MIAMI UNIVERSITY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Minutes of the Board of Trustees Meeting
Oxford Campus
Marcum Conference Center, Rooms 180-186
Friday, June 24, 2016

The Secretary to the Board of Trustees confirms that as specified in the Regulations of the Board of Trustees of Miami University, and in compliance with Section 121.22 of the Ohio Revised Code, due notice was given prior to holding this meeting of the Board of Trustees.

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. in the Marcum Conference Center, on the Oxford Campus with the Board Chair, Mr. David Budig, presiding. The roll was called with a majority of Trustees present, constituting a quorum. In addition to the Board members; President David Hodge, Provost Phyllis Callahan, Senior Vice President David Creamer, and Vice Presidents Jayne Brownell, Thomas Herbert, Michael Kabbaz and Peter Natale were also present; as were; Robin Parker, General Counsel; and Ted Pickerill Secretary to the Board of Trustees. Members of the faculty, staff, student body and community were also in attendance.

Present: John W. Altman (National Trustee)     Dennis Lieberman
        Jagdish K. Bhati
        Alexandra Boster (Student Trustee)  John C. Pascoe
        David H. Budig
        Robert E. Coletti (National Trustee) Diane Perlmutter (National Trustee)
        C. Michael Gooden (National Trustee) Mark E. Ridenour
        Terry Hershey (National Trustee)    Robert W. Shroder
        Stephen P. Wilson

Absent: Ciara Lawson (Student Trustee)

Public Study Session

Intercollegiate Athletics

David Sayler, the Director of Intercollegiate Athletics, updated the Board. He highlighted key personnel changes, and reviewed ICA’s core components for success, which include:

Integrity
Student-Athlete Experience
Athletic Success
Academic Success
Positive Visibility
Teammates
Contributor to Society
Fiscal Management
Athletic Director Sayler also reviewed several budget items, highlighting that salary and benefits total expenditures had decreased from FY14 to FY16. He then emphasized the accomplishments of the student athletes, including athletic and academic success, graduation success rates (which lead the MAC in seven sports), and the community service performed by Miami athletes.

Athletic Director Sayler’s presentation is included as Attachment A.

**Public Business Session**

**Comments from the Public**

There were no requests to comment.

**Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes**

Trustee Shroder moved, Trustee Wilson seconded, and by voice vote the minutes of the February meeting of the Board of Trustees were unanimously approved.

**Consent Calendar**

Trustee Wilson moved, Trustee Ridenour seconded, and by voice vote the resolutions presented on the Consent Calendar were unanimously approved.

*Note: All resolutions from the Consent Calendar are included as Attachment B*

**Designation of Emerita/Emeritus**

**RESOLUTION R2016-41**

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the following for the rank of President Emeritus effective on the formal date of retirement:

David C. Hodge
President

*(Approved in conjunction with the vote on the Hodges’ Resolution of Appreciation)*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the following for the rank of Ambassador Emerita effective on the formal date of retirement:

Valerie L. Hodge
University Ambassador

*(Approved in conjunction with the vote on the Hodges’ Resolution of Appreciation)*
BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the following for the rank of Professor Emerita effective on the formal date of retirement:

Karen Dawisha
Political Science

Joan Fopma-Loy
Nursing

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the following for the rank of Dean Emeritus effective on the formal date of retirement:

G. Michael Pratt
Dean, Regional Campuses/Anthropology

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the following for the rank of Administrator Emerita effective on the formal date of retirement:

Melanie Brunner
Accounts Payable

Michele Dienno
Public Relations/Marketing

Jeanne Via
Housing, Dining, Recreation and Business Services

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the following for the rank of Administrator Emeritus effective on the formal date of retirement:

John Morton
Geology and Environmental Earth Science

Daniel Rambo
Housing, Dining, Recreation and Business Services

Resolution to Elect Dr. Renate Crawford
University Ambassador and Adjunct Professor of Physics

RESOLUTION 2016-42

WHEREAS, Miami University was chartered in 1809; and

WHEREAS, Miami University’s 207 year history has been marked by exceptional achievement, with over 200,000 alumni who have served, succeeded and inspired others in nearly every field of endeavor; and
WHEREAS, the role of the University Ambassador is strategically important to the advancement and success initiatives of Miami University; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Renate Crawford earned her PhD in Physics from Kent State University, became a National Research Council Postdoctoral Fellow at the Center for Biomolecular Engineering at the Naval Research Laboratory in Washington, D.C. and served as a faculty member at the University of Massachusetts, where she later became chair of the department of physics and subsequently associate dean of engineering. Dr. Crawford also served as an adjunct associate professor of physics at the University of Notre Dame; and

WHEREAS, the chair and faculty of the Department of Physics, the Dean of the College of Arts and Science and the Provost have approved Dr. Renate Crawford’s appointment as an Adjunct Professor of Physics at Miami University; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Renate Crawford is uniquely positioned to serve as the University Ambassador during the Presidency of Dr. Gregory Crawford, Miami University’s 22nd President.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the members of the Miami University Board of Trustees do hereby elect Dr. Renate Crawford, University Ambassador and Adjunct Professor of Physics effective July 1, 2016 at a salary of $30,700; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the members of the Board of Trustees warmly welcome Dr. Renate Crawford and look forward to working with her in continuing Miami’s great success and in embracing Miami’s bright future.

Done, by the Miami University Board of Trustees, this Twenty-Fourth Day of June, Two Thousand Sixteen at Miami University, in the City of Oxford, County of Butler, State of Ohio, during the Two Hundred and Seventh year of the University’s Charter.

Records Management Program

RESOLUTION R2016-43

WHEREAS: the Ohio Revised Code authorizes boards of trustees of state-supported institutions of higher learning to establish and administer a records management program for their respective institutions; and

WHEREAS: Miami University has established a records management program for the purpose of insuring proper scheduling, storage and disposal of university records using Record Retention for Public Colleges and Universities in Ohio: A Manual (Inter-University Council of Ohio) as the basis for Miami University's records management program.; and

WHEREAS: the objectives of the records management program are to reduce the number of non-current records, oversee records storage and access outside the office of origin, eliminate unnecessary duplication of records, offer a systematic method of records destruction, and create an awareness of documents with a permanent archival value;
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees appoints the General Counsel as the University Records Manager responsible for the Records Management Program and adopts the Miami University Records Management Mission Statement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that this resolution supersedes Board of Trustees Resolution R2011-59.

Miami University Records Management Mission Statement

In compliance with Section 149.33 of the Ohio Revised Code, Miami University, by the authority of its Board of Trustees, has established a records management program under the jurisdiction of the Office of General Counsel for the purpose of ensuring proper scheduling, storage and disposal of university records. This program is designed to reduce the number of non-current records, facilitate document imaging, eliminate unnecessary records, offer a systematic method of records maintenance and destruction and create an awareness of documents with a permanent archival value.

Comments by the Chair

Chair David Budig relayed the following information:

Good morning and welcome to this meeting of the Miami University Board of Trustees. Thank you again David for that excellent update on Miami Athletics. The academic achievement of our student athletes is truly remarkable and we look forward to the start of the fall sports schedule and of course, our future bowl appearance.

We are already getting started for the next academic year, as this past month, there have been orientation sessions for our entering freshmen and we are looking forward to welcoming a very impressive, diverse, and academically accomplished group in the fall. As I mentioned during our last Board Meeting, this is the most accomplished class of incoming students that Miami has ever seen and I would again congratulate Michael Kabbaz and the entire Enrollment Management and Student Success Team on this accomplishment.

Later today we will recognize, with a resolution of appreciation, Dean Mike Pratt, who has been instrumental in positioning our Regional Campuses to quickly meet the evolving needs of their communities and our students. Mike has been invaluable in all that he has done for Miami and we are indebted to him for his time and talent toward the success of our Regional System.

As we all know, this is a very special Board of Trustees meeting as it will be David and Valerie’s final meeting as the President and Ambassador of Miami University

A decade ago, they traveled to Miami and during their tenure, Miami has succeeded beyond even the most ambitious and far-reaching of expectations. They have embraced Miami as their home, as we have embraced them as true Miamians and dear friends.

Thank you David and thank you Valerie. I do not want to go too deeply into the incredible contributions you have made to Miami as we will hear more about your
accomplishments later today as we read your resolution.

Normally, I would highlight many of the unique and special recognitions and events which have occurred since our last meeting. But today, I would like to keep my remarks short and allow us to keep focus upon celebrating the success of David and Valerie Hodge.

Reports, Ordinances and Resolutions

President’s Report

Miami University President Hodge relayed the following:

Good morning! Thank you David for the kind words for Valerie and me. Well, this is an emotional time. One of the things that happened during Alumni weekend is that we were made honorary members of the Alumni Association, so we’re pretty thrilled about that. Now we’re true Miamians and we’ll be that for the rest of our lives. And, I just want to say before I go into my remarks that when we look at the accomplishments and we think about things that have happened over the last ten years it’s due to the incredible work of the faculty and staff and the generosity of alumni and friends to the University - no question about it, that’s what made this possible, that’s what attracted us here and that’s what proven to be the most important ingredient.

Let me just offer a few thoughts. First of all, I want to say how impressed I am by some of the things that we’re doing with our intercollegiate athletics. Having been at the University of Washington for thirty one years and seeing what the power five conferences are like, I have a much deeper appreciation for the quality program that we have here. It starts first and foremost with integrity. Integrity is kind of an elusive feature for a lot of sports programs; it’s real easy for people to cut corners and do things that will give them a competitive edge in the short run - and I can say with complete confidence that we are vigilant about avoiding that - we are committed to the concept of integrity from top to bottom and I couldn’t be more proud of our programs. We’ve also highlighted the success in academics and the success in placing our students when they graduate into careers. We have an extraordinary record here so our student athletes have a complete collegiate experience and leave here with great job prospects. They add to the competitive spirit of the university - most of you have heard me say many times that one of the things we seek in incoming students and we nurture throughout the collegiate experience is that fire in the belly, that drive, that energy, that gumption, and athletics brings that in a heightened and focused way that adds greatly to the spirit of the campus. Lastly, I would be remiss without saying something about how the facilities that we’ve created for intercollegiate athletics have benefited the entire university. Like the Goggin, and the new Indoor Sports Center, these kinds of facilities where intramural are also played, where our club sports do very, very well - winning several national championships - these facilities provide a much bigger impact that you might otherwise see.

Since we last met one of the biggest events was graduation. We were very pleased to have nearly four thousand people graduate. We had what I thought was just an absolutely fantastic speaker in Sir Ken Robinson, who really knocked it out of the park and helped to cap our Year of Creativity and Innovation. The only downside, of course was the weather. We had a
little bit of a problem with the weather. The one thing I will say now - I can say “Whew!” because we got through ten years without having to cancel the outdoor ceremony. We had some miserable experiences, but we never had to cancel one so I’m pretty pleased with that.

This Year of Creativity and Innovation has been in many regards one of my most exciting here, because it’s a culmination of a lot of different individual activities that have been brought into focus and now energized as we go forward. We had two especially large goals. One was to learn as an institution how we can produce graduates who are even more creative and innovative than we have been doing in the past. And there are lots of efforts to think about curriculum and how we can use curriculum and co-curricular activities to advance that goal. The second major goal was to become an even more creative and innovative university and we’re doing this in lots of ways. The steering committee group, and I want to thank the steering group again, created this general logo “MIAMIDEAS” where there is just one “I” and it’s all one word. I hope that this will continue to be a force for the future because I think it captures a lot of the creativity and innovation that’s made Miami special and most certainly will be critical to our success in the future. One example of that is that I was able to secure a gift from one of our alums who really appreciates our commitment to MU-Lean and all of the things that we’ve accomplished with that; not just because it’s the bottom line - it has effected forty million dollars of economic impact on the university so far - but because it imbues a spirit of innovation and creativity. So we’re creating a series of awards that will be announced next fall that will recognize creativity and innovation at both the individual level and at the group and institutional level, so we’re really excited to see that go forward.

For a fourth time the university won a Backman Scholars Institutional Award which supports undergraduate research and faculty mentoring. We’re one of only 12 universities nationally to receive this award; a tremendous recognition of the quality of our faculty and the contributions they make to our students.

