

Minutes
OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS
Columbus, Ohio
January 21, 2000

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Tahlman Krumm, Jr.

The roll was called by the Secretary, Gerald Gordon. Those present were:

Edmund J. Adams	Tahlman Krumm, Jr.
Jeanette G. Brown	Thomas W. Noe
Gerald H. Gordon	Ralph E. Schey

Regent Gordon stated "the record should show that notice of this meeting has been given in accordance with provisions of the Board of Regents' Rule 3333-1-14, which rule itself was adopted in accordance with Section 121.22(F) of the Ohio Revised Code and of the State Administrative Procedures Act."

CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS RELATED TO THE AGENDA (ITEMS MAY BE AMENDED, ADDED TO OR DELETED FROM THE AGENDA AT THE DISCRETION OF THE BOARD)

No changes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 17, 1999

A motion was made by Regent Brown to approve the Minutes of the December 17, 1999, meeting of the Board. Regent Adams seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

COMMITTEE UPDATES

Communications Committee – Regent Noe: A meeting was held last Tuesday with all of the vendors who picked up the Statewide Marketing RFP. Representatives from twenty-three firms attended the meeting. An evaluation team will meet on February 23 to choose the top four or five firms. Presentations from the finalists are scheduled for March 14. The External Relations staff will meet on January 28 with key legislative staff on higher education and information needs to bring them up to date on what is going on. Preparation of an annual report for the Ohio Board of Regents is underway. The Chancellor will talk about the tobacco settlement in his report.

Resources Committee – Vice Chancellor Petrick: There are two items on today's Board agenda: the Joint Use Agreement between Cleveland State University and the Cleveland Play House, and the Controlling Board items.

Initiatives Committee – Discussion of a collaborative agreement between Owens Community College and the University of Findlay

Vice Chancellor Walters: I have two items to discuss this morning. The first is a collaborative agreement between Owens Community College and the University of Findlay.

As you know, there has been a very long history of effective relationships between Owens Community College, which has a campus in Findlay, and the University of Findlay. There have been many articulation agreements in Findlay, as well as strong collaboration in Toledo. There's a shared resource arrangement for parking and library services, as well as for other collaborative arrangements. There have been, however, in recent years some differences about how best to optimize that relationship and, in particular, on the question of general education related between the two institutions.

The Regents involvement began when Chairman Krumm met with presidents and trustees to talk about how to develop a process to build a stronger collaborative relationship. That led to discussions that the staff presided on beginning in July and then proceeded through November. There were teams of three to four people from each institution. The meetings were very productive, very focussed. I think that there was no question that the representatives of both institutions felt very strongly that they wanted to try to arrive at a solution and arrangement that was the most productive one for students and for residents of the region. And that did result in the Framework of Agreement document which we discussed with the Initiatives Committee last month.

Just some of the highlights of this Framework of Agreement: First of all, it's not a contract. It's a way of organizing and describing the overall relationship with the hope of giving it greater stability by doing that. Some of the key elements are academic agreements, and particularly one in general education which we will discuss in a little more depth in a moment. I'll ask the respective Vice Presidents to describe it, and also some 2+2 programs, where these institutions are working together very closely to provide degree programs that will be of acute interest to the community and to the region, two very important areas. They also have renewed the business agreements for parking and library.

There's been extensive discussion about other kinds of arrangements, and I think there's very definitely an openness toward other arrangements. Finally, the Framework of Agreement talks about how to maintain and expand that relationship. It calls for regular contacts between the Vice Presidents, and it also describes external assistance – what would happen if there are some disagreements that are not easily resolved – and the two have agreed on a process they would use to approach that.

Dr. Paul Unger, the Vice President of Academic Affairs from Owens, and Dr. Ed Erner, the Vice President for Academic Affairs from Findlay, will describe

very briefly, as they did for the Committee last month, how they would see the general education arrangements working, in particular.

