

Minutes  
OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS  
Cleveland, Ohio  
September 19, 2002

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Jeanette Grasselli Brown.

The roll was called by the Secretary, Edmund J. Adams. Those present were:

|                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Jeanette Grasselli Brown | Thomas W. Noe            |
| Edmund J. Adams          | J. Gilbert Reese         |
| Gerald H. Gordon         | Ralph E. Schey           |
| Tahlman Krumm, Jr.       | Representative Callender |

Regent Adams stated “the record should show that notice of this meeting has been given in accordance with provisions of the Board of Regents’ Administrative 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)**

Chancellor Chu recommended that action Item #6 under the board’s consent agenda be considered separately given the fact that the budget will be presented to the board during the Chancellor’s remarks.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 10, 2002**

A motion was made by Regent Adams to approve the Minutes of the July 10, 2002 meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Regent Krumm and unanimously passed.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS AND SUMMARY OF DELIBERATIONS**

Communications Committee – Regent Adams: The communications committee met this morning and we discussed the latest issue of the newsletter that we call The Issue, which dealt with transfer and articulation policies. Regents are urged to continue to feed topic ideas to Deborah Gavlik for that fine publication.

We had a report on the House Select Committee on Ohio’s System of Higher Education Hearings. Hearings have been held in Columbus, Cincinnati, Toledo, Cleveland, Stark County and Granville and there is a remaining scheduled hearing in Marietta. Several of the Regents testified at those hearings. Common themes discussed in the hearings are the need for more Ohioans to

have higher education, remediation costs, funding formula concerns, the funding of out of state students and faculty workloads.

We had a report on the Third Frontier Network Partnership for medical scientific research and education. The goal is to establish the world's most advanced broadband network for this purpose and the effort is to obtain federal dollars - \$7 million in the next federal budget and \$20 million in the following 3 year budget for a total of \$27 million in 4 years. This project would enable colleges and universities to share scientific instrumentation and to collaborate on medical education.

We were introduced to a new publication, The Policymakers Guide to Higher Education in Ohio 2002, compiled by our staff. This will be sent to each candidate and incumbent running for state office.

We received a report on a workshop that was held for legislative aides recently. This meeting was a good opportunity to provide background to assist in answering constituent questions. The workshop focused on financial aid and future topics will include tuition and costs, state support and the various challenges, etc.

We received a report on enhancements to our website and a media update on current contacts of our media people and the media. The Knowledge Economy Awareness Initiative has completed four presentations to audiences ranging from 20 to 250. Three additional presentations are scheduled for northeast Ohio in the coming weeks and our staff is working on phase two follow-up materials.

The Governor expressed interested in holding a workshop in Columbus in December and we are working with the Governor's office to schedule the event.

Resources Committee – Regent Reese: The Resources Committee met this morning and welcomed new Regent appointees Donna Alvarado and Bruce Beeghly.

Neal McNally reported on the Fall 2002 survey of student fees, which documented the recent fee increases that we've known about for some time. We noted the fee increases are similar to those reported in many other states and that historically fees or students moved in the opposite direction of state support, as one goes up the other goes down.

We also considered the higher education operating appropriations recommendations for FY04/FY05. The appropriations would devote resources to core campus support and student financial aid for the most part. More than 80% of the additional funds would be allocated for these purposes. Vice Chancellor Rich Petrick will report on these recommendations later in the meeting.

Finally, we considered the July and August controlling board items and the release of a portion of fiscal 2003 job's challenge funds. The committee recommended for the consent agenda Items 3.5 and 3.7 and to hold the operating budget recommendations Item 3.6 until after Vice Chancellor Petrick's support.

Initiatives Committee – Regent Krumm: The Initiatives Committee would like to add to the consent agenda for action today the provisional reauthorization of the Union Institute. This provisional reauthorization is at their request as they go through programmatic and curricular recalibration. The initiatives committee considered the issue and approved it and urge it be added to the agenda for today. There are ten items approved for consideration at the October meeting and all are recommended for approval by this committee.