I think all of us were a little bit surprised in some regards to see the Time magazine article about Miami being one of the top ten universities in the country in producing Fortune 500 CEO’s. It is just a stunning record of Miami contributing to leadership. This has been one of the most enjoyable parts of being president, as I go around and talk to CEO’s and other leaders within companies, I hear again and again the same message, which is that Miami graduates, as someone from PricewaterhouseCooper put it, not only work for companies, they move companies! They move up in companies at an extraordinary rate because they’ve been well educated, they have deep intellectual roots, and they also have breadth and those intangibles that set them apart. So I’m not at all surprised to see that we’re among the top 10 because I hear these comments so often.

Another feature that really stands out in my mind was the awarding of a five-year contract for Miami to host the American Legion Buckeye Boys State Program. This is really a stunning accomplishment that’s been two years in the making. When we began to hear that they might be considering a move from Bowling Green, after having been there for thirty-nine years, we really made this as a campus effort - thank you to Kim Kinsel the others on David Creamer’s team, they really put together a tremendous proposal for Boys State. The thing that impresses me so much about it - and I had a chance to visit with the site group when they were here, and also
to visit up at Bowling Green, to actually see the young men participating - is that the mission of the Buckeye Boys State aligns so beautifully with Miami’s. You’ve got students that you’re challenging by asking “How can you deepen your understanding of how government works so that you can be an active citizen or possibly, a government official who will advance the well-being of those around you.” It’s just an absolutely fantastic experience. So here we are, a five year commitment, so we’re going to have at least 1,200, and we hopefully more, young men finishing their junior year, rising high school seniors, come to Miami to spend eight days here in just an extraordinary program. I’ll also say you may not realize this but it’s often recognized that the Buckeye Boys State program is actually considered to be one of the very best in the nation, the thoroughness, the completeness, the emphasis it provides, makes it an extraordinary program.

I also want to single out Randi Thomas for all of this. Randi headed up a group of people who have really worked to help overcome the inertia of the group there with Boys State; you have to understand, they’ve been at Bowling Green for thirty-nine years, you really become very attached to a place, so the idea of thinking about someplace different can be a challenge. But we took our time and educated them about the possibilities. I think this is going to be a fantastic partnership and we’re going to add some new aspects to what they can do because of our commitment to these young men.

I mentioned a moment ago about Alumni Weekend and Valerie and I being very pleased to be inducted as honorary alumni. It was a great weekend, at the end of the day we had nearly two thousand people show up and display their great spirit. I don’t think that in all the years we’ve been doing this that we’ve had a year where we’ve received more compliments from people about classes they attended, or events they had gone to; it was just a first class operation all around. So Tom, kudos to you and to Ray Mock and to everybody in your group who made the weekend so great. One of the highlights for us was on Saturday night when they had the Alumni Glee Club concert. Normally the Glee Club is eighty to one hundred voices, but this was one hundred and eighty voices, and I had not appreciated how much more powerful one hundred and eighty voices are than eighty to one hundred. It was just an amazing concert and we will miss the Glee Club dearly and we will miss living right across the street from Hall Auditorium where we could just go over and enjoy these events.

I’d like to end my remarks by talking about an opportunity that Valerie and I had that surprised us in many regards, and deepened our understanding of some of the special history of Miami. We were invited by Jim Roberts who’s an alum and heads up the Americans Veterans Center in Washington D.C. to participate in the Memorial Day activities that occur in Washington D. C. There’s a concert at the Kennedy Center that features the Air Force Orchestra plus a number of notable choirs; it’s fantastic, and is then followed by the Memorial Day Parade. I must say, just as a personal aside, the old joke about getting to Carnegie Hall requires practice, practice and practice. Well, I didn’t practice and I’ve been on the stage at both Carnegie Hall and the Kennedy Center, so I feel pretty blessed in that regard! So it pays to hang around people who do practice and sometimes good things will come to you as well.

So we had the opportunity to participate in this. To be on the stage and to share some stories about Miami, which I’ll come to in just a moment, was wonderful. Then on Sunday we marched in the parade in downtown D.C. which typically attracts a couple of million visitors. We
were the only university to do that and as we walked by the reviewing stand they gave some words that Jim Roberts had put together that touches on the history of Miami’s contribution to the military and to the security of the nation. We marched behind a banner that recognized Lieutenant Robert Meder. Lieutenant Meder was one of the Doolittle Raiders, he was a pilot, and flew one of the planes; he made it there, dropped the bombs, then crash landed in China, and unfortunately died in a prisoner camp in China during the war. He’s a symbol of our history and a lot of what we’ve done. We’re the only university that does it, and alumni who are in the D.C. area march behind this banner and we give tribute to this fallen hero from Miami’s class of 1939.

But as I talked at the Kennedy Center and I reflected on how to share what’s special about this, some facts can apply, they relate to the Civil War in particular, and as you may know the whole concept of a Memorial Day started shortly after the Civil War - although formalization came along much later. So I was thinking about the Civil War and Miami’s role in it and as probably most of you know, at the time of the Civil War Miami contributed 50 generals and admirals to the two different sides; two members of Lincoln’s cabinet were also of Miami origins, so we had a very substantial contribution. But there’s a story about two brothers, two fraternity brothers who were at Miami that I think captures even more deeply the spirit and meaning of this and to me reinforces those qualities that have made Miami special over all these years. This story was also told in a Glee Club concert this spring when they were performing a song from the Civil War and trying to deepen our understanding of the significance and meaning of the song.

At the time of the Civil War, we get to the end of the school year and students who had been friends and in some cases fraternity friends went to the train station together and literally some students boarded a train going north and some students boarded a train going south. At a battle sometime later there were two fraternity brothers who were in the same battle and one of them was reputed to have been killed and the word got to the other. He then searched diligently on the battlefield until he found his fallen fraternity brother. He then buried the fraternity brother and marked a tree, then sent a letter to the parents telling them what had happened to their son, where he was and how his body could be found. There is something so profoundly moving in that story that I find difficult to put into words. But, there are a couple of dimensions that really stand out. The first and foremost is how deep and long our history is. Valerie and I not only had the opportunity to be at Miami for ten years, we also had the opportunity to be here at the celebration of our bicentennial; to be part of a university that the recognizes the fact that it’s two hundred years old. Throughout those two hundred years we faced many crises; we in fact closed for twelve years, and the fact that we reopened is truly a miracle! So there’s a deep history here. The second is, it’s also about why we’re here, and why is captured in this story, it’s captured in the heroism, the commitment of these graduates; and I would hope that we would continue to produce generation, after generation, of graduates who have that same deep commitment. Finally, I would also say it’s about how personal this university is. From the very first moment we stepped on this campus until the very last moment, we have been struck by the commitment, the passion, the caring that marks this university. We think about the future, we think about the past, we think about those things that have driven us, and most of all we think and look forward with anticipation to those values that will continue to propel and to sustain a future that is great for Miami University.
Response by Chair David Budig

President Hodge’s remarks were met with applause, and Chair Budig responded:

You know how to move a room; that was fabulous! David and Valerie, it’s impossible to put into words how you’ve transformed Miami in what you have done for the school, and for the city. The one thing you can always rest assured of, as you talk about history, your footprints will be here forever. Your legacy will be here and we can’t thank you enough!

Report of the Chair of University Senate Executive Committee

Dr. Drew Reffett, Chair of the Senate Executive Committee, thanked the Hodges for their service to Miami, and reported that there had been no meetings of the Senate since the previous Board meeting.

Chair Budig thanked Dr. Reffett for his report and for his service to Miami.

Report of the Student Body President

Maggie Reilly, Student Body President, relayed the following:

Ladies and Gentlemen, I’m honored to have the chance to speak before you today. My name is Maggie Reilly and I am currently serving as Miami’s Student Body President. To give you a quick background of myself, I am a rising senior Political Science Major with minors in Entrepreneurship and Writing & Rhetoric. I’ve been serving the students of Miami through Associated Student Government since I was a freshman senator and have been on the Executive Cabinet ever since. In addition to ASG, I am a College of Arts and Sciences Student Ambassador, a Law and Public Policy Scholar, a member of Alpha Chi Omega Fraternity, and a previous member of the Miami University Club Volleyball Team.

Associated Student Government has already gotten off to a great start this summer. Our Secretary for On-Campus Affairs, James Oaks, has been in Oxford all summer in order to get a head start on his goals for next year and to ensure that all auxiliary services are best serving the students once the school year commences. Vice President Stuart Coulston and my predecessor, Joey Parizek, just attended a leadership conference in Washington D.C. The conference, which had over 180 colleges represented by their student leadership in attendance, discussed the most pressing issues facing college campuses today and programs to implement moving forward.

Beyond this summer, ASG is looking forward to get started providing advocacy for students on campus and working with administrators to figure out the best solutions to all on campus problems. In August, the Executive Cabinet will meet to finalize our goals for the upcoming year. So, I will inform you of the specific initiatives we have already begun working on this summer and what we will be focusing on throughout all of next year.

Our largest initiative revolves around uniting all facets of campus together. It is our goal to unite as many different groups on campus as possible. The first step is to create a mutual
relationship between Greek life, diverse organizations, and athletics through support and philanthropy. The next step is to ensure that ASG is meeting with all student organizations throughout the school year to guarantee that all groups are getting the same treatment, no matter their size.

The second initiative is breaking the barriers between all students, Associated Student Government, and University Administrators. Too often, students that aren’t involved in student government feel like they are being left out of conversations surrounding what decisions are being made at the University. To combat this, we are going to implement ways to create transparency between students, ASG, and the administration so that no one is left in the dark and all voices are heard.

Our final initiative involves the umbrella term of student health. On one side of health, ASG feels like we can be doing a much better job at creating programs to better the mental health of students at the university. On the other side, we will be focusing our efforts on optimizing the physical health of students and faculty alike through recreation and dining services.

Lastly, on behalf of ASG and the student body, I would like to thank the Hodges for your dedication to Miami University for the past 10 years. Your commitment and love for the students has been exceptional and your impact on Miami will go far beyond your years.

In closing, thank you for granting me the honor to join you for today’s meeting. On behalf of ASG and the Student Body, I wish you all a great rest of the summer and look forward to what the next school year will bring.

Chair Budig thanked Ms. Reilly for her report and for her service to Miami.

Provost’s Remarks

Provost Callahan relayed the following:

This summer we will again be offering the Summer Scholars program. This is a 2 week program offered collaboratively by EMSS and Academic Affairs that provides an opportunity for talented high school students to experience college life. Part of that experience includes academic modules that offer a diverse range of topics and are taught by our faculty. This summer, 24 faculty, representing all 5 academic divisions on the Oxford campus, will be offering 22 unique summer modules (25 total). Modules including genetic engineering, public affairs, business basics, the entrepreneurial experience, understanding the human brain, architecture and fashion design to name a few. There are 367 students who have confirmed their enrollment in the Summer Scholars Program, an increase of 41 students over last year.

Regional campuses are promoting new 4 year degrees and are emphasizing the ability for students to create their own paths, focusing on flexibility and quality of the degree, and the impact that degree has on our community. Since January, 2016, and on a monthly basis there
have been small, but consistent increases in applications received compared to last year. At the end of May, applications were up by 34 (2% increase) compared to last year at the same time.

The Interior Design Program leading to the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree in Interior Design met Council for Interior Design accreditation (CIDA) Professional Standards. The program has been awarded accreditation for a term of 6 years, effective April 2016. This accreditation, the result of rigorous peer review, attests to the quality of the interior design program.

The Institute for Food at Miami University is a Provost Interdisciplinary Innovation Project to engage diverse communities around issues of food, health, and sustainable agriculture; it is being led by co-PI Peggy Shaffer and Alfredo Huerta. The goal is to build an interdisciplinary food centered curriculum and research program, an organic university farm and experiential education center, and community partnerships in support of a healthy and equitable regional food system. The farm is located adjacent to the Ecology Research Center and provides a space for hands-on learning and research, while enhancing the university’s commitment to sustainability and ecological research. It is being planned as a working farm to supply Miami’s Demske Culinary Support Center with locally produced organic vegetables for university dining services. A full time farm manager, Lauren Wulker, and a part-time sustainable agriculture specialist, Charles Griffin, have been hired. ERC Director Ann Rypstra and ERC Station Manager Jeremy Fruth, also provide support. Recently, the Institute has received external support from alumni who have generously provided funding and equipment. Additionally, an interdisciplinary faculty cohort have a grant currently under review at the USDA.