Dr. Paul Unger: We really appreciate the opportunity for your consideration in the culmination of a long series of productive discussions, and I would be remiss if I didn't commend Garry Walters on his leadership in providing a forum for productive discussion. We really made a lot of headway in a relatively short period of time with senior administrators from each institution.

I would like to begin by saying that our relationship is not totally new and, in fact, we came into these discussions with eleven formally signed articulation agreements that had pre-existed. These agreements are everything from in the business area, environmental science and criminal justice, as well as our Associate of Arts and our Associate of Science degrees for, previously, our Toledo campus students. In fact, we have many students who wanted to pursue the AA and AS degrees who are enrolled in our Findlay campus to take as much as they can get out of our course inventory.

We're proceeding, Dr. Erner and I, walking before we run. Our relationship is not new. We have registered students in the past and make that registration process transparent to the students, such that they can register for a University of Findlay-offered course at the 100 and 200 levels, of the list that you have in front of you, through our institution and never really know any difference, it's just the building where they might be taking that class and the instructor that they might be taking it from.

Ed and I agreed on a list of general education electives that add to the diversity. And part of the purpose of our getting together was to take advantage of the best of both of our institutions and to offer more diversity to our general education offerings because either we do not have the laboratory facilities or the faculty expertise to provide this sort of diversity on our Findlay campus as we would on our Toledo campus. As you can see, the list starts off with anywhere from art, philosophy, bilingual multicultural studies, and four languages. Again, that's just the beginning. We hope to pursue other areas such as musical arts, drama, theater arts, sculpture, and other areas where the University of Findlay might have faculty expertise, and again, that we do not.

We are currently working on updating our articulation agreements in the teacher education transfer area to reflect the new teacher licensing provisions, and we're putting those in place. As a matter of fact, we just finalized those and put those in the catalogue yesterday and we're still updating our agreement. We're also updating our agreement in the early childhood education area, and we are working closely with the University, based on the leaderships of Chancellor Chu when he spoke around the state with the *it. Works* program (Information Technology Works). We're looking at this from a broad spectrum: the 2x4, from the secondary level, through the associates degree, through the bachelors degree, and potentially through the masters degree, because the University of Findlay is looking at that and we're doing the same thing on our

Toledo campus, and we are doing this under the umbrella of the Tech Prep notion. So that's moving along very well.

I mentioned the 100 and 200 level courses. The 300 and 400 level courses that are referenced in this Framework of Agreement will be promoted through the Owens Community College means of promotion on our campus, and students would be advised to go over to the University and talk to University officials about what courses would apply at the 300 and 400 level to their transfer degree that they could be pursuing, because what Dr. Erner wanted to do is to make sure that students who had the ability and were qualified to take that level of instruction could get a head start on their bachelors degree and take some of those courses prior to that time.

We are cross-listing the 100 and 200 level courses and we just made a change in our catalogue to include that. And we are interested in working with the University in jointly funded promotion and advertising. Dr. Erner and I will be meeting on a regular basis to talk about curriculum, to talk about other matriculated programs and our efforts in trying to establish other formalized agreements. We really feel that this is a win-win situation for Findlay and Hancock County and the surrounding areas, and it does provide a very accessible transfer education that is not currently available in that area.

Dr. Ed Erner: I have been involved with this entire process since 1983 when the two institutions began working together. I think the long-term considerations that we need to be involved with are what is best for the students of all ages, our customers. We also need to be about the business of breaking down the walls between what is technical education, what is community college education, and what is four-year college education. I think that's what agreement, and this agreement, over the numbers of years has really revolved around. If there's a time to disagree, there's a time to put aside personal and professional differences, and there's a time to sit down and say we will move ahead, we will work on what we agree on, and we will set other things aside. With that in mind, I would to thank Regent Krumm and Chancellor Chu. When he first came to town Chancellor Chu did his erstwhile work in terms of coming north several times.

