do we provide for students of color as far as the percentage as compared to other comparable colleges. I think that is where we need to measure where we at.

Dr. Miller:

We can get you that data.

Mr. Richardson:

Okay.

President Rimai:

And I should say that a fair amount of this comparative data on graduation rates and retention and those things, if you dive into the Report Card you can find all of that. We just didn’t put it into paper. Other questions?

Mr. Chesley:

Yes. I know that we are into retention, but part of the retention is our population. For example, I note in our African American student head count we are down by about 1% in 2003 as opposed to rising in that. The same thing is true in the percentage of African American faculty. It appears to me that there has been no growth, this is just an observation, there’s been no growth in fulltime faculty African American in 2003 of 3.7% and it is 3.7%. My question is, is one of the issues of attracting African American students related in any way to a percentage of African American faculty.

Dr. Livingston:

There is a lot of anecdotal information in the literature that speaks to that. Essentially what we find is a very high correlation between the number of fulltime African American faculty and the enrollment of African American students as well. I am yet to find a study that says that there is a cause and effect relationship, but there is a very high correlation between the two. You’re absolutely right, too. We have plateaued as it relates to African American…
Mr. Chesley:

We have what?

Dr. Livingston:

Plateaued as it relates to the number of African American faculty and that is a target area for us in our efforts at enhancing growth and retention.

Mr. Chesley:

My belief is that Ohio State is much larger as is Toledo, Akron, I can’t speak, but Miami has always been consistently low. Is this an issue that directly or indirectly impacts retention?

Dr. Livingston:

We believe that it does. Who teaches in the classroom is a big factor and again, we don’t have the data that would speak conclusively to the cause and effect, but we do think there is a relationship there.

Mr. Chesley:

I just, in comment, believe that in seven years the fact that it has plateaued or gone down as to students and faculty is something that I think we should seriously look at particularly from the standpoint of retention.

Dr. Livingston:

With respect to our diversity effort, we’ve identified that as the highest area of concern that we have. We have dedicated resources that would allow us to secure a person who is primarily responsible for the recruitment and retention of faculty of color.

President Rimai:

One of the reasons that we keep this information and we look at it regularly is because it helps us manage our resources better. I think there has been a concerted effort,
particularly on the faculty recruitment side, to address the issue of the diversity of our faculty. It’s not all, you know, a story about patting ourselves on our back, it is really a tool, a diagnostic tool to help us understand how to better manage the resources that we have.

Mr. Wyler:

Mitch, is there a national standard on public institutions of African American Faculty?

Dr. Livingston:

A standard?

Mr. Wyler:

Yes, as a percentage of the faculty.

Dr. Livingston:

Not that I’m aware of.

Dr. Miller:

We have benchmarked the UC profile both of faculty and students against several different groups and what I am about to say, I think, is unfortunate from a national perspective, but for Research I institutions our profile actually beats most institutions. Now that’s a sad note, but it happens to be true.

Mr. Wyler:

Okay, because it seems to me that since I’ve been on this board that that has been a focus of the institution is to try to recruit more African American faculty. For whatever reason, we haven’t been getting to those higher levels.

Dr. Livingston:
Both to recruit and retain – both of those are very critical. But when you say standard, I don’t know that there’s a national standard on that, but I do know that we outperform others even if the performance level is very low.

Mr. Wyler:

I misspoke. I probably should have said national average and we’re exceeding the national average?

Dr. Livingston:

Yes. It’s a very challenging environment out there in terms of the availability pool. In many respects we are competing with other institutions and we’re paying for faculty to attract them away from an Ohio State or some other place.

Mr. Wyler:

The supply and demand curve there is in place and if you have a good one, someone wants to steal it for a higher price?

Dr. Livingston:

Yes.

Mr. Wyler:

That’s what I thought.

Mr. Niehoff:

Other questions or comments?

Mr. Humes:

Mr. Chairman, I really think that we have a situation here the really represents one of the great successes of our university over the last seven years. I think that we should be very proud. I think hearty congratulations go to Dr. Livingston and his team. If you look at the growth of our retention rates, the new programs that have been added in terms
of the summer orientation, the One Stop Center. We’ve had them for a few years and we take them for granted now. But if we go back to when we didn’t have them, the difference in life on campus is so remarkable for the student experience. I think that is showing up not only in retention, but I think that combined with what has happened with the rebirth to our campus physically has combined to enhance our enrollment. I really think that while there are certainly are challenges, and also I should say that I believe that we have had a significant focus on increasing financial aid to students through fundraising and through various sources. I really think there has been a great focus on that at many levels and I think that has resulted in significant increases. I think we should celebrate this. I think this is something that has really enhanced our university tremendously and I would like to congratulate everyone involved with this and the other people on your team.

President Rimai:

Thank you. Well I suppose this is an excellent segue to our next presentation given our focus on fundraising in the last presentation. Mr. Jeff Williams is here from the UC Foundation to give us a report on the activities of the Foundation over this last year.

(Jeffrey P. Williams, Chairman, UC Foundation Board of Trustees, gave the following presentation on The UC Foundation Annual Report on the Progress of UC’s Fundraising Program.)

Mr. Williams:

Good morning, I’m Jeff Williams, Chairman of The University of Cincinnati Foundation. Interim President Rimai and Members of the Board of Trustees, good morning. I want to begin this morning by expressing my appreciation for your support for the Foundation and its efforts at raising private support for the university throughout the year. This morning I offer my annual report on behalf of the UC Foundation for the FY2009. In addition, I’m standing in for my good friend and Convening Proudly Cincinnati Co-Chair Otto Budig, who would normally be here to provide you with a campaign update. Unfortunately, due to the press of business, he couldn’t be with us
today so I’ll combine his regular campaign report with my annual summary on our fundraising successes and challenges.

I’d like to begin by sharing this past year’s private support totals. In spite of the depth of the economic downturn and the extreme turbulence in the investment markets that has been with us through the past eighteen months, those of us involved in attracting private support to UC have had a successful year. Total private support for FY 2009 stands at $91,340,362. These numbers represent indeed a drop from last year’s record fundraising total, but still demonstrate a strong, stable base of support among university alums and friends. In terms of dollars raised, FY 2009 is our fourth most successful fundraising year in UC’s history. Notably and in the face of such troubling economic times, we continue to see substantive growth in the number of donors who gave to the university. The past year’s donor count of 32,722 is an increase of 1235 donors or nearly 4% over FY 2008. We are very proud of these numbers and while it’s impossible to predict what the future holds, we believe they keep us on track to reach Proudly Cincinnati’s ambitious goal of $1 billion goal by June 30, 2013.