In Architecture & Interior Design, Associate Professor Diane Fellows has been mentoring students in the MU Habitat Studio. This year, they conducted a project that assists Syrian refugees in Jordan.

With the approval of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) of the UN Refugee Agency, Miami students collaborated with Artists and Engineers of Za'atari Refugee Camp in Jordan. Their work was facilitated by the International Relief & Development (IRD) organization (an NGO) at the camp. Their studio work with the Za'atari Community resulted in the UNHCR+IRD preparing to build:

- 20 shelters for community gathering,
- 3 prototype beds (inclusive for disabled; currently just foam mattresses for 80,000 people), and
- 2 tricycles with passenger carts built as prototypes, which are needed for independent transport.

The group received UNHCR financing approval to proceed with construction (expect money to be released within a few weeks). They will hire skilled workers from the camp, as well as semi-skilled workers, so there is a vocational training component to the project. They estimate that 50 people, including their local maintenance people, will manage the project.

Additionally, 20 architecture students are currently in Ghana doing a design/build project.
in a village there.

Money magazine reported that MU was third, behind Stanford and Princeton, among the top 10 colleges with the most alumni serving as CEO in the Fortune 500. (The rank order is by the number of undergraduate degrees each school confers). The article notes that Miami “offers a rigorous liberal arts curriculum that prepares its students for all kinds of challenges”. This liberal arts tradition, is, of course, the hallmark of a MU education. The article also noted that Miami is the only school in the top 10 with more than one female CEO to its credit (Lynn J. Good – Duke Energy and Kimberly S. Lubel, CST Brands).

Five Miami University students have been offered Fulbright U.S. Student Program grants for the 2016-2017 academic year. This is the highest number of Miami students to be offered Fulbright grants in a single academic year. The Fulbright U.S. Student Program is the largest U.S. exchange program. It provides about 1,900 grants in more than 140 countries worldwide in categories such as study/research, English Teaching Assistantships and travel grants. Miami’s newest Fulbright English Teaching Assistants are:

- Matthew Armelli, a German major who graduated in December 2015 and Jonathan Meyer, an international studies and German double major with a minor in history will be teaching in Germany.
- Rebekah Harper, a senior integrated English language arts education major with a minor in rhetoric/writing. She will be teaching in Turkey.
- Emily Paxson, a senior international studies major with a minor in German and William Smeal, a senior Spanish and linguistics double major with minors in Latin American studies and Lusophone studies will be teaching in Bulgaria.

From the Department of Psychology: Miami is one of only four institutions in the United States to receive a three-year $190,000 grant from the Indo-U.S. 21st Century Knowledge Initiative distributed by the U.S. Department of State. Miami shares the grant with the department of psychology at Christ University in India.

Associate Professor Vaishali Raval is leading an international team to develop curricula with a global perspective that focuses on evidence-based training and incorporates cultural awareness in the treatment of mental illness; this is an approach to treatment that is critical in diverse societies. Miami hosted the team from India this past May to begin the peer mentoring phase of the project.

Miami received its fourth Beckman Scholars Institutional Award. Miami is one of only 12 institutions nationwide to receive the Arnold and Mabel Beckman Foundation’s 2016 Beckman Scholars Program Institutional Award. The $130,000 award supports undergraduate research and faculty mentoring for select students in chemistry, biochemistry and the biological sciences.

Finally, on behalf of Academic Affairs, I thank President David Hodge and University Ambassador Valerie Hodge for their service and outstanding commitment to Miami University for the past 10 years. We wish them much happiness and joy (and great fishing – for one of
them, anyway) in their very well deserved retirement.

**Academic and Student Affairs Committee**

**Report of the Committee Chair**

Committee Chair Bob Shroder relayed the following information:

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee met yesterday in Stonebridge Hall on Western Campus, following the meeting we toured the facilities. Two resolutions were considered, the adoption of revived remediation standards, and the approval of an updated completion plan. The Committee recommends approval of both resolutions by the full Board today.

The Committee heard from student leaders, and from the Vice Presidents of the Divisions of: Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Enrollment Management and Student Success. The Committee received presentations on several topics, and also reviewed written reports, which will be available in the meeting’s minutes.

Rebecca Baudry Young, Director of Student Wellness updated the Committee on wellness initiatives, specifically a strategic plan to address high-risk alcohol use. Elements of the plan begin even before enrollment, and some on-campus features include Step Up training, the UNV101 course, as well alternate on-campus activities, and the training of groups, such as students requesting to join Greek organizations.

Michael Kabbaz, Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Success, reviewed key enrollment goals for fall 2016, application trends and confirmed student trends. Confirmation trends show an increase in out-of-state students, an increase in the average ACT score, near level numbers for international students, and an increase in domestic student diversity.

Brent Shock, Assistant Vice President and Director, Student Financial Services, updated the Committee on student loan debt. The average debt for 2014-2015 was $30,015, which is near the mid-point for reporting Ohio public universities, which have a band of $27,400 to $36,538. The portion of Miami students graduating with debt is lower than our Ohio counterparts at 53%. He also informed the Committee of counseling available to students regarding loans and debt.

Provost Callahan updated the Committee on changes to the State remediation standards, and to the strategic completion plan. The changes must be authorized by the board of Trustees, and the Committee recommends approval of the associated resolutions here today.

Lindsay Carpenter, Budget and Operations Manager, then updated the group on eLearning strategies, and online course offerings.
Following the presentations, Rob Abowitz, Associate Director of Residence Life hosted a tour of the building.

**Resolutions**

*Note: All Academic and Student Affairs Committee resolutions and any associated supporting materials, are found in Attachment C.*

**Revised Remediation-Free Standards**

Provost Callahan spoke in favor of the resolution, explaining that it informs students of the minimum standards. Trustee Bhati then moved, Trustee Wilson seconded and by unanimous voice vote, the resolution was approved.

**RESOLUTION R2016-44**

WHEREAS, Miami University Board of Trustees Resolution R2014-06 adopted the remediation-free standards established by Ohio’s public college and university presidents in December 2012, and the related assessment requirements, into Miami University student placement policies; and

WHEREAS, in 2016, the standards were recently updated with technical revisions by ODHE (with faculty panel input), and approved by the IUC and OACC presidents; and

WHEREAS, the specific revisions include:

- Removal of COMPASS Assessment for both English and Mathematics
- Recommended change to increase ACT Reading Sub-Score to >22 (previously >21)
- Removal of Accuplacer Elementary Algebra Assessment while retaining Accuplacer College Level Mathematics Assessment
- Addition of MapleSoft T.A. for Mathematics only, required score >50% correct responses
- Addition of ALEKS for Mathematics only, required score >46
- Addition of PlaceU (WebAssign) for Mathematics only, required score >18

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the revisions proposed by the Ohio Department of Higher Education (with faculty panel input) and approved by the Inter-University Council, and Ohio Association of Community Colleges, in 2016, are hereby adopted.

**Updated Strategic Completion Plan**

Provost Callahan spoke in favor of the resolution, explaining that it was prepared in consultation with Enrollment Management and Student Success, and includes intervention and more proactive advising. Trustee Shroder then moved, Trustee Bhati seconded and by unanimous voice vote, the resolution was approved.
RESOLUTION R2016-45

WHEREAS, the 130th Ohio General Assembly added Ohio Revised Code 3345.81 (Strategic Completion Plan), effective September 29, 2013; and

WHEREAS, ORC 3345.81 required, by no later than June 30, 2014, the Board of Trustees at each Ohio institution of higher education to adopt an institution-specific Strategic Completion Plan designed to increase the number of degrees and certificates awarded to students; and

WHEREAS, this Board of Trustees, per Resolution 2014-40, adopted, and submitted to the Chancellor and the Ohio Board of Regents, a Miami specific Strategic Completion Plan designed to increase the number of degrees and certificates awarded to students, consistent with the mission and strategic priorities of the institution, and aligned with the state's workforce development priorities, with measureable student completion goals; and

WHEREAS, ORC 3345.81 also required a review of the Strategic Completion Plan every two years.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees hereby adopts the attached updated Strategic Completion Plan for Miami University; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this plan be forwarded to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this plan be reviewed and updated at least once every two years, and that a copy of the updated plan be provided to the Chancellor upon adoption.

Finance and Audit Committee

Report of the Committee Chair

Committee Chair Mark Ridenour relayed the following information:

The Finance and Audit Committee met yesterday in 104 Roudebush Hall. The Committee considered one ordinance, eight resolutions and received several reports. All of the ordinances and resolutions are recommended for approval later in this meeting.

Budget planning was one of the major themes at yesterday’s meeting as several of the agenda topics focused in some way on either the current or future budget. There were presentations on the appropriation ordinance for fiscal year 2017 and the efficiency study prepared in response to the Governor’s Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency. The Committee also considered a resolution authorizing the endowment spending rate that determines the amount available to be spent for each endowed fund.
In response to the Governor’s Task Force Recommendations on Affordability and Efficiency, Miami is committed to growing its undergraduate scholarships by $30 million over the next five years. This is in addition to almost $60 million in efficiency improvements achieved over the last six years and almost $40 million in new undergraduate scholarships for the same period. The University is also committed to making further gains in the efficiency of its administrative and facility operations, participating in statewide procurement initiatives, lowering the cost of textbooks and course materials, and improving financial literacy as it relates to student debt.

Progress towards the Governor’s task force goal to increase undergraduate scholarships by $30 million will immediately occur in next year’s budget. The budget to be acted on later in this meeting includes $12.5 million in new undergraduate scholarships as a first step towards the new five year goal. The budget also includes over $13 million for improved employee compensation as both increased student aid and talented, dedicated employees are essential to Miami’s future.

In addition to considering several matters related to the University’s budget, the Committee also addressed several facility resolutions including the authorization of two new residence halls. The two new halls will address a 300 bed shortfall that exists today for freshmen and sophomore housing and replace aging facilities that are not cost effective to renovate. By constructing the two new residence halls at the same time, about $4 million in cost savings will result for these projects.

The Committee also considered an $11 million project for the partial renovation of Hughes Hall. This project will increase the amount of lab space on campus enabling the renovation of Pearson Hall to commence next summer. The project will also provide expanded labs and offices for the engineering program that has experienced significant enrollment growth.

In addition to the three new capital projects, the Committee also considered two routine facility resolutions authorizing local administration for the Pearson Hall project and a utility easement for a road construction project near the Hamilton campus.

As previously noted, all of the facility related resolutions are endorsed by the Committee.

Finally, the Committee considered the establishment of several new quasi-endowments for the Farmer School of Business and received reports on advancement and internal audit activities. The advancement report was especially informative as Vice President Herbert discussed the planning he and his staff have been doing for the introduction of President Crawford to alumni and friends. The Committee also discussed with Vice President Herbert the planning for the University’s next capital campaign and some of the needs that will accompany such a campaign.

**Ordinances and Resolutions**

*Note: All Finance and Audit Committee Ordinances and Resolutions, and any supporting materials, are found in Attachment D.*
It was proposed that the five construction related resolutions (Local Administration, Hughes Hall, Tennis Court Site, Withrow Hall Site, and the Utility Easement) be considered in a single vote. Hearing no objections, the five resolutions were presented for consideration in a single vote. Dr. Creamer then spoke in support of the five resolutions. Trustee Bhati then moved, Trustee Wilson seconded, and by unanimous voice vote, the five resolutions were approved.