I think we are at a point now where we have a framework for agreement to move ahead. Actions speak louder than words. Just yesterday I was in a meeting with Solomon Software Company in Findlay and we have put together a four-year curriculum that actually includes coursework from the Solomon Software Company, which is a rapidly growing company. They now are a part of our curriculum. Some of their people will be teaching for us, and we will be doing some co-teaching. During that meeting I said, we are in the process of finalizing agreement with Owens Community College. We have encouraged and will continue to encourage conversation and cooperation with Owens so that those students can move right through from high school, post-secondary op, community college, and four-year programs at the University of Findlay, with internships with Solomon Software. At that point they may go into externships, internships. And Solomon tells us that there will be jobs in the neighborhood of \$60,000 to \$70,000 waiting for the graduates of those programs. So that is a

very specific example where Paul and I must and should work together. I would really like to stop at this point and say it's time for action steps and time for less rhetoric, and move ahead with the business of the day.

Regent Krumm: We do appreciate the work that Ed Erner and Paul Unger have done, because ultimately they had to find a way to work together sensibly and cooperatively in the best interests of the large community and the students of that area. We are very grateful. President Brown and President Zirkle obviously have played a part in this and it would not have happened if there had not been assent that this should work.

Vice Chancellor Walters: I have had occasion to work with all of the state's academic leaders over the years, and I think these are two of the very top group of academic leaders that we have in Ohio, Dr. Erner and Dr. Unger, and it makes me much more confident that this framework will succeed because of the quality of leadership.

Initiatives Committee – Preliminary report on the review process undertaken pursuant to Ohio Administrative Code 3333-1-08 of the University of Phoenix's application to operate in Ohio

Vice Chancellor Walters: Our next presentation is on the University of Phoenix's plan to operate in Ohio. As you know, the Ohio Board of Regents must authorize all institutions that have a physical presence in the state. I underline that term because a college or university offering exclusively web-based instruction does not have to be authorized by the Ohio Board of Regents because it lacks physical presence in the state.

The standards by which the Regents review these institutions are set forth in our Rule 8. Rule 8 describes the standards in terms of traditional colleges and universities, but it also says quite clearly that if a college or university proposing to operate in Ohio has a different means of approaching those standards the Regents may consider them and offer an exemption. In light of that, the University of Phoenix applied to operate in Ohio.

Discussions began a little over a year ago. The University of Phoenix is an unusual institution. It is for profit. It is focussed exclusively on adult students, on part-time education. It has been accredited by the North Central Association since 1978. While it does offer baccalaureate and master's degrees, the institution prefers, at the baccalaureate level, to offer completion degrees and to have students who have completed typically two years of college before they enter the University.

One statistic that I think is interesting, because people tend to think of the University of Phoenix as being an on-line educational institution, is that currently about 15% of the instruction is on-line, and 85% is classroom. The on-line percentage is growing relatively quickly, but it is principally an institution that offers classes at a physical site.

Our initial staff plan was to use our traditional review process. We discussed that with the University. They thought it was a good idea and we proceeded. They prepared documentation, as we require. We put together site-visit teams and commenced a site visit. One of the things we learned in that site visit was that the traditional process that we employed would not work for the University of Phoenix. The reason is that the teams that we put together are experts in a particular discipline, for example, in graduate business programs. The focus of what they look at is the curriculum, the staffing, the essence of that program. They also look at other issues such as library and general education, but those are typically not the focus of their review. We discovered at the site visit that our teams had not had time to assimilate the different instructional model that the University of Phoenix has. The site visit was at a site where the University of Phoenix is currently offering courses, which meant that central University of Phoenix staff were not there, were not available to answer questions. As a result of just the first day of an attempted site visit, we believed that this process was not going to give us a fair analysis of the University of Phoenix, and so we talked to the University about a different approach.

This different approach has two phases. The first phase, which we are presenting to you today, we are calling a foundation report. This will address concerns that were raised in this truncated initial site visit, as well as other structural issues. These are:

- (1) General education: although the University of Phoenix does prefer that other institutions provide the general education, that's not always possible, so it does offer some general education courses.
- (2) The instructional staffing model of the University: it uses far fewer full-time faculty than traditional institutions.
- (3) The library resources that the University offers: it has moved overwhelmingly to use electronic on-line resources to support its programs.
- (4) There were concerns about graduate programs, and when we talk about the resolution of those I'll give you more detail.
- (5) We were also interested in issues of assessment – how the University looks at the quality of its students, its students' progress, the quality of its programs vis-à-vis others.
- (6) The traditional issue of curriculum.
- (7) Student progress and support, how students are assisted through their progress toward a degree.