The Initiatives Committee heard a series of updates by Dr. Tafel and Dr. Schilk on building of the math and science infrastructure in the state and updates on narrowing the achievement gap conference that was convened several months ago and a blue ribbon panel, which will work with the Joint Council of the OBR and ODE. This panel will recommend strategies for narrowing this gap. There was an update on the MathRules Initiatives, which is Governor Taft's companion piece to Ohio Reads. Dr. Tafel gave us an update on the University Centers of Excellence and mentioned the math and science partnership grants.

Dr. Garry Walters and Dr. Harry Andrist briefed the committee on a new series of doctoral programs, professional doctorates especially in the allied medical fields. We have new licensure requirements, new degree requirements that are going hand in hand with the licensure requirements. Are these doctoral programs or are they something else? That is the issue to be considered.

Finally, we received a series of updates on workforce development and research

Chair Brown commented that no performance committee meeting was held in September and called for approval of the consent agenda.

Consent Agenda: A motion was made by Regent Krumm to approve Agenda Items 3.1 through 3.8 with the removal of Item 3.6 to be covered in the Chancellor's report, and as amended by the addition of Item 3.8, which is the Union Institute. The motion was seconded by Regent Adams and unanimously passed.

- 3.1 Columbus State Community College, Associate of Applied Science in Real Estate Appraisal
- 3.2 The Ohio State University, Master of Occupational Therapy
- 3.3 The Ohio State University, Doctor of Philosophy in Women's Studies
- 3.4 Ohio Eminent Scholars Program Awards
- 3.5 Consideration of the release and distribution of \$1,981,841 in FY 2003 Jobs Challenge Performance Grants from Amended Substitute House Bill

- 3.6 Higher education operating budget recommendations for FY 2004/-  
FY 2005
- 3.7 Requests to the Controlling Board for the period July 1, 2002 through  
August 31, 2002
- 3.8 Union Institute and University, Cincinnati, Ohio: Provisional  
Reauthorization

RESOLUTION 2003-19  
Agenda Item 3.1

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 program is approved:

Columbus State Community College  
Associate of Applied Science degree in Real Estate Appraisal

RESOLUTION 2003-20  
Agenda Item 3.2

BE IT RESOLVED: upon the recommendation of the Chancellor and with the concurrence of the Regents' Advisory Committee on Graduate Study as well as the Initiatives Committee of the Ohio Board of Regents that the following new degree program is approved:

The Ohio State University  
Master of Occupational Therapy

RESOLUTION 2003-21  
Agenda Item 3.3

BE IT RESOLVED: upon the recommendation of the Chancellor and with the concurrence of the Regents' Advisory Committee on Graduate Study as well as the Initiatives Committee of the Ohio Board of Regents that the following new degree program is approved:

The Ohio State University  
Doctor of Philosophy in Women's Studies

RESOLUTION 2003-22  
Agenda Item 3.4

WHEREAS, the Governor of the State of Ohio and the 123<sup>rd</sup> General Assembly of Ohio have supported the establishment of the Ohio Eminent Scholars Program; and

WHEREAS, the 123<sup>rd</sup> General Assembly appropriated \$5.2 million to be used by the Board of Regents “to establish an Ohio Eminent Scholars Program, the purpose of which is to invest educational resources to address problems that are of vital statewide significance while fostering the growth in eminence of Ohio’s academic programs...”; and

WHEREAS, Ohio’s state-assisted colleges and universities and nonprofit Ohio institutions of higher education holding certificates of authorization issued under section 1713.02 of the Revised Code were invited to submit proposals in statewide competition for Ohio Eminent Scholars endowment awards; and

WHEREAS, Ohio’s state-assisted colleges and universities and nonprofit Ohio institutions of higher education holding certificates of authorization issued under section 1713.02 of the Revised Code responded to the goals of the Ohio Eminent Scholars Program with outstanding proposals; and