Local Administration Competency Certification Program

RESOLUTION R2016-46

WHEREAS, the Ohio General Assembly enacted SB310 which appropriated $23,900,000 to Miami University for capital improvement projects for the 2016-17 biennium; and

WHEREAS, the Local Administration Competency Certification Program allows institutions of higher education to administer state-funded capital facilities projects pursuant to section 3345.51 of the Revised Code without the supervision, control, or approval of the Ohio Department of Administrative Services; and

WHEREAS, the University desires to continue to participate in the Local Administration Competency Certification Program and administer its own capital facilities projects;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Miami University Board of Trustees authorizes the university’s participation in the Local Administration Certification Program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the appropriate University officials are directed to take all necessary steps to accomplish that purpose, including, without limitation, giving written notice to the Ohio Board of Regents pursuant to R.C. 3345.51 (A)(2), of the Board’s request to administer a capital facilities project within sixty days after the effective date of the section of an act in which the General Assembly initially makes an appropriation for the project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that pursuant to the requirement set forth in R.C. 3345.51(A)(3), the University intends to comply with section 153.13 of the Revised Code, policy and procedure guidelines for contract documents established pursuant to section 153.16 of the Revised Code, and all laws that govern the selection of consultants, preparation and approval of contract documents, receipt of bids, and award of contracts with respect to the applicable project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that pursuant to the requirement set forth in R.C. 123.17 (D)(6), the University agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the State and the Ohio Department of Administrative Services for any claim of injury, loss, or damage that results from the University’s administration of a capital facilities project pursuant to the Local Administration Certification Program; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that pursuant to the requirement set forth in R.C. 123.17 (D)(5), the University will conduct biennial audits of the University’s administration of capital facilities projects in accordance R.C. 3345.51(C); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that pursuant to the requirement set forth in R.C. 123.17 (D)(2), the University will select new employees to participate in the Local Administration Certification Program as necessary to compensate for employee turnover.

Hughes Hall C-Wing Renovation

RESOLUTION R2016-47

WHEREAS, the Hughes Hall C-Wing Renovation project involves the renovation of the second and third floors of the west wing of Hughes Hall creating swing space for the Pearson Hall Renovation and additional space for the College of Engineering and Computing; and

WHEREAS, the project includes the installation of new mechanical, electrical, data, plumbing, life safety systems, code compliance, lab safety improvements and other ADA upgrades to create flexible multidisciplinary lab spaces; and

WHEREAS, Miami University has identified local funds in the amount of $11,000,000 for the Hughes Hall C-Wing Renovation project; and

WHEREAS, the $11,000,000 budget includes a cost of work estimate of approximately $7,875,000; and

WHEREAS, Miami University has determined that reduced costs, speed of implementation, and coordination may be gained by using the Design Build project delivery method; and

WHEREAS, the receipt of Guaranteed Maximum Price is planned for July 2016; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees desires to award a contract to the most responsive and responsible Design Builder;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby authorizes the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services and Treasurer to proceed with the award of contracts for the Hughes Hall C-Wing Renovation project with a total project budget not to exceed $11,000,000.
North Quad Residence Hall, Tennis Courts Site

RESOLUTION R2016-48

WHEREAS, the Housing Master Plan called for 7100 beds on the Oxford campus upon completion of the plan; and

WHEREAS, on-campus housing demand has continued to grow during implementation of the Housing Master Plan’s first and second phases creating overflow conditions and leasing of off-campus housing in excess of 300 beds; and

WHEREAS, a recent Housing Master Plan update anticipates a demand of 8100 beds by fall 2018 generating a shortfall of up to 600 beds on campus; and

WHEREAS, construction of a new residence hall(s) is needed to provide sufficient housing options for students; and

WHEREAS, the New North Quad Tennis Court Site Residence Hall project will provide approximately 340 beds on the existing site of the Inter-Collegiate Athletics varsity tennis courts for occupancy in fall semester 2018; and

WHEREAS, the relocation of the varsity tennis courts to the west side of Yager Stadium will support the Athletic Master Plan and is necessary to complete this project; and

WHEREAS, Miami University has determined that reduced costs, speed of implementation, and coordination may be gained by using the Design Build project delivery method; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees previously approved a budget not to exceed $3,500,000 in contracts for the preconstruction phase of the project including the planning, design, cost estimating, and other services necessary to prepare the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP); and

WHEREAS, Miami University has identified funds in the amount of $38,500,000 for the New North Quad Tennis Court Site Residence Hall project; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees desires to award a contract to the most responsive and responsible Design Build firm;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees authorizes the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services and Treasurer, in accordance with all State guidelines, to proceed with the award of a contract for the New North Quad Tennis Court Site Residence Hall project with a total project budget not to exceed $38,500,000.
North Quad Residence Hall, Withrow Court Site

RESOLUTION R2016-49

WHEREAS, the Housing Master Plan called for 7100 beds on the Oxford campus upon completion of the plan; and

WHEREAS, on-campus housing demand has continued to grow during implementation of the Housing Master Plan’s first and second phases generating unfavorable overflow conditions and leasing of off-campus housing in excess of 300 beds in the fall of 2015; and

WHEREAS, it is not cost effective to renovate Swing Hall or construct an addition to Clawson Hall as originally planned; and

WHEREAS, the Housing Master Plan now anticipates a demand of 8100 beds by fall 2018 generating a shortfall of up to 270 beds even with the construction of a new residence hall on the tennis court site; and

WHEREAS, construction of a new residence hall(s) is required to provide sufficient housing options; and

WHEREAS, the New North Withrow Hall Site Residence Hall project involves the construction of a new 270(+) -bed residence hall on the existing site of Withrow Court for occupancy in fall semester 2018; and

WHEREAS, Miami University has determined that reduced costs, speed of implementation, and coordination may be gained by using the Design Build project delivery method; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees previously approved a budget not to exceed $2,500,000 in contracts for the preconstruction phase of the project including the planning, design, cost estimating, and other services necessary to prepare the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP); and

WHEREAS, Miami University has identified funds in the amount of $37,000,000 for the New North Withrow Hall Site Residence Hall project; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees desires to award a contract to the most responsive and responsible Design Build firm;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees authorizes the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services and Treasurer, in accordance with all State guidelines, to proceed with the award of contract for the New North Withrow Hall Site Residence Hall project with a total project budget not to exceed $37,000,000.
Utility Easement

RESOLUTION R2016-50

WHEREAS, the City of Hamilton is proceeding with a new road and intersection project providing a direct link between US 127 and Miami’s Hamilton Campus ("US 127 Project"); and

WHEREAS, the US 127 Project requires a relocation of existing overhead electrical power facilities; and

WHEREAS, the relocation requires the University to grant a new utility easement to Duke Energy of Ohio, Inc. to construct, reconstruct and maintain these lines, a copy of which is attached to this Resolution and incorporated herein ("Utility Easement");

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees approves the Utility Easement, subject to the terms and conditions set forth therein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services be authorized to sign the Utility Easement.

Budget Ordinance

Dr. Creamer spoke in favor of the ordinance, stating it included increased scholarships, increased salaries for employees, a tuition freeze for returning Ohio residents, and the implementation of the Miami Tuition Promise. Trustee Bhati then moved, Trustee Wilson seconded, and by unanimous roll call vote, with seven in favor, none opposed, the ordinance was approved.

APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE O2016-06

BE IT ORDAINED: by the Board of Trustees that the Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-17, as presented at this meeting, be and it hereby is enacted with the following current expenditures and transfers for the major purposes as follows:

General Fund Expenditures:
- Salaries: $203,988,471
- Staff Benefits: $74,339,593
- Scholarships, Fellowships and Student Fee Waivers: $97,090,941
- Graduate Assistant Fee Waivers: $21,555,771
- Utilities: $14,323,036
- Other Expenditures: $42,508,993
- Subtotal General Fund Expenditures: $453,806,805
General Fund Transfers:
- Debt Service (mandatory transfer) ................................................................. 8,642,559
- General Fee and Other (non-mandatory transfers) ...................................... 58,033,385
Total General Fund ........................................................................................................ $520,482,749

Designated Fund ............................................................................................................. $45,713,572
Restricted Fund ............................................................................................................... $62,361,610

Auxiliary Enterprises:
- Expenditures ........................................................................................................... $118,286,243
- Debt Service (mandatory transfer) ........................................................................ 42,581,890
- Other Transfers (net) .............................................................................................. 24,087,736
- General Fee Support ............................................................................................... (35,341,452)
Total Auxiliaries ........................................................................................................... $150,169,445

TOTAL .......................................................................................................................... $778,727,376

Provided that the above appropriations include aggregate merit and salary improvement increases for faculty and unclassified staff equal to three percent (3.05%) effective with the beginning of the appointment year; and

Provided further that an additional one percent (1%) is included for faculty salaries for making improvements in the market competitiveness of associate and full professors salaries; and

Provided further that a pool of funds amounting to three percent (3.0%) is included for classified staff salary enhancements and adjustments to scale; and

Provided further that additional institutional funds are set aside for student financial aid, selected support (non-personnel) budgets, and debt service; and

Provided further that the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services and Treasurer, with the approval of the President, may make such adjustments as are necessary in the operating budget within the limits of available funds or within the limits of additional income received for a specific purpose (“restricted funds”).

**Governor’s Task Force Response**

Dr. Creamer spoke in support of the resolution. He stated that early recognition by the Board has allowed Miami University to make great progress over the past six years to enhance affordability. He stated that the plans and actions taken, align well with the Governor’s goals. Trustee Bhati then moved, Trustee Pascoe seconded and by unanimous voice vote, the resolution was approved.
RESOLUTION R2016-51

WHEREAS, Ohio Governor, John R. Kasich, on February 10, 2015, issued Executive Order 2015-01K establishing the Ohio Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency in Higher Education (Ohio Task Force) to review and recommend ways in which state-sponsored institutions can be more efficient, offering an education of equal or higher quality while decreasing their costs; and

WHEREAS, Am. Sub. HB 64 requires all boards of trustees of Ohio’s state institutions of higher education to complete by July 1, 2016, an efficiency review based on the report and recommendations of the Ohio Task Force and to make a report to the Chancellor of Higher Education within 30 days of the completion of the efficiency review that must include how each institution will implement the recommendations and cost saving measures; and

WHEREAS, the report of the task force included two master recommendations requiring: the savings and new dollars from the efficiency review be employed to reduce the cost of college for students or provide tangible benefits for the quality of students’ education and a five year goal to be established for savings and new resources to be achieved by fiscal year 2021; and

WHEREAS, Miami University with the adoption of this resolution establishes as its five year goal $30 million in increased student scholarships to be met by fiscal year 2021 and has completed or has in progress actions consistent with the efficiency review as outlined in the Ohio Task Force report; and

WHEREAS, the evaluations and recommendations associated with the efficiency review are recommended in cooperation with Miami’s Fiscal Priorities committee; and

WHEREAS, Miami envisions this action not only being important for the five year period required by the report but has also recommended that program reviews be implemented for non-academic programs to better ensure that the Ohio Task Force goals to improve quality and efficiency be continued beyond 2021;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees of Miami University accepts the efficiency review and recommendations that accompany this resolution including the five year goal to increase student scholarships by at least $30 million; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees directs the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services to submit the accompanying report and the related recommendations to the Chancellor of Higher Education by the legislated deadline.

Endowment Distribution Formula

Dr. Creamer spoke in support of the resolution stating there has been no change in the rate or general methodology from the prior year, but that the Foundation will review for possible refinement in future years. Trustee Shroder then moved, Trustee Bhati seconded and by voice
vote, the resolution was unanimously approved.

**Resolution R2016-52**

WHEREAS, Miami University receives and manages contributions of cash, securities, life insurance, personal property, and real estate in its endowment; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees desires to continue the policy of supporting University operations and scholarships through the distribution of income and realized gains from the endowment; and

WHEREAS, Miami University Resolution 2010-4 established an amended Spending Policy effective with the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010, and authorized such Policy to remain in effect until formally modified by the Board of Trustees; and

WHEREAS, Miami University Resolution 2010-4 also directed the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services to annually evaluate the variables underlying the spending formula and to present recommendations as to the spending formula to be used for the fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services has presented his recommendations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, and the Finance Committee has accepted those recommendations; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees, has considered the proposed Spending Policy, with the care that an ordinarily prudent person in a like position would exercise under similar circumstances, considering the following factors:

1. The duration and preservation of the endowment fund;
2. The purposes of the institution and the endowment fund;
3. General economic conditions;
4. The possible effect of inflation or deflation;
5. The expected total return from income and the appreciation of investments;
6. Other resources of the institution;
7. The investment policy of the institution;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The Board of Trustees hereby authorizes that the spending distribution for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, be computed according to the following formula:

*The weighted average spending formula is to be comprised of two elements: a market element, given a 30% weight in the formula, and an inflation element, given a 70% weight in the formula. The market element is to be computed by multiplying the market value of the investment portfolio on March 31, 2016 by a long-term sustainable spending percentage of 4.5%. The*
inflation element is to be computed by increasing the prior year's actual spending distribution by the annualized increase in the Consumer Price Index as of March 31, 2016.