The second phase of our review would be a traditional one. We told the University that it was possible, given that we would have put this effort into the initial phase, that we would not have to have site visits for all of the degree

proposals that they have, but that we would leave that decision up to the teams that we put together for each one. Certainly there would need to be a paper review.

Our phase one review team was put together very carefully. I do want to describe the background of the team because it illustrates the focus that we brought to this review and the perspectives that we tried to make sure that we had covered.

Dr. David Hartleb is President of Northern Essex Community College in Massachusetts. He was formerly a Vice President with the University of Cincinnati, responsible for their two-year campuses. We have worked with Dr. Hartleb as a consultant in the past. He is very well respected.

Associate Vice Chancellor Jon Tafel and I discussed the importance of assessment and we thought about states that have a strong record of looking at issues of assessment. Jon has contacts in Virginia which have been interested in this issue of really trying to ascertain what is value-added in education and what is progress. They recommended Dr. John Muffo, who is a nationally known expert on the assessment of academic programs.

James Seal, who is a Professor of Business at the University of Portland, has been a reviewer for Ohio a number of times, and is someone we have valued as a very thoughtful analyst.

Lyman Porter is a Professor Emeritus of Management and also just finished a term as Dean of the College of Business at the University of California, Irvine. I think it is important to mention that Dr. Porter has been very active in accreditation in business. He has been a national official of the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business.

Because of the library dimension, we talked to colleagues in the library community for a reference of someone who was connected to business programs but who was also very knowledgeable about on-line resources. We were given the name of Shari Bauxbaum, who is the business librarian at Michigan State University, who has published work on on-line business, library resources, and is working on a major project there.

For graduate education, we selected Jim Fry, Dean of the Graduate School at Colorado State. He is the former Vice President and Dean at the University of Toledo. We worked closely with Dr. Fry in the past.

The team got all of the materials from the University of Phoenix, reviewed them, asked questions, got answers from the University, and told the University what remaining questions and concerns they had. We then went on a site visit to the University in late November. The two and a half day visit gave us extensive opportunity to talk to the University staff and senior faculty and discuss issues with them.

You have a full report which I will go over briefly. Our team was quite positive about the University's approach to general education. It does recommend – recommendations in our lexicon of things that we expect the University to comply with – that remedial courses not count for degrees, as is the practice in Ohio and the University has agreed to that.

The perspective on the library was very positive. Ms. Bauxbaum pointed out that in business, in particular, library resources are now moving heavily, given the nature of the discipline, toward electronic resources and she was very impressed with the materials that they had available for their students, as well with their ability to support those students electronically and by telephone. The team recommended that the University include in its curriculum a proficiency in information literacy. This is something that we think all universities and colleges ought to do, but it is particularly important for the University Phoenix given its extensive reliance on electronic resources.

In graduate programs, I think it's important that we can't give an assessment of those because we did not look at the individual programs yet. The team does recommend some changes in degree titles. The reason for that is that in Ohio over the years we have developed a graduate taxonomy that says if you call a degree Master of Arts or Master of Sciences, that is a graduate degree that could lead to further education to the doctoral program. If it is a terminal degree, if it is not designed to go on, then it should have a master of whatever the particular discipline would be. It would be the difference between the Master of Science in Accounting, which in theory ought to allow the student to take that as a path toward a doctoral degree in accounting, or a Master of Accounting, which is viewed as a terminal degree. This is in large part trying to be clear to students about what it is they're getting when they get graduate education. We recommended that and the University has agreed. The University, however, says that it may have a problem with the North Central Association because they would be offering essentially the same degree with different titles within North Central's region, so we would have to work that out.