Turning to Proudly Cincinnati our campaign – during the past year we marked several notable accomplishments and achievements surrounding it. Many of you helped celebrate the public launch of the campaign last October in Fifth Third Arena where we celebrated the new $1 billion campaign goal and more than 463 million gifts on hand as the campaign went public. It’s important to remember that more than $84 million was raised through the generosity of this board and the UC Foundation board. Such a display of personal generosity provides impetus for us to meet with alums and friends of the university and ask for support. Once again, thank you for your personal gifts to the campaign. We also enjoyed three regional campaign lunches in the spring and early summer which provided increased exposure for the campaign and brought the energy and spirit of the campaign launch to alums in other cities. The first regional event took place on April 16th in New York and was hosted by regional co-chair Dick Thornburgh and an able crew of volunteers. The next campaign launch took place in May in Chicago at Arlington Park Race Course with the leadership of regional chair Bob Fealy. On June
18th, the campaign launched in Washington, D.C. at the University Club with the support of area chairman Todd DeGarmo. I attended all of these events and they were truly wonderful, spectacular events with a tremendous amount of enthusiasm and volunteers coming out of the walls. They were all really terrific. These areas show some of the greatest potential for major gift support outside of the tri-state region. Increased energy and resources focused on these areas is already paying dividends. We’ve seen $9.1 million from donors in New York City, $5.8 million from donors in Chicago, and $4.2 million from donors in Washington, D.C. Finally, we also celebrated surpassing the halfway mark of the campaign in early summer. We celebrated this success with the surprise ceremony where a DAAP staff member, Jim Berns, was honored for making the specific gift which pushed Proudly Cincinnati past the $500 million mark. Currently the campaign progress stands at $522.7 million through August 31st of this year.

I personally am extremely pleased with how the first four years of the campaign have unfolded. While there certainly are some challenges on the horizon, we are confident that the campaign will be successful and we will reach our goal by 2013. Before I speak more about these challenges, I have one last bit of good news to share. President Rimai had referred to this earlier, I wanted to remind you of the record breaking results of this year’s faculty staff campaign. As I’ve told you several times before, I think this is one of the most amazing signs of generosity that the faculty and staff continually, year after year, raise more money than they did the year before and persuade more of their fellows to participate in their campaigns. We utilized the new peer-to-peer fundraising approach that allowed faculty and staff to serve as captains of their departments, programs, or units and set up fundraising web pages on the Proudly Cincinnati website. The web pages allowed the leaders to share updates with their donors, email others to ask them to get involved, and track their team’s progress toward the fundraising goal. This new approach combined with the work of the previous faculty staff campaigns resulted in a new level of success. 2765 current and retired faculty and staff contributed $10.4 million to this campaign. That’s a 22% increase in the number of donors despite the economic downturn and $1.3 million more than last year’s effort.
Now, although there has been very much to celebrate over the past year we’ve also faced unprecedented challenges. The economic downturn has impacted almost every aspect of our lives. This is certainly true for fundraising. While there are signs the economy is beginning to stabilize, the slowdown has had ramifications for the Foundation—the most obvious being felt in smaller gifts. Beyond that, the turbulent stock market has taken a major toll on the value of UC’s endowment. In the short term, this means endowed funds have less money to pay out for their given purposes and in the long term the weakened stock market means fewer resources for the Foundation. The support we have received from the university and Interim President Rimai has been unswerving. Through good stewardship of our resources, the Foundation has steadily built up reserves during the solid years to weather downturns just such as this. The Foundation’s Finance and Operations Committee anticipated the shortfall that we have actually experienced making sure there were opportunities to make midyear adjustments to avoid as much damage as possible. Regarding our budget situation, Foundation leadership has few good options in FY 2010. Decisions were made to cut salaries by 3.84%, that’s the mathematical equivalent of 10 days of furlough and reduce the UCF retirement fund match to a 1 to 1 ratio. Fortunately, we didn’t have to eliminate any positions, something that would have been extremely detrimental to the continuity that is so critical to our development efforts. In addition, a hiring frost has been instituted meaning that only positions deemed vital to the Foundation operations and development efforts will be filled. Needless to say, we remain committed to the successful completion of the Proudly Cincinnati campaign. Opportunities are present even in difficult times and it is up to us to work hard every day to identify those chances. We appreciate the hard work of those serving on this board as well as the collaborations between fundraisers and the academic and university leadership.

Before I leave the podium, I want to offer some personal reflection. As many of you know, I will be stepping down from the role as Chairman of the Foundation as of the end of October. I intend to remain active as a trustee, but I hope by institutionalizing the role of Foundation Chairman that we will provide for the continued energy and fresh ideas that inevitable comes with the ascension of new able leadership. To that end,
nearly a year ago, the Foundation board created and filled the role of Vice Chairman with an eye to having that individual taking on the role of Chairman this fall. The UCF board appointed Steve Wilson, who I will ask to stand up—he is back there and many of you know him and those of you who do not, this is Steve Wilson—and for the past year Steve and I have been working closely together on any matter that needed board attention. As of our October meetings, Steve will take the gavel and I must say I am very pleased with the choice the UCF board made. His deep experience in all the organizational issues that come with building substantial capabilities that we aspire to see at the Foundation, coupled with his deep love for the university, promise to be just the combination that we need in the UCF chairman’s role. Finally, I want to personally thank the University of Cincinnati’s board for being both accessible and supportive, for finding the time to be part of our fundraising efforts, and for providing the wise continuity that has resulted in the university being so incredibly well positioned in the community, the region, and in the world of higher education. It’s always foolish to acknowledge particular individuals at a time like this, but nonetheless I would like to offer special thanks to the two board chairs with whom I’ve been privileged to work and who are here with us today. I want to thank them specifically for their openness and friendship during this time. Jeff Wyler and Buck Niehoff, thank you very much for your friendship and cooperation. I would like to thank my many friends on the senior staff and among the deans for your patience in trying to teach me “how things are done” within the academy. These past eight years as vice chairman, co-chairman, and finally chairman have been amongst the most rewarding of my life. Having the opportunity to continue building the capabilities of this enterprise and to help drive the results from year-to-year have provided unique opportunities to give back to this university that’s been so important to me. As I approach this important personal threshold, I hope you can understand why it is so natural for me to tell everybody that I see that I’m Proudly Cincinnati. Thank you.

(Applause).

President Rimai:

Before we let Jeff go, I think he deserves another moment of recognition. Jeff has redefined the concept of volunteerism and support of one’s alma mater. I think he has set
a standard that will be difficult for many to meet, although I think Steve is well positioned to do so and we are grateful for your willingness to take on the mantle. Not only has the university benefited monetarily in terms of Jeff’s leadership in the campaign, but frankly his dogged determination to move the Foundation forward in support of the best interests of the university has been phenomenal. We recognize that in part when at this last graduation we honored Jeff with an honorary degree, but really there is really no way to express our gratitude for your efforts Jeff. We are most grateful and we appreciate your leadership over the course of the last several years. Thank you very much. (Applause).