WHEREAS, the distinguished Ohio Eminent Scholars Final Review Committee, following a careful and thorough review of the sixteen finalists, submitted its recommendations to the Ohio Board of Regents; and

WHEREAS, the Ohio Board of Regents at the meeting of July 19, 2001 approved eleven Ohio Eminent Scholars Program awards where sufficient funding was only available for seven Eminent Scholar endowments; and

WHEREAS, the Governor and the 124<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of Ohio provided an additional \$3 million in Ohio Eminent Scholars funding within Am. Sub. Senate Bill 261 (the budget modification bill) to support the previously approved four Ohio Eminent Scholars awards;

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED: upon the recommendation of the Chancellor, and with the concurrence of the Initiatives Committee of the Ohio Board of Regents, the Ohio Eminent Scholars Program is awarded to the university programs on the list attached hereto.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: the Ohio Board of Regents expresses its gratitude to the Governor and the General Assembly for their vision in ensuring the enhancement of excellence in Ohio graduate and professional programs as well as for enabling faculty and students in Ohio graduate and professional programs to address problems that are of vital statewide significance; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: the Ohio Board of Regents further extends its sincere compliments to each program that was considered; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: the Ohio Board of Regents recognizes with appreciation the valuable contributions of the distinguished senior scholar/administrators who served on the Ohio Eminent Scholars Disciplinary and Final Review Committees.

**OHIO EMINENT SCHOLARS PROGRAM AWARDS**

**September 19, 2002**

| <b>University</b>               | <b>Program</b>                       | <b>OES Award</b> | <b>Capital Grant</b>    |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| Ohio State University           | Computational Nanotechnology         | \$750,000        | Funds not yet available |
| Kent State University           | Theoretical Liquid Crystal Physics   | \$750,000        | Funds not yet available |
| Miami University                | Protein Solution Structural Analysis | \$750,000        | Funds not yet available |
| Case Western Reserve University | Condensed Matter Physics             | \$750,000        | Funds not yet available |

RESOLUTION 2003-23  
Agenda Item 3.5

WHEREAS, the state's biennial budget directs the Ohio Board of Regents to distribute higher education funds in accordance with various requirements; and

WHEREAS, in this action the Board is requested to consider the release and distribution of the Performance Grant portion of the FY 2003 Jobs Challenge appropriations; and

WHEREAS, the Ohio Board of Regents is mandated by the Ohio General Assembly to administer the distribution of various line item appropriations included in Amended Substitute House Bill 94 of the 124<sup>th</sup> General Assembly; and

WHEREAS, certain of these funds are provided for a specific purpose and others are to be distributed at the discretion of the Board; and

WHEREAS, the Jobs Challenge appropriations are reserved for member campuses of the Enterprise Ohio Network; and

WHEREAS, the Performance Grants are distributed to campuses that have fulfilled performance criteria for employee training and related services for businesses and industries strategically important to the state's economic success.

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 FY 2003 appropriations for Jobs Challenge Performance Grants, as described in the attached table and made a part hereof, be approved for distribution.

RESOLUTION 2003-24  
Agenda Item 3.6

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section 3333.04 of the Ohio Revised Code, the Ohio Board of Regents is required to review the appropriation requests of state colleges and universities and to submit to the Office of Budget and Management and to the Chairmen of the Finance Committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate its recommendations in regard to the biennial higher education appropriations for the state; and

WHEREAS, to provide technical assistance and substantive policy recommendations for the biennial budget request, the Board of Regents reconvened the Higher Education Funding Commission and the State Share of Instruction consultation, and convened a statewide consultation on state student financial aid; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents has received and considered the recommendations of the Chancellor for the state higher education operating appropriation for the 2003 - 2005 biennium, which incorporate the recommendations of the Funding Commission, the State Share of Instruction consultation, and the State Student Financial Aid consultation; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents recognizes the need for a recovery of state investments in higher education from the budget constraints of FY 2002 and FY 2003, and therefore especially endorses the major increases recommended for the State Share of Instruction and the Challenges; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents also recognizes the need for changes in the state's need-based aid program, and supports the increases in and changes to the program to provide, over time, more equitable grant awards to independent students with dependent children.

NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board concurs in the higher education operating appropriation recommendations of the Chancellor for the fiscal biennium 2003 – 2005 as set forth in the materials attached to and made a part hereof; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Chancellor is hereby authorized to transmit such recommendations with appropriate supporting documentation to the Office of Budget and Management and to the Chairmen of the Finance Committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate in accordance with established state budgetary procedures; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Chancellor is authorized to work in close cooperation with the Director of the Office of Budget and Management and subsequently with appropriate legislative officers and committees in presenting the operating appropriation needs of the higher education system during the 2003 – 2005 biennium, reporting periodically to the Board on progress, and to actively seek support toward the achievement of the purposes and objectives encompassed within the recommendations now before the Board.

RESOLUTION 2003-25  
Agenda Item 3.7

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 July 1, 2002 through August 31, 2002, shown on the sheets attached hereto, are hereby approved and recommended for approval by the Controlling Board.

RESOLUTION 2003-26  
Agenda Item 3.8

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 institution be granted Provisional Authorization beginning October 1, 2002 and ending October 1, 2004.

Union Institute and University, Cincinnati, Ohio

**CHANCELLOR'S REPORT**

We're grateful to Cuyahoga Community College and to President Jerry Sue Thornton for the warm hospitality we've been shown here this week. Dr. Thornton marks her 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary at Tri-C this year and we wish her well as she celebrates this important milestone. Cuyahoga Community College is Ohio's first and largest community college and they're working hard to stay on top. Autumn enrollment is up 9.6 percent this year – to 23,324 – the largest fall enrollment increase since 1975. This follows a 12.6 percent summer

enrollment hike and a spring increase of 9.7 percent. I'm told Oprah Winfrey will be on hand in November to help celebrate Dr. Thornton's anniversary. In return, the president will appear on Oprah's show, 'College Presidents Who Can't Say No to New Students'.

Today, I'm going to forego the bulk of the time that normally is set aside for my comments, so that we can hear presentations on two critically important issues – the upcoming biennial budget and the presentation of four Eminent Scholar awards. Over the next several months, the Governor's office and the General Assembly will be considering the details of the FY '04 and FY 05 budget cycle. Rich Petrick, our vice chancellor for finance, has been crunching the numbers and is here to outline for us the challenges and opportunities we face in the coming biennium.

### **RICH PETRICK'S BUDGET PRESENTATION:**

Rich Petrick, Vice Chancellor of Finance, will summarize the budget deliberations we have been engaged in and will present for your consideration, the Regents recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly for Higher Education Funding.

*[Note: These comments were accompanied by a Powerpoint presentation to the Board.]*

Madame Chair, Members of the Board, Chancellor Chu:

I'm pleased to discuss the FY 2004 – FY 2005 operating budget recommendations. These recommendations are the result of the hard work of a number of consultations and commissions for the past 6 months.

### **Background:**

As Chancellor Chu already mentioned, we experienced 3 years of budget cuts beginning FY 2001, when higher education appropriations were reduced by \$20 million. Then \$240 million was cut in FY 2002 – FY 2003. As a result of this, FY 2003 total appropriations for higher education were less than total appropriations in FY 2001 after cuts. At the same time, public campus enrollment has been growing significantly; Tri-C's recent experience is but one example. Enrollment jumped 4.5% in FY 2002 -- or roughly 14,000 students in one year. We expect enrollment to jump by 28,000 full-time equivalent students over a 3-year period. Total number of headcount students could be in the vicinity of 40,000 – 50,000 new students, depending on the mix of part-time or full-time attendance. All of this, by way of background, is a reminder that Ohio is an undereducated state, and that enrollments surge when the economy slows down. Unfortunately, when students are most in need of higher education and have the greatest opportunity because of the economic slowdown, the state has had the fewest resources to enable campuses to serve these students. Hopefully we can reverse this situation with these budget recommendations.