The team did have some concerns about the University's credentials for graduate faculty and their minimum requirements. There is a recommendation in the report that where people have the minimum graduate background that that would need to be balanced by extensive depth in professional experience. One of the things we talked about in this context is that in offering a master's degree – and you can build the analogy to legal education where the people who teach in law school have the same degree as the students who are going for it – law schools often hire adjunct faculty to teach. But if they have someone who is going to be teaching contracts, they hire someone who has extensive experience, who is well known and well regarded in that field. We have said to the University that that same compensation ought to apply in their choice of faculty, and they have agreed.

Curriculum: Our team was very positive about the way in which they develop and manage curriculum. Curriculum is developed by the central site and replicated to the campuses. Faculty do have an opportunity to participate

in curriculum development and there is training for faculty as the curriculum changes.

Faculty staffing: As you know, the University relies heavily on what we call “adjunct faculty” and what they call “practitioner faculty.” These are – let’s say in the case of an M.B.A. programs - people who are actively accountants who would be teaching accounting courses in the program. The University has a very careful process for selecting adjuncts, for training them, and for monitoring their performance. Our team thought that this was an exemplary approach for the use of adjunct faculty.

Student progress and support: This team was very positive overall. I would single out one thing that the University of Phoenix does that our team thought was particularly impressive, and that was the dimension that they have added in critical thinking. The University requires all students who plan to enroll to take a critical thinking diagnostic test. If they score below a certain level there are specific courses that emphasize critical thinking that they are channeled into that they must take at the beginning of their education. They must succeed in it to go on. They have also worked to infuse the critical thinking dimension into all of their courses through the program. And then, as students graduate, they will use the same test that they take when they come in to see if, in fact, they are adding value in critical thinking. It’s very thoughtful. The data really aren’t in yet; they haven’t had this in place long enough for us to see what the impact is. It is an interesting continuous improvement focus that they have developed in this area and the team was very impressed.

In the area of assessment, quality assurance: Again, very positive. Our team, including our assessment specialist, thought that these were some of the best data that they had ever seen and thought that the University was a leader in this area. One thing that they did recommend, which is a challenge for the University, is what we call here “norming” of the MBA program, trying to find some way to show how their students compare to graduates of other MBA programs. This is difficult for them to do given that they are not accredited by the AACSB, as many business schools are not, and that they don’t use exactly the same measures. But the University of Phoenix actually had already been working in this area, and is working with, I believe, the Educational Testing Service to develop some source of data that would allow them to compare where their MBA students are with others. I should emphasize that this was not a concern in the sense that the team felt there was anything wrong, because the coursework as structured is very much similar to the traditional MBA.

Some observations: The team emphasized that it was a strong, well-led and well-managed University. Our team members were quite impressed with the University’s academic and business leadership. They did express a concern – this is not in the form of a recommendation – that the rapid expansion of the University would stress this academic management model. Currently, the Provost’s office and that of the Vice President for Academic Affairs in Phoenix, very actively review choices of adjunct faculty, grading policies, success rate, and so on, throughout the system and use a very extensive set of data to try to

make sure that all of the operations are running at the accepted level. Our team was concerned that, as they get larger, the central staff would be unable to manage that information, and that they may need to think of some different structures.

Finally, I should mention that you have a copy of the report from Massachusetts. This is not quite the final report, but I think it is very close to being the final report from Massachusetts. I knew from my colleague in Massachusetts that they were a bit ahead of us in doing this review. We've known also over the years that Massachusetts' process is very similar to the Ohio process. Dr. Tafel told me he thinks that Massachusetts got its process from Ohio when they started their Board, so we were eager to see the Massachusetts report. We actually got it after our first draft was done. As we note in the second appendix there's a high level of consistency between the findings of Massachusetts and our team.

Our recommendation from the staff is that we proceed with program-specific reviews as prescribed in the report.