Mr. Chesley:

I’ve probably had the shortest period of time to work with Jeff, but I want to thank him for everything that he has done and particular yeoman work that he has done in the last several months relative to the Search Committee. It was incredibly detailed and incredibly important and I for one, am very, very proud and I know this entire board is very, very proud and don’t leave us, okay? You may not be the chairman anymore, but we certainly do need you.

Mr. Niehoff:

Thank you, Stan. Well said. Now we will begin our committee meetings. The first meeting will be the Academic and Student Affairs Committee followed by the Finance and Administration Committee. I would like to call upon Chairman Humes for the Academic and Student Affairs Committee.

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 9:47 a.m.; the meetings concluded at 11:20 a.m.
THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees was convened at 11:20 a.m. and, as noted on the first page (page 1) of these minutes, roll call was taken.

Approval of the Minutes of the June 23, 2009 Regular Board Meeting; July 23, 2009 Special Board Meeting; August 18, 2009 Special Board Meeting; September 8, 2009 Special Board Meeting; and September 9, 2009 Special Board Meeting

Mr. Niehoff called for additions, corrections, or deletions to the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees of June 23, 2009 and the Special Meetings of the Board of Trustees of July 23, 2009, August 18, 2009, September 8, 2009 and September 9, 2009. Upon motion of Mr. Barrett; seconded by Mr. Richardson, the minutes were approved as distributed.

Report of Summer Powers

Mr. Niehoff:

I would like to report the Summer Powers actions. The report is in your Board materials under the tab that is so designated. The recommendations were approved by the President and the appropriate Board Committee Chairperson or the Board Chairman pursuant to the authority delegated in paragraph (B)(3) of University Rule 3361:10-1-01, which provides for approval of actions during the summer recess of the Board.

Those specific recommendations are:

- Authorization to Enter into Lease Agreement with Batavia, LLC
- Resolutions Confirming the Status of the University as a Participating Entity in the Health Alliance

I would like to ask Mitch McCrate to comment briefly on these two items.

Mr. McCrate:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Very briefly, the first of these items was a proposed lease agreement for classroom space and office space for Clermont College. That lease,
in fact, has not been entered into because they have not reached agreement on economic terms so it may not be entered into at all so that item is still pending. The second is simply an affirmation by the board that the university was a participating entity in the Health Alliance for FY 2008/2009. This had been a request by the Health Alliance on behalf of their external auditors for purposes of getting audited financial statements.

Mr. Niehoff:

Any questions or comments?

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 and the Finance and Administration Committee at their respective meetings held on September 22, 2009, prior to the Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Academic and Student Affairs Committee Recommendations

09.09.23.01 ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

Synopsis: Appointments of Faculty and Academic Administrators

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the academic appointments of faculty identified in the attached document. These recommendations have been approved by the appropriate departments, colleges, and offices of the Vice President for Health Affairs and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

Appointment

Yong Kim, PhD  Head, Department of Finance  College of Business  Effective: September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2013

Kay Kinoshita, PhD  Department Head  Department of Physics  McMicken College of Arts and Sciences  Effective: September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2014

Gila Safran-Naveh, PhD  Jewish Foundation Endowed Chair of Judaic Studies  Department Head of Judaic Studies  McMicken College of Arts and Sciences  Effective: June 1, 2009 through August 31, 2013
Robert A. Skipper, PhD  
Department Head  
Department of Philosophy  
McMicken College of Arts and Sciences  
Effective: September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2014

**Reappointments**

Daniel Acosta, PhD  
Dean  
Winkle College of Pharmacy  
Effective: November 1, 2010 through August 31, 2014

Louis Bilionis, JD  
Dean  
College of Law  
Effective: July 1, 2010 through August 31, 2015

Mark Harris, PhD  
Director  
School of Art  
College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning  
Effective: September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2012

Lawrence Johnson, PhD  
Dean  
College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services  
Effective: July 1, 2010 through August 31, 2015

**Tenure**

Michael L. Clemons, PhD  
Associate Professor with Tenure  
Department of Africana Studies  
McMicken College of Arts and Sciences  
Effective: January 1, 2010

Gregory H. Williams, PhD, JD  
Professor of Law with Tenure  
Professor of Political Science with Tenure  
Effective: November 1, 2009

**Administrative Leave**

Richard Newrock, PhD  
Dean  
College of Applied Science  
Effective: July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010

**Emeritus Status**

Joseph F. Bottoni, MA  
Professor Emeritus of Design  
College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning  
Effective: September 1, 2009

Linda Bricker, MBA  
Associate Professor Emerita of Management  
Raymond Walters College  
Effective: September 1, 2009

Joy M. Callan, MBA  
Professor Emerita of Management  
Raymond Walters College  
Effective: September 1, 2009

Louise A. Flavin, PhD  
Professor Emerita of English  
Raymond Walters College  
Effective: September 1, 2009
Warren E. George, PhD  Emeritus Associate Dean  
College-Conservatory of Music  
Effective: October 1, 2009

Alan Oestreich, MD  Professor Emeritus  
Department of Radiology  
College of Medicine  
Effective: September 16, 2009

Ralph E. Pommering, MBA  Assistant Professor Emeritus of Management  
Raymond Walters College  
Effective: September 1, 2009

Richard L. Ward, PhD  Adjunct Research Professor Emeritus  
Department of Pediatrics  
College of Medicine  
Effective: August 16, 2009

09.09.22.02  RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Synopsis:  Approval of tenure and promotions

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve granting of tenure and promotion for faculty effective September 1, 2009, according to the attached list. These recommendations have been approved through the process of progression through the departments, colleges and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR

College of Applied Science
Harry Prats  Has Tenure

FROM ASSOCIATE LIBRARIAN TO ASSOCIATE SENIOR LIBRARIAN

University Library
Ted Baldwin  With Tenure  
Lorna Newman  With Tenure

FROM ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

College-Conservatory of Music
Michele Kay  With Tenure  
Ann Porter  With Tenure

09.09.22.03  COLLEGE MERGER

Synopsis:  New college formed by the merger of the College of Engineering and the College of Applied Science

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the merger of the College of Engineering and the College of Applied Science. The newly-formed college will be named the College of Engineering and Applied Science.
Finance and Administration Committee Recommendations

09.09.23.04 GENERAL RECEIPTS OBLIGATIONS, UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI, SANDER CLASSROOM RENOVATIONS

Synopsis: It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the attached resolution,* known as Sander Classroom Renovations authorizing the issuance of General Receipts Obligations, University of Cincinnati, not to exceed $5,900,000. This is a request for new debt authority.