Another important point by way of background: colleges and universities have managed extremely well in the face of these budget cuts. The tuition increase this year and last year are below the rates that we estimate are needed to fund normal costs and to replace lost state dollars. How have the campuses been able to do this? With tight and strict management. Two important ways they have done it over the past 2 years is through the use of their budget reserves, and through operating cuts or deferrals of operating expenditures. These actions have helped campuses over the hump during this biennium -- but they can only be used one time, and the resources are simply not there to do it again for a second biennium of cuts. Without help from the state, the campuses will experience real pressure during FY 2004 – FY 2005. There are smaller and smaller margins, and smaller and smaller reserves to use to manage their operations.

**Process and participants:**

These recommendations are the result of 3 major consultations – the state chair of instruction consultation, the student financial aid consultation, which is new, (the first one we have had in twelve years), and the higher education funding commission. I can spend a complete hour on all of these, but I just want to thank the hundreds of people who participated in these deliberations and consultations, contributing their data and wisdom to these recommendations. Many of them are in this room here today and to let you know that they are the ultimate authors of the recommendations that you will see before you.

The budget request seeks the maximum amount permitted by the state Office of Budget and Management. We are permitted to ask for up to a 10% per year increase in funding and we have done so. This amounts to an additional \$247 million in FY 2004 and \$276 million in FY 2005. These are extremely optimistic numbers, but they are not extravagant in terms of the relative deprivation that higher education has experienced and the immense need that is out there as well, as evidenced by the surge in enrollments.

Two major points I want to emphasize about the budget recommendations:

- 1) These budget recommendations will partially restore core institutional support. It will fund new enrollments, as I have already mentioned, it will help restrain tuition, an issue we have already discussed, and it will strengthen campuses' abilities to fulfill their missions.
- 2) This will help reform our need-based financial aid program by making the grant awards more equitable across different types of students relative to their financial need. The financial aid recommendations are part of a multi biennium reform that is currently underway.

In terms of the state share of instruction, three major components would be funded in this proposal. To fund the increase of new students, on average we need between 2% & 2-1/2% per year just to fund the new enrollments. That is

about \$40 million. To reduce the student's share you need about 5% per year. That is about \$80 million, and these dollars will restrain tuition increases. And to keep talent, that is to attract and retain talented faculty and staff, is roughly 4% per year. 4% per year is the average increase in civilian compensation payroll last year and roughly the average for prior years.

Another item in the state share of instruction, which we hope to have to you by the end of October, is the complete plan to phase down the annual hold harmless guarantee, which has long been an issue in the contention in the formula. Campuses are now guaranteed exactly 100% of prior years funding. The proposals under discussion would be to keep the maximum guarantee under 100%, and would provide for a guarantee level that would float downward with overall funding changes in the state share of instruction. This would always preserve some portion of funds for enrollment growth even in the worst of budget times, and the less-than-100% guarantee would move many campuses, if not most campuses, off the guarantee and onto the formula over time.

The challenges are the second big piece of core funding and institutional support. We are requesting significant increases of 10% and 5% for access and success challenges and 10% and 10% for research and jobs challenge. The research and jobs challenge form the core of our economic development as emphasized and reported to you in the budget line items. All of these challenges have been immensely successful relative to the goals they have set for themselves in terms of their contributions to Ohio students and contributions to Ohio's economy. These have been reported to you separately and I won't go into this today.

The second major piece is student financial aid. Our goal here is to reform the need-based grants system and to increase awards for all grants -- not simply the need-based grant program. The recommendations support enhancements in other categorical student financial aid, for example, the merit based academic scholarships would be increase 10% & 5%. Student choice grants meet the request of the Association of Independent Colleges & Universities, and are fully funded in this request. The Ohio National Guard Scholarship is another example that these recommendations would fully fund. The recommendations come from the Adjutant General, who guides the policy and we implement it.