If, however, the June 30, 2016 market value of an individual endowment fund account is below the cumulative value of all gifts contributed into that account, then only the pro rata share of realized dividends and interest allocated to that account may be distributed instead of the amount determined by the spending calculation.

Farmer School of Business Quasi Endowments

Dr. Creamer spoke in support of the resolution, stating that quasi-endowment funding will be very important going forward in future years. Trustee Bhati then moved, Trustee Ridenour seconded and by voice vote, the ordinance was unanimously approved.

Resolution R2016-53

WHEREAS, from time to time, Miami University accumulates financial balances through the receipt of large, unrestricted gifts and the prudent management of resources; and

WHEREAS, the Provost, the Deans, the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services, and the Vice President for Advancement periodically identify a portion of these funds that can be utilized to create quasi-endowments to establish a source of long-term funding for strategic initiatives; and

WHEREAS, Resolution R2015-45 established the Miami University Quasi-Endowment Policy; and

WHEREAS, the Dean of the Farmer School of Business desires to establish a quasi-endowment to promote academic excellence, funded from division carry forward, and to be used for the funding needs of Farmer School of Business as determined annually by the Dean; and

WHEREAS, the Dean of the Farmer School of Business desires to establish a quasi-endowment to promote faculty excellence, funded from the business course surcharge, and to be used for support of FSB faculty compensation as determined annually by the Dean; and

WHEREAS, the Dean of the Farmer School of Business desires to establish a quasi-endowment for the needs of the Department of Economics, funded from unrestricted gifts, and to be used for the funding needs of the Department of Economics as determined annually by the Dean and Department Chair; and

WHEREAS, the Dean of the Farmer School of Business desires to establish a quasi-endowment for the needs of the Department of Marketing, funded from unrestricted gifts, and to be used for the funding needs of the Department of Marketing as determined annually by the Dean and Department Chair; and
WHEREAS, the Dean of the Farmer School of Business desires to establish a quasi-endowment for the needs of the Department of Marketing, funded from designated funds, and to be used for the funding needs of the Department of Marketing as determined annually by the Dean and Department Chair; and

WHEREAS, the Provost and the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services of the University, with the concurrence of the Finance and Audit Committee, has recommended approval of this plan;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees approves the creation of the FSB Academic Excellence Fund quasi-endowment in the amount of $2,090,000.00 from division carry forward, the FSB Faculty Excellence Fund in the amount of $4,185,000.00 from the business course surcharge, the Economics General Fund quasi-endowment in the amount of $50,000.00 from unrestricted gifts, the Marketing General Fund quasi-endowment in the amount of $50,000.00 from unrestricted gifts, and the Marketing Academic Excellence Fund quasi-endowment in the amount of $125,000.00 from designated funds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the annual distributions of the FSB Academic Excellence Fund be used for the needs of the Farmer School of Business as determined by the Dean of the Farmer School of Business; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the annual distributions of the FSB Faculty Excellence Fund be used for the support of compensation for the faculty of the Farmer School of Business as determined by the Dean of the Farmer School of Business; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the annual distributions of the Economics General Fund be used for the support of the Department of Economics as determined by the Dean of the Farmer School of Business and the Department Chair; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the annual distributions of the Marketing General Fund be used for the support of the Department of Marketing as determined by the Dean of the Farmer School of Business and the Department Chair; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the annual distributions of the Marketing Academic Excellence Fund be used for the support of the Department of Marketing as determined by the Dean of the Farmer School of Business and the Department Chair.

**Student Trustee Reports**

Student Trustee Alex Boster relayed the following:

As spring semester has come to a close and summer break is off to an excellent start, the students of Miami are staying involved with organizations and clubs, and are engaged in internships and study abroad opportunities. In addition, Miami is in the process of welcoming the incoming freshman class and transfer students who will be joining our community this fall.
Orientation for the incoming class began on the first of June and is made up of sixteen one-and-a-half day sessions throughout this month. During each session, students are split into small groups, receive tours of campus, and schedule classes. For most of the orientation, incoming students spend time with their SOULs, or Student Orientation Undergraduate Leaders. The SOUL program gives upperclassmen a chance to transition and guide the first-years through their first college experience here at Miami. The orientation sessions will continue through June 30th and are going well thus far.

At the Miami University Art Museum, the “Seldom Seen” series of art exhibitions is coming to a close this Saturday. Since the beginning of the spring semester, the museum has been featuring art that is rarely displayed due to complications with the amount of space and/or preservation. Many of the pieces featured are described as “whimsical” and “original”, and give students, faculty, and the community a great opportunity to view a different and unique display at the Art Museum.

The Miami University Libraries are currently hosting “and now, Live from Miami…” which has been running since April 18th and will continue through August 12th. The exhibit is celebrating fifty years of broadcasting students and the importance of student engagement in radio and television productions.

Thirteen Miami students traveled to Cuba during the beginning of June for a three-credit-hour summer workshop called “Stories from Cuba”. During the class, the group studied the history of journalism in Cuba. While observing the culture during their travel, journalism students Ben Blanchard and Jack Evans noticed the love of baseball the children had and gifted a Cuban little league team with twelve new baseballs. This experience brought together the journalism piece of the course and the culture portion as Blanchard and Evans found something remarkable to report on. The students in the workshop are currently writing blogs about their experience, and they will be posted later this month.

In addition to the students studying abroad during the summer months, there are many taking courses online and on campus. Rising junior Savana Driller is taking fifteen credit hours this summer on the Oxford campus during two of the summer sessions offered. Her course load includes Finance, Business Statistics, and Chemistry classes. Her dedication to studies over the summer months shows that Miami students are committed to hard work and are engaged in learning year-round.

Indiana’s 2016 Richmond Shakespeare Festival, running through this weekend, features Miami students, faculty, and alumni both onstage and behind the scenes. The festival offers opportunities for actors, artistic directors, and language professionals.

Student United Way, an organization focused on leadership, education, financial stability and health, just completed its first semester on the Hamilton campus. Its center revolves around strengthening communities and individual lives. During the spring semester, SUW held events raising money for Booker T. Washington's Community Center. Over $200 was raised, and the funds will support the community center’s Little League baseball program. Peter Engelhard, the
incoming President for this coming academic year, reports: “We expect for it to grow with more members and to be able to collaborate with other nonprofits in the Hamilton area…”

To close, I would like to congratulate President Hodge on a wonderful ten years here at Miami. Even though our terms only overlapped for a short time, I am grateful to have been able to work with you. Your legacy here at Miami will always be remembered by the impact you have made on individual students and the university as a whole. Thank you for your dedication to this wonderful place, and I wish you and Mrs. Hodge the best for the future.

**Other Business**

*Note: All resolutions from Other Business are included as Attachment E.*

**Resolution Reappointing National Trustee John Altman**

Trustee Shroder moved, Trustee Wilson seconded, and by unanimous voice vote, the resolution was approved.

**RESOLUTION R2016-54**

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees re-appoints John Altman for a second three-year term as a National Trustee, ending June 30, 2019.

**Resolution Reappointing National Trustee Terry Hershey**

Trustee Lieberman moved, Trustee Bhati seconded, and by unanimous voice vote, the resolution was approved.

**RESOLUTION R2016-55**

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees re-appoints Terry Hershey for a second three-year term as a National Trustee, ending June 30, 2019.

**Resolution of Appreciation to Dean G. Michael Pratt**

Chair Budig and President Hodge spoke in favor of the resolution, praising Dean Pratt. Trustee Shroder moved, Trustee Bhati seconded, and by unanimous voice vote, the resolution was approved.

**RESOLUTION R2013-56**

WHEREAS, G. Michael Pratt served as the first ever regional dean, overseeing Miami’s Hamilton and Middletown Regional Campuses and West Chester’s Voice of America Learning Center; and

WHEREAS, Dean Pratt is a Middletown native and graduate of Middletown High
School, who attended Miami University Middletown in route to a Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology from Miami University; and

WHEREAS, Dean Pratt is an internationally-renowned battlefield archeologist, whose efforts at the Fallen Timbers Battlefield and Fort Miamis National Historic site in Ohio, and at the River Raisin Battlefield in Michigan, helped each location in achieving National Park status; and

WHEREAS, Dean Pratt is also an expert forensic anthropologist, dedicated to applying his skills to better the community, having served as a member of the National Disaster Medical System, responding to the Tri-State incident in Georgia, and to Hurricane Katrina, and who has also assisted the FBI, state and local law enforcement with field investigation in Ohio and Michigan; and

WHEREAS, Dean Pratt applied his leadership skills to dramatically advance Miami University’s Regional Campuses; over the course of his tenure, the Regional Campuses transitioned from offering primarily Associate Degrees to now offer more than a dozen Bachelor degrees and a Master of Science in Criminal Justice; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Campuses have responded to the needs of the community and Miami’s students to enhance the offerings and opportunities in the delivery of quality health care, through new degrees and the opening of the Greentree Health Science Academy; and

WHEREAS, through Dean Pratt’s leadership, the Regional Campuses also saw the founding of the English Language Center, the implementation of merit scholarships, and the establishment of the College of Professional Studies and Applied Sciences; and

WHEREAS, through Dean Pratt’s efforts, the Regional Campuses are now well-positioned to enter the future to quickly respond to the evolving needs of the region, to better serve Miami students, and to partner with community leaders to advance Southwestern Ohio.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the members of the Miami University Board of Trustees do hereby express to Dean G. Michael Pratt their sincere gratitude and warm regard for his service and leadership to Miami University; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the members of this Board offer their best wishes for his continued good health and success in all future endeavors, and extend an open invitation to Mike and Patty to visit often in the years ahead.

Done, by the Miami University Board of Trustees, this Twenty-Fourth Day of June, Two Thousand Sixteen at Miami University, in the City of Oxford, County of Butler, State of Ohio, during the Two Hundred and Seventh year of the University’s Charter.

Dean Pratt was then called forward. He thanked the Board, praising the Miami leaders with whom he had worked, and stating his career was now ending were it had begun. He thanked the regional campuses faculty and staff for their great efforts, stating they are the most
dedicated and talented group with whom he has ever worked. Finally, he praised his wife, Patty, for her efforts working with the community in support of Miami University and the regional campuses. He concluded by thanking interim Dean Cathy Bishop Clark, for assuming the responsibility of dean, stating that she would keep the positive momentum going.

Dean Pratt then received a standing ovation from all present.

Resolution of Appreciation to the Hodges

Chair Budig spoke in favor of the resolution, praising David and Valerie Hodge. Trustee Ridenour moved, Trustee Bhati seconded, and by unanimous voice vote, designation of the Hodges as emeriti and the resolution were approved.