The Sander Classroom Renovations project consists of renovating the aging mechanical system and a portion of the first and second floors within the Sander Dining building. The mechanical system was originally designed for food preparation and dining functions which no longer exist in the building. The renovated space is to accommodate the growth of the ELS program for incoming international students. Also, the relocation of classrooms and offices for the Colleges of Arts & Sciences and Education will be accommodated. This will make space available for swing space. The Sander Classroom Renovation project was approved at the June 23, 2009 Board Meeting as part of the Capital Budget Fiscal Year 2009-2010. The design is currently underway. Bids and awards are expected in June 2010 with construction to be completed in time for the 2011-12 academic year.

The purpose of this recommendation is to request the authorization of the issuance of general receipts obligations in the amount of $5,900,000. The attached resolution also provides authorization to issue Build America Bonds (BAB) should the economics warrant as such. The $5,900,000 total debt authority and $500,000 state capital appropriation is sufficient to fund the $5,600,000 project costs and debt issuance costs. Average annual net debt service, based on 5.0% annual interest rate for the amount of the debt to be issued is estimated at $538,000 in FY 2012 and will be repaid over 15 years by undesignated funds.

09.09.22.05 GENERAL RECEIPTS OBLIGATIONS, UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI, PROCTOR HALL FAÇADE REPLACEMENT

Synopsis: It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the attached resolution,* known as Procter Hall Façade Replacement authorizing the issuance of General Receipts Obligations, University of Cincinnati, not to exceed $4,700,000. This is a request for new debt authority.

The Procter Hall Façade Replacement project will replace the deteriorating and problematic façade originally applied to Procter Hall. All existing aggregate panels contain asbestos and will be removed. Some of the façade will be replaced and some will be repaired as appropriate. This façade replacement will also result in a more energy efficient building. The Procter Hall Façade Replacement project was approved at the June 24, 2008 Board Meeting as part of the Capital Budget Fiscal Year 2008-2009. The design is currently underway. Bids and awards are expected in January 2010 and construction is expected to be complete in December 2010.

The purpose of this recommendation is to request the authorization of the issuance of general receipts obligations in the amount of $4,700,000. The attached resolution also provides authorization to issue Build America Bonds (BAB) should the economics warrant as such. The $4,700,000 total debt authority is sufficient to fund the $4,000,000 project costs and debt issuance costs. Average annual net debt service for the amount of the debt to be issued, based on 5.25% annual interest rate for the amount of the debt to be issued is estimated at $362,000 in FY 2012 and will be repaid over 20 years by undesignated funds.

*Filed in the Office of the Board of Trustees
09.09.22.06 RESOLUTION AMENDING RESOLUTION NOS. 08.09.23.08 AND 08.09.23.09

Synopsis: It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the attached resolution* amending the original authorization, designation and purpose of Morgens Residence Hall Upgrades and Scioto Residence Hall Upgrades resolutions authorizing the issuance of General Receipts Obligations, University of Cincinnati, for the safety, fire suppression and other improvements to Morgens Hall and Scioto Hall, not to exceed $5,600,000 each hall for a total of $11,200,000.

This is not a request for new debt authority, but rather a request to change the purpose of the borrowed funds. The funds will still be used for Morgens and Scioto but the scope of the project for both residence halls has changed as discussed below.

The attached resolution amends resolutions nos. 08.09.23.08 and 08.09.23.09 authorizing the issuance of General Receipts Obligations for the Morgens Residence Hall Upgrades and Scioto Residence Hall Upgrades projects to provide funding for revised and/or increased project scope. The original resolutions authorized the issuance of General Receipt Obligations to fund the following scope of work: complete fire suppression systems, upgrade the fire alarms, minor interior improvements and replacement of some furnishings in both halls. An increased/revised scope of work for the Morgens Residence Hall Renovation was approved at the June 23, 2009 Board Meeting as part of the Capital Budget Fiscal Year 2009-2010 and includes fire suppression systems and upgrading of fire alarms in Morgens and some parts of Scioto Hall, environmental remediation in Morgens and Scioto Halls, some major renovations in Morgens Hall and decommissioning of Scioto or possibly site improvement.

This recommendation is required to allow the General Receipts Obligations authorized and issued to date ($10,000,000 issued for project costs within Series 2008G Bonds) to be used for the increased/revised scope of work recently approved for the Morgens and Scioto Residence Halls. The design for the Morgens Residence Hall Renovation project is currently underway and expected to be completed late summer of 2010 at which time construction will begin. The Morgens Hall Renovation project was approved at a cost not to exceed a total of $30,000,000 (an addition of $20,000,000) and will be funded with debt funds. Additional debt authorization for Morgens Hall Renovation project will be required, but will be deferred until calendar year 2010 when the project is more defined.

09.09.22.07 APPOINTMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF TECHSOLVE, INC.

It is recommended that the individuals named below be appointed to the Board of Trustees of TechSolve, Inc. effective September 2009 through September 2012.

William Kent, Senior Vice President for Clinical Care Delivery Cincinnati Children’s Medical Center

Dr. Ralph Katerberg, Interim Dean, College of Business University of Cincinnati

In addition, it is recommended that the individuals named below be reappointed to the Board of Trustees of TechSolve, Inc. effective September 2009 through September 2012.

*Filed in the Office of the Board of Trustees
MICK CONIN EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT

Synopsis: It is recommended that the Board ratify an amendment to Head Men’s Basketball Coach Mick Cronin’s contract which extends his employment for two years to the end of the 2013-2014 basketball season.

Coach Cronin has performed well during his initial three years with the university. As such, extending his contract without increasing the financial terms is a sound decision. The extension also enhances the coach’s credibility in recruiting athletes, marketing the university, and fundraising.

A copy of the amendment is attached.*

AUTHORIZATION TO CONVEY A PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY UTILITY EASEMENT

Synopsis: This resolution seeks the Board of Trustees’ authorization to convey a permanent and temporary utility easement in exchange for $25,452.00 to the City of Cincinnati (“City”) permitting the installation and maintenance of sanitary and storm water sewers across the campus of the College of Applied Science (“CAS.”)

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees authorize the execution of a contract and instrument conveying to the City temporary and permanent easement rights for the installation and maintenance of sewer improvements on and over the CAS campus. A copy of the proposed utility easement together with the proposed contract containing the business terms of the transaction are attached.* The recommended action is sanctioned by Ohio Revised Code §3345.18 which authorizes the Board of Trustees to convey to other governmental entities utility easements in operating real estate. In consideration of the grant of easement, the City proposes to pay to the University compensation in the amount of $25,452.00 as specified in the contract. The University’s Office of Planning+Design +Construction has reviewed the location of the proposed improvements and determined that it will not impair the University’s use or the value of the property. And, while the temporary easement will limit the University’s access to a portion of a parking lot during construction, pursuant to the contract the work will be performed at a time that minimizes the impact upon CAS operations. Finally, the compensation to be paid by the City has been evaluated by the University’s Director of Real Estate Administration and determined to be fair and reasonable. The authorization of the Board of Trustees is, therefore, respectfully requested.