The statewide student financial aid consultation concluded with some very good data that the state's method for calculating financial aid/financial need seriously underestimates need. We are using a method that is at least 30 years old and its foundation really has not been examined for a very long time. We now have the data to do that with relative ease and discovered that the federal program that is used to distribute Pell grants is more equitable and therefore preferable. Ultimately we would hope to move to using the federal methodology not in FY 04 & FY 05, but in FY 06 & FY 07. A movement in FY 04 & FY 05 would be too rapid and too costly. We want to phase this important change in over time, and also have the time to study the effects. So for the short term, we would increase awards for independent students with

dependents. This is the population of students who are most seriously underfunded relative to need according to the new data. Over the long term, we would use the federal measure of need called “expected family contribution” or “EFC”.

Very quickly, to show you the order of magnitude of the problem that we have discovered. We have two classes of students: dependent students, which are traditionally 18–24 year old students, and the independent students, those who live independent of their parents, and many of them might have dependents. Under the state system, the OIG system, 22,382 students are eligible for the maximum state grant. Under the federal methodology, if we were to switch this year to the EFC program, (these are last years figures), 47,308 students would be eligible for the maximum grant. That is, their expected family contribution is zero, and this is a reasonable measure showing how our current methodology for determining financial need must be revised to be fairer and more equitable.

The next table simply shows the order of magnitude in terms of cost and the biggest impact is on independent students. The independent students are the most seriously underserved by the current system. The Regents recommendations would begin to largely bridge this gap through FY 04/FY 05 so that by FY06 the independent student would be brought up to equity; then would be in a position to make the additional changes that are needed. We will have a separate report on this later in this fiscal year.

There are other possible long-term changes that will be under review and will be reported back to you as the financial aid consultation continues its work.

This is the nickel, maybe dime tour, and I want to thank you all for your good support and good recommendations as the recommendations have been developed.

Motion to approve the consent agenda budget item - Regent Krumm makes the motion – Regent Reese seconds the motion – all in favor – the I’s have it – this has passed.

#### **CHANCELLOR’S REMARKS CONTINUES:**

Although most of the budget news during the current biennium has been bad news, there have been some positive stories as well. Two highlights were included in SB 261, which provided \$50 million to kick-start Gov. Taft’s Third Frontier initiative, and gave the Board of Regents \$3 million that allows us to complete a job we left unfinished more than a year ago – the funding of four Eminent Scholars that the board approved in July 2001 but did not have the appropriations to distribute.

Eminent scholar’s presentation (the chancellor and Regent Brown)

The Ohio Eminent Scholars Program has played a crucial role in making Ohio's research universities the important economic engines that they have become over the past three decades. These endowed faculty chair positions attract high-quality scholars who foster national and international eminence in academic program quality and research excellence. The Eminent Scholars and their research students address critical state needs, by enhancing the state's economic development, K-12 education, and public health and safety. And they draw additional research dollars to the state. One study by Ohio State University found that their Eminent Scholars have secured their own research funding in excess of \$32 million – more than \$70 million if collaborative projects are counted.

Before we present the awards I'd like to say thanks to Gov. Bob Taft and the leaders of the General Assembly for allowing us to continue this vital program. These additional dollars were appropriated during very difficult economic times, because our state's leaders recognize that the Eminent Scholar program is an important investment that will strengthen Ohio's economic competitiveness. Incidentally, the proposed operating budget includes a recommendation to fund seven (7) additional Eminent Scholar positions in FY 2005, at an increased rate of \$1,700,000, or \$850,000 of state funds for each position. We hope that the support from the governor and the general assembly remains strong.