RESOLUTION R2016-57

WHEREAS, President David C. Hodge and Ambassador Valerie L. Hodge have inspirationally led Miami University for the past decade; and

WHEREAS, Miami University has excelled under their thoughtful leadership to become nationally celebrated for its strong commitment to undergraduate teaching; and

WHEREAS, in the face of severe economic challenges, the Strategic Priorities Task Force was formed to not only weather the Great Recession, but to spark a renaissance, and today Miami University is recognized as first in the nation in providing an exceptional, high value education; and

WHEREAS, the sound strategic planning and financial leadership during their tenure enabled an unprecedented transformation of the Oxford campus. With the renovation and expansion of numerous existing buildings, the rebirth of Gaskill and Rowan Halls to become the Armstrong Student Center - the new focal point of the Miami experience - combined with the construction of entirely new facilities, such as the Farmer School of Business Building, the Indoor Sports Center, and six residence and dining halls, the Hodges have ensured the student experience will be greatly enhanced for many generations to come; and

WHEREAS, to make this Miami experience more economically accessible for Ohio’s students, the Miami Access Fellowships were established; and

WHEREAS, to improve affordability for all, tuition increases were dramatically limited, and then the Miami Tuition Promise was implemented to guarantee level tuition and fees for four years, providing families with certainty regarding the cost to attend Miami University; and

WHEREAS, to ensure Miami’s continued success in the future, the bold and innovative Miami 2020 plan was implemented, which united the entire Miami Community in the quest to achieve the vision of offering "the best undergraduate experience in the nation, enhanced by superior, select graduate programs;" and
WHEREAS, to better meet the needs of the Hamilton and Middletown Regions, Miami students, and the State of Ohio, the Regional Campuses became an Academic Division, able to create the programs and degrees vital to their communities’ success and growth; and,

WHEREAS, the Hodges remarkable tenure also saw the adoption of the Code of Love and Honor, and “I Am Miami,” which define the culture to which we aspire, and are in keeping with the values so treasured by this Board and all Miamians.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the members of the Miami University’s Board of Trustees do hereby express their sincere gratitude and deepest appreciation for David and Valerie Hodge’s commitment, service and leadership; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the members of this Board offer their best wishes for their continued good health and success in all future endeavors, and extend an open invitation to David and Valerie to visit often in the years ahead.

Done, by the Miami University Board of Trustees, this Twenty-Fourth Day of June, Two Thousand Sixteen at Miami University, in the City of Oxford, County of Butler, State of Ohio, during the Two Hundred and Seventh year of the University’s Charter.

All of the Trustees then expressed their gratitude and praise for the Hodges. They spoke of the Hodges leading Miami through challenging times, with Miami emerging stronger than before, and well-positioned for continued success in the future. They also spoke of the wonderful legacy the Hodges have created, with a focus on students, the positioning of Miami as a leader in undergraduate education, in creating outstanding programs, such as M.I.A.M.I. Women, and for engaging and re-engaging Alumni. Trustee Lieberman also read a Montgomery County, Ohio, Board of County Commissioners, proclamation celebrating and honoring the Hodge presidency.

The Hodges were then met with a standing ovation by all in attendance.

Executive Session

Trustee Wilson moved, Trustee Ridenour seconded, and by unanimous roll call vote, with seven voting in favor and none opposed, the Board convened to Executive Session to consult with counsel, to review pending litigation, and to discuss Personnel Matters – the compensation of a public employee; as provided by the Open Meetings Act, Ohio Revised Code Section 121.22.

Return to Public Session - Other Business

Following the Executive Session, the Board returned to public session to consider two resolutions.
Bonus and Salary for President Hodge

Trustee Ridenour moved, Trustee Lieberman seconded, and by unanimous voice vote, the resolution was approved.

RESOLUTION R2016-58

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves continuation of the current $432,022 salary, as the Academic Year 2016-2017 salary for President David Hodge; and, as per the terms of the Miami University Presidential Employment Agreement, a strategic accomplishment bonus payment of $200,000, to be contributed to the Supplemental Qualified Retirement Plan (SQRP).

Honorary Degree for University Ambassador Valerie Hodge

Given the unique opportunity, the Board considered the circumstances appropriate to directly consider approval of an honorary degree for Valerie Hodge. Trustee Lieberman then moved, Trustee Ridenour seconded, and by unanimous voice vote, the resolution was approved.

RESOLUTION R2016-59

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the awarding of an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws (LL.D.) to:

Valerie L. Hodge  
University Ambassador  
2006 to 2016

in recognition of her exceptional service to Miami University. Valerie tirelessly served Miami during a period of exceptional success, marked by many great achievements, outstanding accomplishments and extraordinary recognition, of which a few highlights include; the opening of the Armstrong Student Center, the successful completion of the ambitious For Love and Honor Campaign, and a fall 2016 entering class which is the most academically accomplished and diverse class in the history of Miami University. Valerie Hodge embodies the values of For Love and Honor, and she will be deeply missed.

Written Reports

Tom Herbert, Vice President for Advancement submitted a written report which is included as Attachment F.
Adjournment of Meeting

The Board adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
Miami University
Intercollegiate Athletics
Board of Trustees Annual Report

June 24, 2016
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SIGNIFICANT PERSONNEL CHANGES – 2015-16


3. Associate AD Steve Brockelbank Promoted, November 12, 2015.

4. Director of Fan, Campus and Community Engagement Lindsay Sparks Hired, January 20, 2016.


CORE COMPONENTS OF SUCCESS…

1. Integrity
2. Student-Athlete Experience
3. Athletic Success
4. Academic Success
5. Positive Visibility
6. Teammates
7. Contributor to Society
8. Fiscal Management
FISCAL MANAGEMENT…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY14 Actuals</th>
<th>FY15 Actuals</th>
<th>FY16 Projection</th>
<th>FY16 to FY14 change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In (General Fee)</td>
<td>$17,063,439</td>
<td>$16,658,901</td>
<td>$17,245,132</td>
<td>$181,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$10,305,291</td>
<td>$10,287,800</td>
<td>$10,216,378</td>
<td>$(88,913)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>$6,268,619</td>
<td>$6,612,392</td>
<td>$6,702,680</td>
<td>$434,061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONFERENCE CHAMPIONSHIPS – 2015-16

Field Hockey – MAC Regular Season Co-Champions

Collegiate Synchronized Skating – US National Champions

Women’s Tennis – MAC Regular Season Co-Champions

Softball – MAC Tournament Champions
OTHER ATHLETIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS – 2015-16

Volleyball: Knocked off #19 Michigan State in straight sets at Spartan Invitational on Sept. 5

Soccer: Topped the SEC’s Vanderbilt (1-0) on opening night for the program’s 200th all-time victory

Synchro: Senior finishes 9th out of 26 teams at the ISU World Championships//Collegiate team wins 12th straight (extending own record for consecutive national titles) and 18th overall national title//Senior team places 2nd at national championships; earns berth to ISU World Championships//Junior team finishes 8th at national championships

Softball: Defeats Notre Dame in NCAA Regional
INDIVIDUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS – 2015-16

Field Hockey: Bea Dechant (First Team) and Mariona Heras (Second Team) named to NFHCA All-West Region Team

Field Hockey: Dechant named to NFCHA All-American Third Team and MAC Player of the Year

Field Hockey: Paula Portugal named Freshman of the Year

Field Hockey: Inako Puzo named MAC Co-Coach of the Year and Greater Cincinnati-Northern Kentucky Women’s Sports Association recognized Puzo (Coach of the Year) and Dechant (Field Hockey Player of the Year)
INDIVIDUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS  (continued)

Cross Country: Joe Stewart placed third at the MAC Championship to earn First-Team All-MAC honors//Qualified for the NCAA Championship

Cross Country: Stewart named Ohio Runner of the Year and All-Ohio Champion

Women’s Swimming: Pei Lin Two-Time First-Team All-American (1- and 3-meter dive)//NCAA Championships - Pei Lin 2nd 3-meter Dive; 3rd 1-meter Dive//Pei Lin NCAA Zone C 1- and 3-meter Dive Champion//MAC Diver of the Year - Pei Lin
INDIVIDUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS (continued)

Men’s Golf: Patrick Flavin won three different tournaments and advanced to the NCAA Regional as an individual

Volleyball: Carolyn Condit named GCNKWSA Lifetime Service Award

Tennis: Ana Rajkovic named Leann Grimes Davidge Sportsmanship Award

Softball: Taylor Shuey Named MAC Player of the Year
ACADEMIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS – 2015-16

Fall 2015
Semester Department GPA: 3.27*
65% Student-Athletes earned a 3.0 term GPA or higher
38 Student-Athlete’s earned a 4.0

Spring 2016
Spring Semester Department GPA: 3.21
67% Student-Athletes earned a 3.0 term GPA or higher
38 Student-Athlete’s earned a 4.0

*Highest Fall Department Term GPA on Record
ACADEMIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS (continued)

16 of 19 Programs Achieved Team GPA’s of 3.0 or higher in Spring 2016:

Field Hockey – 3.32; Golf – 3.12; Hockey – 3.12; Men’s Swimming and Diving – 3.23; Men’s Track & Field – 3.14; Men’s Cross Country – 3.08; Women’s Soccer – 3.49; Softball – 3.36; Synchronized Skating – 3.50; Women’s Tennis – 3.58; Volleyball – 3.34; Women’s Basketball – 3.27; Women’s Swimming and Diving – 3.38; Women’s Indoor and Outdoor Track & Field – 3.45; and Women’s Cross Country – 3.46

Bold indicates championship team in 2015-16
2015 MAC NCAA Graduation Success Rates
Fed Rate based on data from 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MIAMI</th>
<th>Akron</th>
<th>Ball St</th>
<th>BG</th>
<th>BUFF</th>
<th>CMU</th>
<th>EMU</th>
<th>KENT</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>OHIO</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>WMU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total GSR</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fed Rate</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball - M</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC/Track - M</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf - M</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming - M</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball - W</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC/Track - W</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer - W</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball - W</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming - W</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis - W</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball - W</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers in RED indicate where Miami scored the highest or shared the highest score.
# Federal Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Students</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Students</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Student-Athletes</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Student-Athletes</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Student-Athletes</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FEDERAL GRADUATION RATES (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Basketball</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s CC/Track</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Other Sports</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Basketball</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s CC/Track</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Other Sports</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT – 2015-16

Student-athletes engaged in over 2700 total hours of community service and charitable activities during the 2015-16 academic year – more than double last year’s numbers! Their efforts in fundraising and service include these highlights:

- $14,000 gift from Women’s Basketball to the Luna Cares Foundation
- $9,000 gift to the Wounded Warrior Project (Skating)
- $1,500 gift from RedHawk Council to TeamIMPACT (largest gift in the country from an athletic group)
- Softball team committed 15 hours of service per person this year
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT (continued)

Miami student-athletes contributed to over 45 local groups, including:
Animal Adoption Foundation
Bogan Carnival and Bogan Elementary School “Class at the Court”
Borderline Volleyball Club
Bring Joy to a Child
Butler County Youth Hockey Evaluations
Cincinnati Big Brothers/Big Sisters
Cincinnati Children's Hospital
Convocation Pep Rally
Dragonfly Skate Dinner
Freshmen Move-in Day
Grass Roots Soccer
Joe Nuxhall Miracle League
Junior RedHawks Youth Hockey
Kiwanis Chili Dinner, Food Drive and Pancake Breakfast
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT (continued)

Knolls of Oxford
Kramer Carnival
Kramer Elementary “Class at the Court”, “Miami Mile” and Kid’s Night
Light the Night Walk with Football TeamIMPACT Teammate Liam Kaufman
Luna Cares Fundraiser with Women’s Basketball and Trick or Trail Run
Makos Swim Club
Marshall Elementary School “Class at the Court”
Matthew 25 Ministries
McCullough Hyde Memorial Hospital and Oncology Unit
McGuffey School
Miami HAWKS Peer Educators
Miami Valley First Tee Program
National Girls & Women in Sports Day
Navy SEALS Letters of Encouragement and Thanks
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT (continued)

Oxford Camps, Canned Food Drive and Choice Food Pantry
Plant the Promise in Uptown Park
RASKALS (Random Acts of Kindness Affecting Local Seniors)
Reading with the RedHawks
Shooting for Smiles
Sommerville Community Service
Susan G Komen Cincinnati Race for the Cure
Swoop's Stoop
Talawanda Middle School “Goals for Life”
Talawanda Summer Program
TeamIMPACT

100% of our student-athletes contributed to the Red & White Club
## TITLE IX/GENDER EQUITY – 2015-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Students Overall</td>
<td>50.62%</td>
<td>8,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Student-Athletes</td>
<td>51.31%</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Students Overall</td>
<td>49.38%</td>
<td>8,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Student-Athletes</td>
<td>48.69%</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GRADUATING CHAMPIONS CAPITAL CAMPAIGN

Gunlock Family Performance Center

Jay Hayden Baseball Center

Tennis Relocation

Yager West Renovation
RESOLUTION R2016-41

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the following for the rank of President Emeritus effective on the formal date of retirement:

David C. Hodge
President

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the following for the rank of Ambassador Emerita effective on the formal date of retirement:

Valerie L. Hodge
University Ambassador

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the following for the rank of Professor Emerita effective on the formal date of retirement:

Karen Dawisha
Political Science

Joan Fopma-Loy
Nursing

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the following for the rank of Dean Emeritus effective on the formal date of retirement:

G. Michael Pratt
Dean, Regional Campuses/Anthropology

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the following for the rank of Administrator Emerita effective on the formal date of retirement:

Melanie Brunner
Accounts Payable

Michele Dienno
Public Relations/Marketing

Jeanne Via
Housing, Dining, Recreation and Business Services
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the following for the rank of Administrator Emeritus effective on the formal date of retirement:

John Morton
Geology and Environmental Earth Science

Daniel Rambo
Housing, Dining, Recreation and Business Services

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
RESOLUTION 2016-42

Resolution to Elect Dr. Renate Crawford
University Ambassador and Adjunct Professor of Physics

WHEREAS, Miami University was chartered in 1809; and

WHEREAS, Miami University’s 207 year history has been marked by exceptional achievement, with over 200,000 alumni who have served, succeeded and inspired others in nearly every field of endeavor; and

WHEREAS, the role of the University Ambassador is strategically important to the advancement and success initiatives of Miami University; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Renate Crawford earned her PhD in Physics from Kent State University, became a National Research Council Postdoctoral Fellow at the Center for Biomolecular Engineering at the Naval Research Laboratory in Washington, D.C. and served as a faculty member at the University of Massachusetts, where she later became chair of the department of physics and subsequently associate dean of engineering. Dr. Crawford also served as an adjunct associate professor of physics at the University of Notre Dame; and

WHEREAS, the chair and faculty of the Department of Physics, the Dean of the College of Arts and Science and the Provost have approved Dr. Renate Crawford’s appointment as an Adjunct Professor of Physics at Miami University; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Renate Crawford is uniquely positioned to serve as the University Ambassador during the Presidency of Dr. Gregory Crawford, Miami University’s 22nd President.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the members of the Miami University Board of Trustees do hereby elect Dr. Renate Crawford, University Ambassador and Adjunct Professor of Physics effective July 1, 2016 at a salary of $30,700; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the members of the Board of Trustees warmly welcome Dr. Renate Crawford and look forward to working with her in continuing Miami’s great success and in embracing Miami’s bright future.

Done, by the Miami University Board of Trustees, this Twenty-Fourth Day of June, Two Thousand Sixteen at Miami University, in the City of Oxford, County of Butler, State of Ohio, during the Two Hundred and Seventh year of the University’s Charter.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
RESOLUTION R2016-43

WHEREAS: the Ohio Revised Code authorizes boards of trustees of state-supported institutions of higher learning to establish and administer a records management program for their respective institutions; and

WHEREAS: Miami University has established a records management program for the purpose of ensuring proper scheduling, storage and disposal of university records using Record Retention for Public Colleges and Universities in Ohio: A Manual (Inter-University Council of Ohio) as the basis for Miami University's records management program; and

WHEREAS: the objectives of the records management program are to reduce the number of non-current records, oversee records storage and access outside the office of origin, eliminate unnecessary duplication of records, offer a systematic method of records destruction, and create an awareness of documents with a permanent archival value;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees appoints the General Counsel as the University Records Manager responsible for the Records Management Program and adopts the Miami University Records Management Mission Statement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that this resolution supersedes Board of Trustees Resolution R2011-59.

Miami University Records Management Mission Statement

In compliance with Section 149.33 of the Ohio Revised Code, Miami University, by the authority of its Board of Trustees, has established a records management program under the jurisdiction of the Office of General Counsel for the purpose of ensuring proper scheduling, storage and disposal of university records. This program is designed to reduce the number of non-current records, facilitate document imaging, eliminate unnecessary records, offer a systematic method of records maintenance and destruction and create an awareness of documents with a permanent archival value.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
RESOLUTION R2016-44

REVISIONS TO THE REMEDIATION-FREE STANDARDS

WHEREAS, Miami University Board of Trustees Resolution R2014-06 adopted the remediation-free standards established by Ohio’s public college and university presidents in December 2012, and the related assessment requirements, into Miami University student placement policies; and

WHEREAS, in 2016, the standards were recently updated with technical revisions by ODHE (with faculty panel input), and approved by the IUC and OACC presidents; and

WHEREAS, the specific revisions include:

- Removal of COMPASS Assessment for both English and Mathematics
- Recommended change to increase ACT Reading Sub-Score to >22 (previously >21)
- Removal of Accuplacer Elementary Algebra Assessment while retaining Accuplacer College Level Mathematics Assessment
- Addition of MapleSoft T.A. for Mathematics only, required score >50% correct responses
- Addition of ALEKS for Mathematics only, required score >46
- Addition of PlaceU (WebAssign) for Mathematics only, required score >18

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the revisions proposed by the Ohio Department of Higher Education (with faculty panel input) and approved by the Inter-University Council, and Ohio Association of Community Colleges, in 2016, are hereby adopted.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
RESOLUTION R2016-45

WHEREAS, the 130th Ohio General Assembly added Ohio Revised Code 3345.81 (Strategic Completion Plan), effective September 29, 2013; and

WHEREAS, ORC 3345.81 required, by no later than June 30, 2014, the Board of Trustees at each Ohio institution of higher education to adopt an institution-specific Strategic Completion Plan designed to increase the number of degrees and certificates awarded to students; and

WHEREAS, this Board of Trustees, per Resolution 2014-40, adopted, and submitted to the Chancellor and the Ohio Board of Regents, a Miami specific Strategic Completion Plan designed to increase the number of degrees and certificates awarded to students, consistent with the mission and strategic priorities of the institution, and aligned with the state's workforce development priorities, with measureable student completion goals; and

WHEREAS, ORC 3345.81 also required a review of the Strategic Completion Plan every two years.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Trustees hereby adopts the attached updated Strategic Completion Plan for Miami University; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this plan be forwarded to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this plan be reviewed and updated at least once every two years, and that a copy of the updated plan be provided to the Chancellor upon adoption.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
Miami University Completion Plan Update

Submitted to Chancellor of the University System of Ohio Board of Regents

June 29, 2016

University Mission

Miami’s mission states that we are “a student-centered public university” with “an unwavering commitment to liberal arts undergraduate education and the active engagement of its students in both curricular and co-curricular life” as well as a deep commitment to “student success.” In addition, Miami “supports students in a highly involving residential experience on the Oxford campus and provides access to students, including those who are time and place bound, on its regional campuses.”

As of fall 2015, 16,387 undergraduates and 2,689 graduate students were studying on the Oxford campus. Regional campuses in Hamilton, Middletown, and the Voice of America Learning Center in West Chester enrolled a combined total of 4,907 students. 54% of Miami students are female, and 65% are residents of Ohio. Of the Oxford first-year class, 51% are female, 56% are residents of Ohio and 98% were born in 1996 or 1997.

Domestic students of color make up 13.7 percent of the first-year class and 12.3 percent of the undergraduate student body (based on fall 2015 Oxford campus enrollment). The breakdown of this population is as follows:

The breakdown of the Oxford undergraduate population is as follows:

- 2.9% Black or African-American
- 3.8% Hispanic/Latino
- 2.1% Asian, Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander
- 3.2% identify themselves as multi-racial
- 0.3% American Indian or Alaska Native and Other

An additional 8.4% are international students with 89.4% of the international students identifying themselves as Asian.

Nine percent of Oxford first-year undergraduates are Pell Grant recipients; 35% have financial need, and 100% of first-year students with need received offers of financial aid.

Of the fall 2015 first-year Oxford campus students, 36 percent of the freshmen graduated in the top 10% of their high school class. Fifty-eight percent entered Miami with college credit from AP, dual enrollment/PSEOP, and other programs, with the average credit received being 18 hours. The average ACT score of the 2015 entering freshman class was 28 (84% of the incoming freshmen were admitted with the ACT).

The first-year student retention for full time students (2014 cohort) is 90.3%. The six-year graduation rate (2009 cohort) is 80%.

Miami University is noted as an exemplary university for having made great gains in decreasing the gap between graduation rates of white and African-American students in a report released March 23, 2016. The recent Education Trust report, “Rising Tide II: Do Black Students Benefit as Grad Rates Increase?,” ranks Miami in the top ten of its list of the “top-gaining four-year public institutions for black students” for closing the gap between black and white students by 10.7 percentage points. Graduation rates improved by 10.5 percentage points for African-American students at Miami from 2003-2013, while overall graduation improved by 0.4 percentage point. Miami’s graduation rates in 2013 were 81 percent for all students and 71
percent for black students. The Education Trust in its report used three-year averages to assess graduation rate change and lists Miami’s rates as 80.7 percent for all students and 68.6 percent for African-American students.

While also focused on a liberal arts education, Miami’s regional campuses serve a different student population. Thirty-two percent of the students are part time, and 68% are full time. Twenty-four percent of the students on the regional campuses are non-traditional students (25 years or older); 55% are female, and 45% are male. Nearly 10% of the students on the regional campuses are CCP students. The majority of students on the regional campuses are place-bound, and none live on campus. The top feeder schools are area high schools as well as local community colleges. The regional campuses house its own academic division, recently renamed the College of Liberal Arts & Applied Science (CLAAS), which offers several baccalaureate degrees, including computer and information technology, forensic investigation, forensic science, civic & regional development, liberal studies, nursing, criminal justice, engineering technology, commerce, and integrative studies. New degrees in applied social sciences, applied communication, and psychological studies have been recently approved. The students on the Hamilton campus have a first-year student retention rate of 66.1%, and students on the Middletown campus have a first-year student retention rate of 54.0% (for the 2014 cohort). Those pursuing bachelor’s degrees in the CLAAS (2009 cohort) have a six-year graduation rate of 26.6% for the Hamilton campus and 20.4% for the Middletown campus.

**BARRIERS TO PERSISTENCE AND COMPLETION**

Although the academic profile and completion rate of Miami’s Oxford campus students remain very strong overall, our data show that there has not been significant change in the two years since the original report. NB: In all figures, retention rates and graduation rates are presented as reported to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), the core postsecondary education data collection program for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Retention rate is defined as the percent of first time, full time, degree-seeking students who enter in the fall semester and return to Miami in the fall semester of the next (i.e., their second) year. Graduation rate is defined as the percent of first time, full time, degree-seeking students who enter in the fall semester and graduate within six years. Students are assigned to a cohort based on the year they entered the University.
Retention and six-year graduation rates have fluctuated in narrow bands for several years (Figure 1).

**Figure 1: Persistence and Graduation Rates: Entry Terms 2005 – 2014**

In the previous report, several attributes were identified as correlated to a higher risk for attrition for new, full time Oxford students: gender, first generation, and high financial need. For gender, the gap between male six-year graduation rates and female rates persists, with females graduating at a higher rate than males (Figure 2).

**Figure 2: Six-Year Graduation Rates by Gender**
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Because the correlation between six-year graduation rates and retention rates is fairly strong for the period being considered ($r = 0.767$), we expect graduation rates to increase over the next few years since retention rates have been increasing since 2012 (Figure 1). While males have tended to have higher retention rates than females (Figure 3), for the past two years, retention rates for females has increased above males (Figure 3). Interestingly, even when female students have lower retention rates, the graduation rate among females has been consistently higher (Figure 2).

**Figure 3: Retention Rates by Gender**

First generation students continue to have lower graduation rates compared to other groups of students (Figure 4). The gap in graduation rates for first generation students (Figure 4) is due, at least in part, to lower retention rates in that group (Figure 5). Further, we expect to see a decrease in graduation rate for first generation students due to the dip in retention rates in this group between 2010 to 2012. Miami is developing and implementing specific, targeted initiatives to improve graduation rates for this group, including more proactive academic advising, new learning communities focused on assisting with transition to college programming, financial literacy initiatives, and early career development programming across a number of majors.
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Figure 4: Six-Year Graduation Rates for First Generation Students

![Graph of Six-Year Graduation Rates for First Generation Students]

Figure 5: Retention Rates for First Generation Students

![Graph of Retention Rates for First Generation Students]
Finally, financial need (EFC) is a factor in graduation rates. Students with high need (defined as students with an Expected Family Contribution (EFC) < $5,000) have the lowest graduation rates (Figure 6). Encouragingly, retention rates for high financial need students have been improving in recent years (Figure 7).