*Filed in the Office of the Board of Trustees
09.09.22.10 REJECTION OF THE FACT FINDER’S RECOMMENDATION IN THE MATTER OF NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY AND THE FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE (SECURITY OFFICERS UNIT)

Synopsis: It is recommended that the Board of Trustees reject the recommendation of the fact finder in the matter of negotiations between the university and the Fraternal Order of Police (Security Officer’s unit).

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees reject the recommendation of the fact finder in the matter of negotiations between the university and the Fraternal Order of Police (Security Officer’s unit) pursuant to Ohio Revised Code 4117.14. A hearing was conducted on August 13, 2009, after the parties reached impasse over wages in their negotiations. The fact finder’s recommendations are due September 18, 2009, and the Board of Trustees must vote on the matter within seven days of receipt of said recommendations. In light of the fiscal situation and budget restraints facing the university, it is recommended the Board of Trustees reject the recommendation.

09.09.22.11 University of Cincinnati Institute for Military Medicine

Synopsis: It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the naming of the University of Cincinnati Institute for Military Medicine. The Department of Surgery at the University of Cincinnati has developed a high profile status as a center of excellence for research related to military medicine. In recognition of this accomplishment and in an effort to orchestrate the objectives, the department proposes to establish the University of Cincinnati Institute for Military Medicine.

09.09.22.12 James and Kathryn McDonough Hall

Synopsis: It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the naming of the James and Kathryn McDonough Hall. The naming is a name change from the UC-Clermont Education Services Building. This is an honorific naming to honor the contributions of James McDonough to UC, the College of Engineering, and specifically to UC-Clermont during his 44 years of service as a faculty member, administrator and 8 years of service as Dean of UC-Clermont.

09.09.22.13 UC Reading Campus

Synopsis: It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the naming of the UC Reading Campus. Because the faculty at the Genome Research Institute has shifted focus away from genome research and have begun a more concerted effort on metabolism research, it is recommended to change the name to UC Reading Campus.

It is further recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the naming of the Metabolic Diseases Institute. This is a multi-disciplined collaborative Institute to be located within the UC Reading Campus. The name Metabolic Diseases Institute will be indicated as needed on directional signage within the campus.
09.09.22.14  Frances A. Raschig Human Performance Lab

Synopsis: It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the naming of the Frances A. Raschig Human Performance Lab. Ms. Raschig left a bequest of $150,000 for the College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services to be used for either capital additions or operating expenses in the college. The lab supports the work of faculty in the School of Human Services. 5129 Teachers College would be renamed to the Frances A. Raschig Human Performance Lab.

09.09.22.15  External Debt Policy

Synopsis: Authorize the Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance to establish the university’s external debt policy.

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees authorize the Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance to establish the university’s external debt policy that will govern the issuance and use of debt for the purpose of financing capital projects and/or refinancing existing debt of the University of Cincinnati (UC). The draft policy is attached to this resolution and summarized as follows:

- UC shall incur debt in strict compliance with applicable state and federal law and with debt-related contractual covenants.
- UC may incur debt to fund capital projects that are consistent with UC’s mission and strategic priorities and/or the university’s master plan, or to refinance existing outstanding debt.
- UC shall incur debt only with prior approval of the Board of Trustees and the State of Ohio as required.
- UC shall promote the integration of long-term financial planning with long-term capital planning while incorporating sound financial practices, proactive resource management, and thoughtful institutional financial planning.
- UC shall seek the highest possible national credit ratings given economic and market conditions.
- UC aims to maintain the highest possible composite score of Ohio’s Senate Bill 6 ratio with the minimum being above 1.75 and shall use actual and pro forma financial information to periodically monitor its composite score. The Board of Trustees or the Senior Vice President of Administration and Finance in consultation with the President can provide an exception if it is deemed appropriate to do so.
- UC may incur debt bearing interest at variable rates when advantageous in light of market conditions and limit debt portfolio risk to appropriate levels as determined by the Sr. Vice President of Administration and Finance in consultation with the President and Board of Trustees.
- UC shall not enter into debt-related derivative transactions for speculative purposes, but rather shall use debt-related derivatives as indicated in the university’s Derivative Management Guidelines established to limit risks and provide appropriate protection.

Attachment A* is a draft of External Debt policy.

*Filed in the Office of the Board of Trustees
09.09.22.16 UNDERGRADUATE TUITION INCREASE AND WAIVER

Synopsis: Request to increase undergraduate tuition 3.5% effective Winter Quarter 2010 contingent upon an approval of a tuition waiver by the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents.

In the latest State of Ohio biennial budget, all public Ohio universities were granted the ability to increase resident undergraduate tuition up to a maximum fee cap of 3.5% each academic year within the current biennium. To date, the University of Cincinnati has chosen not to implement this tuition increase for the 2010 academic year. Remember that the last time undergraduate tuition was increased at the University of Cincinnati was in the 2007 fiscal year.

Communication from the Ohio Board of Regents has indicated that the Chancellor is willing to allow a university to adopt up to a 3.5% undergraduate increase for 2010 but then waive the increase, thereby not actually collecting the increase from its undergraduate students. Then, the university’s tuition base for the 2011 academic year would include the increased amount even though the higher rate would not have been collected from students in 2010. Subsequently, in 2011, the university would have the option of implementing both the 2010 tuition increase of 3.5% then waived as well as the additional 3.5% tuition increase allowed in 2011. This action would allow UC to have the opportunity to increase tuition up to just over 7% compounded over two years with up to a 3.5% tuition increase being recorded in each year, but with the total increase collected only in the second year of the biennium and thus benefiting undergraduate students in 2010 with the lower tuition rates collected.

Implementing a 3.5% undergraduate tuition increase and then requesting a tuition waiver in 2010 makes it possible to receive in excess of $6 million of additional tuition revenue in 2011 and all years thereafter as compared to taking no action in 2010. The university administration considers raising tuition to be a tactic of the last resort when addressing financial difficulties, but the budget challenges of FY2011 may require it. Thus, the option of implementing and collecting the 3.5% tuition increase for 2010 will only occur after Board approval and appropriate discussions with students, faculty, and administration based on the need to cover further cuts in university funding as necessitated by the current economic crisis.