Performance Committee – Senior Vice Chancellor Filipic: We have begun a conversation with Ohio University. We came across a paper put together by their Office of Institutional Research. Although I had known that Ohio University had had an extensive effort of assessing student progress and the academic programs that contribute to that progress, I was surprised by the extent of activities that were being reported in that paper. We began a conversation with Ohio University with the hope of leading to a report to the Performance Committee, because Performance Committee members have often said how interested they are in what is going on campuses. In a conversation with Rob Sheehan this morning, he said that he thought that many campuses would have similar papers describing their efforts. We are going to try to explore that further.

Evaluation Committee – Regent Brown: The personnel actions on the agenda are recommended for approval.

Consent Request – A motion was made by Regent Noe to approve agenda items 6.1 through 6.7. Regent Brown seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

- 6.1 Authorization for Owens Community College to offer the Associate of Arts and the Associate of Sciences at its Findlay Campus
- 6.2 Central Ohio Technical College, Associate of Applied Science in Forensic Science Technology
- 6.3 Youngstown State University, Master of Physical Therapy
- 6.4 Ohio State University, Ph.D. in Natural Resources
- 6.5 Joint Use Agreement between Cleveland State University the Cleveland Play House
- 6.6 Requests to the Controlling Board for the period December 1, 1999 through December 31, 1999
- 6.7 Personnel Actions

RESOLUTION 2000-77
Agenda Item 6.1

WHEREAS, in previous action the Ohio Board of Regents, out of concern for relationships in the Findlay community and surrounding region, had limited the authority of Owens State Community College so as to exclude offering of the Associate of Arts and the Associate of Sciences degrees at its Findlay Campus; and

WHEREAS, the previous concerns have been resolved as a result of the "Framework of Agreement" (attached), which has been signed by the Presidents of both Owens State Community College and the University of Findlay,

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED: that Owens State Community College is authorized to offer the degrees Associate of Arts and Associate of Science at its Findlay Campus, effective immediately.

RESOLUTION 2000-78
Agenda Item 6.2

BE IT RESOLVED: upon the recommendation of the Chancellor and with the concurrence of the Initiatives Committee of the Ohio Board of Regents that the following new degree program be approved:

Central Ohio Technical College
Associate of Applied Science degree in Forensic Science Technology

RESOLUTION 2000-79
Agenda Item 6.3

BE IT RESOLVED: upon the recommendation of the Chancellor and with the concurrence of the Initiatives Committee of the Ohio Board of Regents that the following new degree is approved:

Youngstown State University
Master of Physical Therapy (MPT)

RESOLUTION 2000-80
Agenda Item 6.4

BE IT RESOLVED: upon the recommendation of the Chancellor and with the concurrence of the Regents Advisory Committee on Graduate Study and the

Initiatives Committee of the Ohio Board of Regents that the following new degree is approved:

The Ohio State University
Ph.D. in Natural Resources

RESOLUTION 2000-81
Agenda Item 6.5

WHEREAS, the 122nd Ohio General Assembly enacted H.B. 850 which includes a specific capital appropriation of \$1,000,000 to Cleveland State University for The Cleveland Play House; and

WHEREAS, the Ohio Board of Regents' Rule 3333-1-03 requires that a joint use agreement between the institution for which funds are appropriated and the organization which will own or lease and operate facilities to be constructed or improved with such funds must be approved by the Board; and

WHEREAS, Cleveland State University and The Cleveland Play House have presented a joint use agreement for approval by the Ohio Board of Regents; and

WHEREAS, the agreement has been reviewed and its format is found to be appropriate, its description of extent and nature of use has been specified, and the commitment extends no less than fifteen years, and it is in conformity with Rule 3333-1-03; and

WHEREAS, the parties have determined that the value of the use is reasonably related to the amount of the appropriation;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED: upon the recommendation of the Chancellor and with the concurrence of the Resources Committee of the Ohio Board of Regents, that the agreement between Cleveland State University and The Cleveland Play House, attached and made a part hereof, be approved.

RESOLUTION 2000-82
Agenda Item 6.6

BE IT RESOLVED: upon the recommendation of the Resources Committee of the Ohio Board of Regents, that the request for release of capital improvements funds received in the period December 1, 1999 through December 31, 1999, shown on the sheets attached hereto, are hereby approved and recommended for approval by the Controlling Board.