**Chair Jeanette Brown presents the awards:**

For the award, 'Computational Nanotechnology at Ohio State University', we welcome Dr. Edward Jennings, the interim President of Ohio State. The senior scholar chosen for this position will work closely with the OSU Center for Materials Research to carry out theoretical studies that will be exploited to find small solutions – on the molecular and atomic level – to the big technological problems of our time. Nanotechnology – the science of new materials and processes achieved through control at the atomic level – is expected to be a strategic branch of science and engineering throughout this new century, one that will fundamentally restructure a host of technologies.

For the award, 'Theoretical Liquid Crystal Physics at Kent State University,' we welcome Dr. Paul Gaston, Provost at Kent State. In liquid crystal research, as in all of science, theorists provide the basic framework of understanding that advances scientific knowledge in the discipline. This new senior scholar at Kent State's Liquid Crystal Institute will complement and expand the research programs at the institute, and in chemical physics, and enhance the LCI's national and international visibility.

For the award, Protein Solution Structural Analysis at Miami University, we welcome Dr. Robert Johnson, Associate Provost and Dean of the Graduate School at Miami. Understanding the structural and physical properties of biologically active molecules is at the heart of biomedical research and could

influence research directions in everything from basic research on structure and function relationships to applied research within the clinical setting. The scholar selected for this program will develop a world-class research program in the area of protein solution structure and dynamics.

For the award Condensed Matter Physics at Case Western Reserve University, we welcome Provost and University Vice President Dr. James Wagner. Modern condensed matter physics lies at the crossroads of electromagnetic theory, statistical mechanics, and quantum mechanics. If you got sidetracked before ever reaching this crossroads, let me say it this way – the laser, the X-ray, and many of our modern electronic devices were created on the roads of scientific inquiry leading to this intersection, and so research in this area holds enormous potential for future economic impact. The senior scholar selected for this position will lead a world-class research program in this arena – specifically in biophotonics, nanoscopic physics, and/or soft condensed matter physics.

**CHANCELLOR’S REMARKS CONTINUES:**

Thank you, Madam Chair, and thanks to all of you who have come here today to accept these awards. It is your leadership that has fostered these truly outstanding, even world class, research programs, and it will be through your leadership that they will continue to grow.

A few final notes: An update is in order on the progress of the Joint Council of the Board of Regents and the Ohio Department of Education’s work on systemic reform of math and science education. Two weeks ago we held a conference to examine the successful strategies for closing the math-science achievement gap. The conference was a giant step toward understanding what it takes to improve math and science achievement for all students, and to close the gaps that exist among student sub-groups. The outcomes of this conference will be shared with a Blue Ribbon Panel that is studying strategies for closing those gaps, so you’ll be hearing more about this in the future.

And, it’s with mixed emotions that I report on the retirement of Ned Sifferlen, who has spent the last 5 years as President of Sinclair Community College, but whose career at Sinclair spans 37 years. I’m happy that Ned will be taking some time in his life to enjoy his grandchildren, and the golf, tennis and fishing he enjoys. But all of us in higher education will miss President Sifferlen’s energy, wisdom and insight. He has been a strong leader at Sinclair during a critical era – but he also has been a model for community college presidents throughout Ohio.

This concludes my remarks for the month. Thank you Madam Chair

**PRESENTATIONS**

- a. "Access and Mission of Cuyahoga Community College"  
  
Dr. Jerry Sue Thornton, President  
Cuyahoga Community College
  
- b. "Workforce Training, Credit Instruction and Economic Development"  
  
Dr. Sunil Chand, Executive Vice President  
Academic and Student Affairs  
Cuyahoga Community College  
  
Mr. Craig McAtee, Executive Director of Manufacturing & Applied  
Technologies for the Workforce and Economic Development Division  
(WEDD)  
Cuyahoga Community College
  
- c. Presentations of Proclamations for Regent Tahlman Krumm, Jr. and  
Regent Gerald H. Gordon

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

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

The next meeting of the Ohio Board of Regents will be held on Thursday, October 17, 2002, at Battelle, Columbus, Ohio, 1:30 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Chair**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Secretary**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**