Therefore, it is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve a 3.5% tuition increase for both resident and nonresident undergraduate students on both the Uptown and branch campuses effective Winter Quarter 2010 per the attached schedules* and contingent upon the approval of a tuition waiver by the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents.

09.09.22.17 APPROVAL OF ELECTRIC SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC., TRANSFERRING THE UNIVERSITY TO BILLING RATE DP AND PROVIDING REVENUES FROM THE SALE OF RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS AND AVAILABLE GENERATION CAPACITY.

Synopsis: This resolution seeks authorization for the Interim President to execute a new three year electric service agreement with Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., (“Duke”), transferring the University from billing Rate RTP to Rate DP thereby avoiding substantial projected increases under Rate RTP, and selling to Duke available generation capacity for $720,000 annually and Renewable Energy Credits (“RECs”) for $500,000 annually.

*Filed in the Office of the Board of Trustees
It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve and authorize the Interim President to execute a new electric service agreement with Duke. The former agreement, approved by the Board of Trustees in January, 2008, expired on December 31, 2008. Since that time the agreement was continued on a month-to-month basis while the parties negotiated the terms of a three year agreement a proposed draft of which, in near final form, is attached. There are four key business terms in the proposed agreement:

**Transfer to Rate DP.** Under the former agreement, the University purchased electricity under Rate RTP calculated using an advantageous Customer Base Line Load (“CBL”) which reduced the University’s electric service costs compared to the more commonly used Rate DP. However, projected adjustments in the CBL under Rate RTP render Rate DP economically advantageous at this time in the opinion of the University. Under the proposed agreement, the University has agreed to participate in the Rate DP program retroactive to June 2009 (when that term was first agreed upon), through December 2011.

**Purchase of RECs.** In March 2009, the Board of Trustees approved a Base Contract for Sale and Purchase of Natural Gas with GSF Energy, LLC (d/b/a “Montauk”), pursuant to which the University anticipated purchasing land fill gas, a recognized renewable energy source, generating RECs which could be sold to and used by utilities to satisfy regulatory mandates. While the agreement with Montauk was not consummated, the University obtained indirect access to the land fill gas through its existing supplier, EnergyUSA, allowing it to generate RECs in the amount originally projected for 2009. It has since identified alternate renewable energy sources which will allow it to generate RECs through 2011. Duke has agreed in the proposed electric service agreement to purchase all of the 50,000 RECs to be generated by the University annually, including those generated in 2009, at a price of $10 per REC, for total annual revenues of $500,000.

**Generation Capacity.** As a public utility, Duke is required to establish and maintain rights to third party generation capacity which can be called upon in the event peak loads or exigent circumstances threaten to exceed Duke’s generation capacity. The University agrees in the proposed agreement to make available to Duke 24MW, 50% of the total capacity of its co-generation turbines, for which Duke will pay to the University up to $720,000 per year. The actual amount of the capacity payment will be limited by the reimbursement amount Duke actually receives under a certain state program, which is subject to approval by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (“PUCO.”) Therefore, the total amount the University will be paid may be less than $720,000 per year. In addition, if Duke calls upon the University to provide power, it will pay to the University an additional amount to cover the University’s costs of generating such power.

**Commission Approval.** The terms of the proposed electric service agreement must be approved by the PUCO. While the University has reviewed with the PUCO staff the terms of the proposed agreement and received positive assurances regarding key elements, absent formal approval of the PUCO the agreement remains contingent.

For the foregoing reasons, the undersigned request that Board of Trustees approve the proposed electric service agreement in a form substantially identical to the attached subject to final non-substantive revisions and finalization of an escrow agreement to be approved by counsel and attached as an exhibit to the agreement; and it is further requested that the Board authorize its execution by the Interim President.
To call for support by the U.S. Department of Transportation and the Federal Rail Administration for the State of Ohio’s stimulus funding request for Ohio’s 3C “Quick Start” Passenger Rail Plan.

Synopsis:
To call for support by the U.S. Department of Transportation and the Federal Rail Administration for the State of Ohio’s stimulus funding request for Ohio’s 3C “Quick Start” Passenger Rail Plan, is being submitted for approval.

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees pass a resolution supporting the Ohio’s 3C “Quick Start” Passenger Rail Plan connecting Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton, and Cincinnati as part of the nationally-prioritized Chicago Hub in President Obama’s Vision for High Speed Rail in America.

This resolution is requested in support of Ohio’s 3C “Quick Start” Plan as the Ohio Rail Development Committee and Ohio Department of Transportation formally apply on October 2, 2009, for federal stimulus funding of up to $400 million under the Recover Act (ARRA) to invest in infrastructure improvements, station development and operating train sets to initiate service along the 3C Corridor.

A modern transportation system that includes passenger rail service enhances the quality of life for those in its proximity, revitalizes our cities and boosts the economic development and growth potential of our region. A form of resolution is attached.*

Comments from Vice Chairman Niehoff

Mr. Niehoff:

The full Board has been present at the Committee Meetings held today and has received the recommendations of the Academic and Student Affairs and the Finance and Administration Committees. The items reviewed and recommended by the Committees are named in the Action Items list at your place.

In addition to those items recommended by the committees, we have a recommendation for the Honorary Degrees and the Award for Excellence. A copy of that recommendation is at everyone’s place.

Regular Session (Non-Committee) Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the nominations of the individuals named below for the Honorary Degree. These nominations have been reviewed and recommended by the University of Cincinnati Honors Committee.

*Filed in the Office of the Board of Trustees
Mr. Niehoff:

The nominations for Honorary Degree are our former colleague, Phil Cox; the one and only Faith Prince; and Richard E. Thornburgh. President Rimai do you have comments about these?

President Rimai:

Well I had the great privilege of speaking personally with all three individuals to ask them to accept the honor of receiving an honorary degree from UC. They were all very surprised and quite excited about the honor. Our honorary degree committee is chaired by Mr. George Schafer and they did a very thorough review pursuant to their process that led to today’s recommendation. All three of these individuals have agreed to be with us at our December 12th Commencement Exercise. Also, Nancy Hamant, who has already been approved by this Board, will receive the Award for Excellence at the December Commencement.

I thought Greg Vehr might have some additional comments, but I think he has left so with that I would be happy to answer any other questions.

Mr. Niehoff:

May I have a motion to approve all of the recommended items with the exception of the seventh item listed under the Finance and Administration Committee which is the Recommendation for Rejection of the Fact Finder’s Recommendation, which we will discuss after we go into Executive Session?