RESOLUTION 2000-83
Agenda Item 6.7

BE IT RESOLVED: upon the recommendation of the Chancellor that the following personnel actions be approved:

<u>RETIREMENT</u>	<u>EFFECTIVE DATE</u>
Barbara Wilson Account Examiner State Grants & Scholarships	12/31/99
<u>RESIGNATION</u>	
Ann Carlin Administrative Assistant Research & Medical Programs	01/21/00
<u>PROMOTION</u>	
Colevia Williams Executive Secretary	01/17/00
Catherine Route Administrative Assistant Division of Operations	01/17/00
<u>APPOINTMENT</u>	
Kirk Trickett Webmaster Administrator	01/18/00

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Welcome to the first Board meeting of this new millennium. This will, however, be the last meeting here in our Rhodes Office Tower until next December. We will be resuming our meeting on campuses starting next month at Franklin University here in Columbus. We will then meet at other Ohio public and private campuses, a public school and an Ohio corporate site over the next nine months. I'm looking forward to the change of scenery and the opportunity to meet with the students, faculty, administrators and public that we serve.

A couple items of note: two days ago, I had the honor of being on the floor of the Ohio House of Representatives to hear Governor Bob Taft's state of the state address. Declaring that "the future belongs to Ohio," the Governor outlined the accomplishments achieved during his first year and his goals for Ohio as we enter a new century. I was pleased that the Governor endorsed three of the major initiatives that the Ohio Board of Regents has been advancing:

First, getting the education establishment to focus on the success of all of our students – to consider committing that every student will learn,

not just observing that they can learn. Of course, the need for this commitment applies to higher education as well as K-12.

Second, revamping teacher education as part of a holistic P-16/lifelong learning education system. We must ensure that teachers develop the specific knowledge and skills required to promote student success – to enable Ohio's graduates to fully participate in our 21st century communities and economy.

And third, focusing on the fundamental needs of the workplace – today and in the future. Among our initial tasks is to expand the success of our Tech-Prep approach beyond our *itWORKS.Ohio* initiative to make information technology literacy a fundamental element of our students' education.

The future of our state depends on bold actions that will achieve these goals, and we look forward to working with the Governor and the State Board of Education on the Governor's proposed Commission for Student Success to determine what students should know and be able to do in each grade and before graduation; how to measure student performance in each grade; how to hold students and adults responsible for academic achievement; and how to make sure all parts of the system work together in complete alignment.

We will also work together through our Joint Council of the Ohio Board of Regents and the State Board of Education to establish standards for computer literacy. Computer literacy has really become the "4th R" for all our students. And, finally, we look forward to the Higher Education Reading Summit proposed by the Governor which, in the spring, will convene a meeting of university presidents, education deans and faculty from colleges and universities that focus on literacy instruction.

We appreciate the Governor's continued leadership in committing the strategic use of the Tobacco Settlement funds for biomedicine and other areas of technology research, research commercialization and much-needed additions to our education technology infrastructure. The Tobacco Bill is in the General Assembly for conference, and facing a difficult time right now. But these commitments will be required if Ohio's college and universities are to meet the challenges set forth by governor Taft and if we are to build a 21st century Ohio economy.

Finally, I was pleased to see the Governor's continued focus on technology and his call for creating a regional center of excellence for biomedicine and biotechnology research and commercialization through the Council of Great Lakes Governors, and for legislation to encourage university professors to conduct more research for commercialization. We look forward to working with the Governor, his staff and the Department of Education on all of his education achievement initiatives.