Upon motion of Mr. Richardson, seconded by Mr. Chesley, the Board approved the items recommended by the Committees by the following roll call vote:
Recommendation Nos. 09.09.22.01 through 09.09.22.09 and 09.09.22.10 through 09.09.22.19

**AYE:** Mr. Niehoff, Mrs. Heimann, Mr. Barrett, Mrs. Buchanan, Mr. Wyler, Mr. Humes, Mr. Richardson and Mr. Chesley

**NAY:** None

**ABSENT:** Mr. Heimann

**ABSTAIN:** Mr. Niehoff from 09.09.22.04, 09.09.22.05, 09.09.22.06 and 09.09.22.15.

**Unfinished Business and New Business**

Mr. Niehoff:

The next item is unfinished business. Is there any unfinished business?

Mr. Chesley:

I don’t know if it’s unfinished or new, but I would like to publically thank the Chairman and all those people that were involved in the Search Committee. I thought it was the most professional search, handled confidentially but at the same time very transparent. I wanted to compliment everybody on the board that was involved and all the staff that were involved and I would also ask that the Chairman write a letter of thanks to those people including members of the board on the Search Committee, but those people of the community – I think there was a total of 14 or 15, I know that Jeff Williams was one, to thank them and give our appreciation for a job very well done.

Mr. Niehoff:

Thank you Stan and I appreciate your comments. The letters have already been written and sent.
Next item is the reports of our board representatives and student trustees. The first report is from the Alumni Association. I appreciate the warmer room today, but not the noise. *(Laughter)* Steve Simendinger.

**Alumni Association Report**

Mr. Simendinger:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our mission in the Alumni Association is to engage alumni and over the last couple of weeks we’ve been very, very busy. The Bearcat Blitz last weekend was really a wonderful event. The crowd inside and around the Alumni Center was estimated at 4,000 which for a lower level football game, I think, really we had a great venue. We’ve also had successful tailgate events at the Oregon State game in Oregon and also at the Rutgers game at New Jersey. It’s really been an eventful period for us and very successful. The Demakes Scholarship Event will be held in this building on October 7th if any of you have an interest in it.

Also, I’d like to address the current renovation of our entire Alumni Center. I’ve mentioned this previously. We finally got the drawings from the Architect’s Office the second week in September here. Unfortunately, it was a little late for us to start to break ground. We do expect to break ground in March and we will have a new ramp, new signage and new landscaping at the facility. I am pleased to report; however, that due to a donation from one of our business alumni, Bob Fealy, we will be doing away with this screen and projector. Thanks to a $50,000 donation by Mr. Fealy, we’ll have two large big screen TV’s on the wall here for use both in our blitzes and for any event that is held here in the Alumni Center. Overall things are on the move and we continue, piece-by-piece to renovate this building—so thank you very much.

Mr. Niehoff:

Thank you, Steve. Now the Faculty Senate report, Dr. Hall?
Faculty Senate Report

Dr. Hall:

Thank you, Chair Niehoff. I know that a lot of people think that the faculty doesn’t work over the summer, but that’s certainly not true. Over the summer the Faculty Senate Cabinet remained active addressing issues related to restructuring, semester conversion, the presidential search, the athletics task force, e-textbooks and textbook affordability, Ohio-link publications, the religious observance policy, and of course—the H1N1 virus.

The Faculty Senate held its annual Fall Retreat just yesterday. The most significant activity of the retreat was the agenda setting session where the senators identified the main issues and activities they would like to take on this year in the senate and in the standing committees. The senators also spent time discussing things the senate might do to encourage a greater sense of community and collegiality among the faculty. The senate continues its work on revising the bylaws of the university faculty and several proposed revisions for consideration at the fall all-university faculty meeting were introduced to the senate for review and comment. The final action at the September 21st meeting was the passage of a resolution canceling the October 28th all-university meeting and calling for a special meeting of the all-university faculty to be held in November. This action was taken in order to provide a faculty forum to introduce and welcome our new President. The full resolution will be made available on the faculty senate website.

The faculty is very enthusiastic about the selection of Dr. Williams as our next president. Several faculty commented that they had googled him and read blogs about him and that they were very impressed with everything they had learned. We would like to thank the search committee for their hard work in completing the search process so quickly and in finding such an exceptional leader in Dr. Williams.

The faculty senate also would like to formally recognize the terrific job that Interim President Monica Rimai has done the past several months. Her leadership has
been outstanding and she truly has been effective in realizing all of the “momentum goals” established at the end of President Zimpher's tenure at UC. We also hope that Monica can be convinced to stay at UC in her role as Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance. I think the cement in New York would just be too much for those knees Monica.

This concludes my report for the September 22, 2009 meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Niehoff:

Thank you, Dr. Hall. Great Report. Now for the reports from our student trustees, Diana Hechavarria.

**Graduate Student Report**

Ms. Hechavarria:

Good morning. The Graduate Student Government Association is happy to report that over the summer graduate student representatives serving on the Ohio Board of Graduate Students participated in a conference call with Chancellor Fingerhut to discuss a variety of issues concerning students such as career placement after grad school (including keeping students in Ohio), energy efficiency savings particularly at UC, and health insurance particularly at UC, state subsidies, attracting international students, research funding from third frontier and economic stimulus funds, and student representation on the Board of Regents. The Chancellor was very pleased to have interaction directly with student leadership and has provided the representatives with contact information to follow up and work with his office. UC’s Graduate Student Government Association has taken responsibility for leading efforts in three categories of these initiatives: energy efficiency savings, health insurance, and research funding. Moreover, the research awards offered by the GSGA have been revamped. They are now competitive and worth more. Thanks to the assistance of Dr. Degen and her office. The judging for these awards is done by graduate fellows and professors that have been
recognized by the graduate school for outstanding mentorship and research. The first round of awards have already been given and we are already receiving applications for the fall deadline.

Also, echoing Marla’s sentiments that graduate students may not work over the summer, the GSGA has awarded over $25,000 in travel funding this summer alone to graduate students to present their research nationally and internationally at conferences to further advance UC’s excellence in research objectives. On the sustainability front, the GSGA will be spearheading and effort to coordinate student groups for the purpose of environmental and sustainability projects with the hope of empowering students to make a measurable difference on campus. This effort will primarily consist of a student subcommittee on the President’s Advisory Council on Environment and Sustainability which is also known as PACES which will bring together other environmental and service groups. The GSGA campus representative, Russell Best, has been asked to participate in a panel discussion at the Central Association of Colleges and University Business Offices annual meeting entitled Sustainability at UC, Politics, People and Promises where we hope to integrate these two initiatives.

Finally, the GSGA is looking forward to welcoming over 8,000 graduate students this fall and further advance research and funding opportunities and support for them as well as providing opportunities for service and leadership. Thank you.

Mr. Niehoff:

Thank you, Diana. Kyle Quinn, please.

**Undergraduate Student Report**

Mr. Quinn:

On behalf of the Undergraduate Student Body, I too, would like to send our sincerest appreciation to the Search Committee and the Board of Trustees. I extend again a deep gratitude to Dr. Zimpher and Monica Rimai and give a warm welcome to
President-Elect, Dr. Williams. Obviously we are excited about the timeliness of this decision before fall classes begin as well.

I’d also like to personally thank our undergraduate representative who served on Search Committee, Janelle Wichmann. I know she thought the experience was obviously beneficial and she grew as a person and leader in that role. Again, I extend my gratitude to you and your receptiveness to her and have her involve in that.

This next academic year should prove to be thrilling for our bearcat undergrads as our overall record enrollment as well as that of freshman, international, and distance learning students were witnessed first hand at Convocation as President Rimai mentioned and as students moved in this past weekend under a new focused recycling program and continued improvements to our campus and local business districts.

The student body came out in a strong manner at our first home football game and our congratulations go out to our nationally ranked football team. I have seen projections for any and every BCS bowl thus far with their fiery 3-0 start. I would also like to thank Mr. Humes for that list earlier detailing some of the statistics. That’s something that we went over every day at 6:30 pm when we were making dinner. I just moved to campus yesterday, so thanks for bringing a taste of home to the board meeting this morning. Additional athletics recognition goes to all our undergrads who have started their fall sports seasons, our Honors Scholar-Athlete of the Month, Branden Stelmak, the 185 Student-Athletes who made the 2008-2009 BIG EAST All-Academic Team, our Cats in the Community team who have served in an all-time record of community service events this summer at the University of Cincinnati, and the lacrosse and swimming/diving teams who garnered the distinction of BIG EAST Team Academic Excellence squads.

Undergraduate student spotlight goes to our students at the College Conservatory of Music who aired on the September 20th episode of CBS Sunday Morning, anthropology students who premiered on the History Channel for their work at the Ohio Valley Archaeology Field School, DAAP students who made a new meaning out of the
phrase “fashion police” by designing new uniforms for our nation’s police force, and the 24 women in science and engineering whose summer research findings across our country were well investigated in the September 10th presentation.

Please aid me in greeting all of our UC students this week to campus for our Welcome Week activities as we enter another chapter of the “Up and Coming Urban Research Institution” together. Thank you and that concludes my report.

Mr. Niehoff:

Thank you, Kyle.

Mr. Barrett:

Can I add one thing Buck?

Mr. Niehoff:

Yes sir.

Mr. Barrett:

Kyle mentioned Janelle Wichmann. I thought she was a very valued member of the Presidential Search Committee. I was extremely impressed with our student representatives, Janelle and Diana. They were very positive, involved and extremely helpful members. I know that Diana was willing to ask the tough questions, someone had to do that and she was willing to do that.

Mr. Niehoff:

And, appropriately, the students were the first people to make the motion and second the motion for our new president.

Mr. Humes:

Mr. Chairman, as just a point of information to those who might not have put the connection together—Kyle Quinn happens to be the son of our Offensive Coordinator for
football which may have something to do with why he came to UC, but we’re very glad that he is here, but his father was the author of those statistics that I read earlier. (Laughter)

Mr. Chesley:

How could we get those statistic published? I think those statistics are remarkable. Certainly I think it should start with the News Record, but I think other local publications should.

Mr. Wyler:

Cliff just left. (Laughter)

Mr. Niehoff:

Okay, President Tim Lolli.

**Student Government Report**

Mr. Lolli:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My last board report, I spoke of a growing partnership between student government and the city of Cincinnati. I am proud to announce that over the summer, our partnership has developed nicely. In July, I traveled with Mayor Mark Mallory along with a contingency of city officials to Portland, Oregon to tour their cities streetcar system. Since then, a proposed resolution bill endorsed by myself and Board of Trustee member and Co-Chair for Cincinnatians for Progress, Rob Richardson, Jr., passed in a historic vote in Student Senate, 19-0-1 opposing Issue 9, the city’s referendum pertaining to the anti-rail charter amendment. The passing of this resolution bill proves that students would benefit from rail transportation and feel that the language in this city referendum would have a negative effect not only on our city, but the students at UC. Student Government is looking to continue our momentum by information the student body of our stance and the implications of this citywide issue.
In regards to the University of Cincinnati’s budget and proposed tuition increase, during our last Student Senate meeting Vice President of Finance, Jim Plummer, along with Senior Associate Vice President, Peg Allensworth, spoke to our elected student representatives. After outlining the condition of our University’s budget, student representatives asked multiple questions to better understand our budget conditions and particularly develop a greater understanding of any potential tuition increase. The consensus from these elected officials was one of concern, not over a tuition increase, but of looming mid-year cuts for FY2010. Involved students have experienced the strain of budget cuts from the previous year, and with the potential of mid-year cuts in the near future; this continual process is starting to negatively affect our college experience. It is the Student Senate’s concern that with continued budget cuts our college experience will be harmed. This fall, myself, along with Student Senate will continue to fight for our college experience by separating the general fee from tuition at the state level in hopes of best serving the student body. I look forward to reporting back to this board our results and hopefully a student resolution and recommendations regarding a potential tuition increase. Thank you and that concludes my report.

Mr. Niehoff:

Thank you, Tim. I will now call for an Executive Session. May I have a motion to enter into Executive Session for the purpose of collective bargaining to prepare for, conduct, or review collective bargaining strategy?

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

**AYE:** Mr. Niehoff, Mrs. Heimann, Mr. Barrett, Mrs. Buchanan, Mr. Wyler, Mr. Humes, Mr. Richardson and Mr. Chesley

**NAY:** None

**ABSENT:** Mr. Heimann
Upon proper motion and second, the Executive Session adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

RECONVENE MEETING

Mr. Niehoff:

The meeting of the Board of Trustees of the University of Cincinnati will now be reconvened. *(Meeting was reconvened at 11:45 a.m.)*

May I have a motion to approve the seventh item listed under the Finance and Administration Committee which is Recommendation for Rejection of the Fact Finder’s Recommendation?

Mrs. Heimann:

I so move.

Mr Niehoff:

Is there a second?

Mr. Chesley:

Second.

Mr. Niehoff:

Please call the roll.

The roll was called by Ms. Stringer.

**Recommendation No. 09.09.22.10**

**AYE:** Mr. Niehoff, Mrs. Heimann, Mr. Barrett, Mrs. Buchanan, Mr. Wyler, Mr. Humes, Mr. Richardson and Mr. Chesley
NAY: None

ABSENT: Mr. Heimann

Adjournment

The recommendation is approved. Our next regular board meeting will be held here at the Russell C. Myers Alumni Center, on Tuesday, November 17th. Thank you all for being with us today.

There being no further business before the Board, upon motion made by Mr. Wyler and seconded by Mr. Richardson, the meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.
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