Also last week the Higher Education Funding Commission met to begin discussions on issues related to the FY 2000-FY 2003 operating budget for

higher education. As you know, the Commission played a crucial role in the last two biennia, and we foresee a similar role in this budget cycle. Among the items we discussed were:

1. The status of the Tobacco Settlement Bill and Senate bill 192, especially regarding funding for educational technology.
2. A review of higher education's capital needs, focusing on the "block obsolescence problem": the aging of large numbers of buildings constructed between 1960 and 1980, in the context of future constraints on capital funding that will result from constitutional limits on state debt capacity and the Governor's commitments to K-12 facility construction.
3. A review of the methodology used to allocate Challenge funding in respect to the implementation of these programs from state and campus perspectives.

We had begun the work of the Funding Commission to really give us sufficient time to address the long-term strategic needs of higher education and of higher education funding in the State of Ohio. Among the issues that we discussed tackling are:

1. How should we balance performance funding against other types of funding, such as instructional subsidy?
2. Looking at our current group of Challenge items and seeing if they address the missions of all of our public colleges and universities.
3. The potential of new learning technologies to enhance learning at our colleges and universities to address Ohio's higher education deficit.
4. Funding guarantees for public campuses.
5. Reviewing the work of the Graduate Funding Commission, which is charged with finding better ways to fund graduate education in Ohio.
6. Financial aid policies – is funding for our various programs appropriately balanced, or should we give greater attention to some programs at the expense of others? How should we think about the balance of funding among support for institutions, support for critical state needs and support for individual students?
7. Finally, we discussed the opportunity to address the higher education performance report that was requested by Governor Taft of this Board of Regents.

One other item of note, on January 11th, which happened to be the first anniversary of Governor Taft's inauguration, we were able to respond to Governor Taft's inaugural call for Ohio "to become a leader on the frontier of knowledge and technology" in a fairly dramatic way. Leaders from a higher

education and industry consortium unveiled ITEC-Ohio: the Internet2 Technology Evaluation Center, highlighting Ohio's prominent role in the development of Internet2. We held a press conference and demonstration of the new technology in the Lobby Hearing Room on the first floor this building, and featured a live, interactive surgery being performed by surgeons at The Ohio State University Medical Center in consultation with others in the Rhodes Building and a site in Germany. I'm happy to report that the patient survived, and is doing quite well. It certainly was a very dramatic presentation.

The purpose of this event was to demonstrate the power of Internet2, and showcase the role that Ohio plays in developing these technologies of the future. The University Corporation for Advanced Internet Development, which is the catalyst behind the development of Internet2, has charged ITEC-Ohio with helping to develop technologies that will improve many aspects of our lives through distance learning, telemedicine and massive digital libraries, among these new, exciting technologies. We expect that this initiative will not only contribute greatly to the health of Ohio's economy for years to come, but also open doors to new careers and learning opportunities for every age group in Ohio's population.

On a congratulatory note, I would like to acknowledge a number of EnterpriseOhio Network campuses for receiving grant awards from the Regents in our \$6.3 million Non-Credit Job Training Program. This appropriation from the 1998 capital bill recognizes the contribution of EnterpriseOhio Network campuses as vital economic resources providing up-to-date training services that attract local and regional business and support expansion and retention projects. The EnterpriseOhio Network campuses have provided essential, non-credit education and training services to Ohio's employers without an established non-credit subsidy from the state. If Ohio's businesses are to compete globally, we must afford their employees the opportunity for lifelong learning that will assure their employability well into the next millennium. The campuses receiving awards are:

The University of Akron – Wayne Campus
Cuyahoga Community College
Lorain County Community College
Muskingum Area Technical College
North Central Technical College
Stark State College of Technology
Edison Community College
Northwest State Community College
Sinclair Community College

Congratulations to all campuses, presidents, faculty, staff and students for their achievement.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

- a. Mr. James McCollum, Executive Director of the Inter-University Council, presented the IUC Efficiency Task Force Report.

- b. Professor Benjamin Britton, College of Design, Architecture, Art and Planning at the University of Cincinnati, presented “Creative Research” relating to his virtual reality projects.

OTHER BUSINESS

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.

The next meeting of the Board of Regents will be held on Thursday, February 24, 2000, 1:30 p.m., at Franklin University, Columbus, Ohio.

Chair

Secretary

Date

Date