**Figure 6: Six-Year Graduation Rates by Financial Need (EFC)**
International student graduation rates were also noted in the 2014 report as a possible future concern. Although the number of international students is small by comparison to domestic students, their collective graduation rate is lower.

Figure 7: Retention Rates by Financial Need (EFC)

Figure 8: Six-Year Graduation Rates by Residency
Retention rates of international students have not been a good predictor of the six-year graduation rate. In fact, retention for international students continues to exceed domestic students.

**Figure 9: Retention Rates by Residency**

Since the completion of the 2014 report, Miami has conducted further research with respect to persistence and graduation factors, including partnerships with the Student Success Collaborative from Education Advisory Board (EAB) as well as analytics provided by Civitas Learning. One factor that has emerged as a significant variable for retention is first term Grade Point Average (GPA, Figure 10). In fact, first term GPA is the most powerful predictor of retention for incoming cohorts. Miami has identified two important cut-points affecting student retention. Students with a first-term GPA below 2.2 have six-year graduation rates below 50% (Figure 10), and students with GPAs of at least 2.2 but less than 2.8 have a statistically significantly lower six-year graduation rates than those whose first term GPA is at least 2.8 (Figure 10). Miami has had intervention practices for students with first term GPAs below 2.0 for a long time, and now, with these more recent data acquired in 2015-2016, Miami has initiated new, proactive intervention practices to outreach to students whose first term GPA was between 2.0 and 2.2, in addition to other ‘at risk’ student populations.
GOALS

College completion and student success are integral to Miami’s seven-year strategic plan, the “Miami 2020 Plan,” which was developed in 2013-2014. The unifying goal of the plan is to “promote a vibrant learning and discovery environment that produces extraordinary student and scholarly outcomes.” The plan includes a set of metrics by which our progress will be measured.

Below are the metrics embedded in the plan that relate to the goal of increasing college completion and an update on how well we are achieving them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miami will achieve a six-year graduation rate of 85% and a four-year graduation rate of 75%.” The regional campuses will increase the graduation rate by 10%, is equally ambitious.</td>
<td>For the most recent cohort (2009), Miami’s four-year graduation rate is 65.3% and the six-year graduation rate is 79.9%. For the regional campuses, the six-year graduation rate is 19.4%, with a goal of 30.0%. Miami’s Student Success Committee is continuing to monitor and develop strategies for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within one year after graduation, 90% of graduates (excluding those enrolled in graduate or professional school) will be employed.</td>
<td>95.5% of Oxford bachelor’s graduates and 97.5% of College of Professional Studies and Applied Sciences (CPSAS) graduates were employed after graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon graduation, 75% of Oxford students who apply to graduate or professional school will receive at least one offer of admission.</td>
<td>Among 2014-15 graduates, 68% of Oxford graduates who intended to enroll in graduate/professional school were enrolled in school by fall 2015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Miami University Completion Plan Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upon graduation, all Miami students will have participated in a research (40%) or a similar experiential learning activity (100%), e.g., fieldwork, field or clinical placement, service-learning, public or private sector engagement, performances, and other applied learning activities.</td>
<td>Among 2014-15 graduates, 87% of Oxford graduates and 80% of regional graduates had either participated in research or participated in a similar experiential learning activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of Miami students will complete an internship before they graduate.</td>
<td>70.2% of Oxford undergraduates completed an internship, practicum, or student teaching before graduating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% of degree programs can be completed in three years or less through curriculum revision and by using different pedagogical approaches and modes of delivery.</td>
<td>As of fall 2016, 65% of degree programs can be completed in three years or less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of Miami students will report that they feel welcome and have had significant and meaningful interactions with diverse groups.</td>
<td>On the Oxford campus, 77% report an average or high sense of belonging on campus and 97% had discussions with people of a different background. On the regional campuses, 55% reported an average or high sense of belonging and 98% had discussions with people of a different background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Miami students will have a curricular or co-curricular cultural learning experience (e.g., intensive community engagement, service-learning experience, intercultural or global learning requirement) by the time of graduation.</td>
<td>As the result of the Global Miami Plan’s global learning requirement, all undergraduate students have had a curricular or co-curricular cultural learning experience by the time of graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Oxford will double the number of transfer students to 500 students, and Miami regionals will increase by 15% the number of transfer students to 500 students.</td>
<td>In fall 2015, there were 218 transfer students on the Oxford campus (down 9% from 2014) and 273 on the regional campuses (also down 9% from 2014). The Student Success Committee is monitoring this trend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPLETION STRATEGIES**

**UPDATE ON 2014-2016 STRATEGIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Progress Made Since 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Revised Committees</td>
<td>Revise the membership of retention and advising committees to better coordinate efforts.</td>
<td>Formed new Student Success Committee; revised membership of Undergraduate Academic Advising Council; formed new grassroots Miami University Academic Support &amp; Advising Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared Mission &amp; Metrics</td>
<td>Develop a shared mission for student success &amp; advisement, goals as well as specific metrics and outcomes to align practice and measure progress. Report annually on findings.</td>
<td>Developed shared advising philosophy, outcomes and metrics, and created assessment plan and annual reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Progress Made Since 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Preparation and Intervention</td>
<td>One-Stop Enrollment Center</td>
<td>Establish a one-stop center (virtual and physical space) to provide the services of the Bursar, Registrar, Student Financial Assistance, and advisement on a 24/7 basis.</td>
<td>Launched One Stop for Student Success in 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Analytics</td>
<td>Purchase and launch Education Advisory Board’s Student Success Collaborative which provides data analytics and predictive modeling to generate risk assessments for each Miami student; student success software platform to provide easily accessible dashboards for advisors; research on best practices in college completion; peer benchmarking; and consulting support.</td>
<td>Purchased EAB Student Success Collaborative and piloted it in two divisions in 2015-2016; university-wide implementation scheduled for 2016-2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early warning system</td>
<td>Identify and intervene with students who may be at risk for non-academic reasons.</td>
<td>In-house transition survey for first-year students with follow-up intervention created and implemented in fall 2015; to be continued in 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Interventions and Support Mechanisms</td>
<td>For targeted populations of students who may be at risk but who have not been captured well in our previous systems.</td>
<td>New student success center launched in 2015, with staff who provide support to student populations at academic risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational programs on healthy lifestyle and informed decision-making</td>
<td>Hire a consultant from the American Institutes for Research, and develop a plan for decreasing high-risk student behaviors, such as alcohol and drug use, eating disorders, and serious forms of misconduct.</td>
<td>New UNV 101 success course developed, piloted in fall 2014 and increased enrollment each year. Over 80% of first-year students are enrolled in UNV 101 for fall 2016. Bystander education incorporated into the UNV 101 course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising &amp; Academic Support</td>
<td>New Advising Staffing System</td>
<td>Move academic advising fully into the Division of Academic Affairs. This advisement will be supported by Residence Life staff who will provide additional socio-emotional and transitional guidance and mentoring.</td>
<td>Advising in Academic Affairs launched in fall 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved Advisor Training</td>
<td>Develop and implement comprehensive advisor training for all staff and faculty advisors and targeted academic support specialists with required and optional portions.</td>
<td>Comprehensive advisor training materials developed and made available online. Over 70% of advisors have completed all required portions of the training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced Recognition</td>
<td>Develop new advising excellence awards, and institute a “Master Advisor” designation which comes with modest professional development funds for those who complete all elements of the comprehensive advising training plan.</td>
<td>A new three-tiered system of advisor recognition has been developed: Level B for advisors who have completed required training; Level A who have completed required and optional training components; and Master Advisor status for those who complete required and optional training and demonstrate evidence of advising excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Progress Made Since 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>Revision of General Education (Global Miami Plan)</td>
<td>Revise general education program to advance written communication and critical thinking and other 21st century outcomes and include a new experiential learning requirement; project-based capstone.</td>
<td>New revised plan approved. Implementation began in fall 2015. Assessment plan underway to ensure quality of student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition Course</td>
<td>Develop new First-Year Experience (FYE) course for students.</td>
<td>New UNV 101 success course developed, piloted in fall 2014, and increased enrollment each year. Over 80% of first-year students enrolled in UNV 101 in fall 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree Completion Program</td>
<td>Create new degree completion program, tentatively titled Applied Liberal Studies, will be offered on the regional campuses.</td>
<td>New B.A./B.S. in Liberal Studies proposed and approved. Implementation begun fall 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support for High-Ability Students</td>
<td>Provide enrichment and support for high-ability students (beyond those in the Honors Program) pursuing particular areas of study (e.g., pre-law, global studies, environment).</td>
<td>New University Academic Scholars Programs implemented on the Oxford campus; additional staffing to support and coordinate programs created in 2015-2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Degree Programs for Nontraditional Students</td>
<td>Propose new degree programs that are targeted at nontraditional and adult learners.</td>
<td>Received approval for B.A. in Community Arts, B.A. in Psychological Sciences, B.A. in Applied Social Sciences, B.A. in Applied Communication and B.A./B.S. in Liberal Studies, since 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Term</td>
<td>Offer new winter term to assist students in meeting degree requirements in a more timely manner.</td>
<td>Launched winter term in 2014; have assessed and expanded it each year since its inception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>Mid-Term Grade Expansion</td>
<td>Revise policy so that students with 45 or fewer earned credits at Miami will receive mid-term grades (compared to the previous policy which enables students with 16 or fewer credits earned at Miami or elsewhere to receive mid-term grades).</td>
<td>Policy approved and implemented in 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction of Required Credit Hours for Graduation</td>
<td>Explore ways of reducing the semester credit-hour requirement for graduation from its current 128 credit hour requirement.</td>
<td>Departments that house degree programs that exceed 124 hours are in the process of revising their curricula. All degree programs must be at or below 124 credits by fall 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction of Credit Hour Requirement for Relocation to Oxford Campus</td>
<td>Reduce the number of credits, from 20 to 16 credits, required for students to relocate from the regional campuses to the Oxford campus to increase number of students relocating to complete bachelor degrees offered only on the main campus.</td>
<td>Revised policy in 2015 to reduce the number of credits required for relocation and further clarified and revised again in 2016 to ensure that the 16 credits are graded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Curricular Review and Elimination of Courses</td>
<td>Review and eliminate under-enrolled or outdated courses and degree programs annually to enable a more</td>
<td>Developed annual procedure for reviewing under- and non-enrolled courses, with courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Progress Made Since 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accurate listing of courses and streamlining of curriculum.</td>
<td>Having low or no enrollment over three or more years eliminated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Term Course Scheduling and Registration</td>
<td>Move progressively toward a multi-term course scheduling and registration process to enable purposeful curricular planning and more accurate advisement.</td>
<td>Launched multi-term scheduling in 2014-2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision of the Policy for Academic Integrity</td>
<td>Revise policies and support to include more opportunities for faculty to educate students about academic integrity.</td>
<td>Revised academic dishonesty policies and procedures in 2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships Coordination</td>
<td>Develop consistent policy and processes and enable university-wide coordination of efforts to better ensure sustained partnerships with schools, colleges and universities across Ohio, the nation, and the world.</td>
<td>Created new online workflow for the development and approval of partnerships to ensure consistency and quality in partnership agreements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with Ohio Board of Regents College Completion Initiatives</td>
<td>Fully comply with PLA with a Purpose as well as all TAGs, CTAGs, MTAG, and OTM requirements, as well as AP alignments to ensure smooth transfer and articulation with other universities in Ohio.</td>
<td>Website for faculty and chairs created to increase understanding; course matches and alignments developed or are in process for all relevant and existing TAGs, CTAGs, MTAGs, and AP requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Website for Transfer Students</td>
<td>Create a smoother transition into Miami or when leaving Miami.</td>
<td>Created website at: <a href="http://miamioh.edu/onestop/your-records/academic-records/transfer-credit-eval/index.html">http://miamioh.edu/onestop/your-records/academic-records/transfer-credit-eval/index.html</a>; also created special advisor training module on transfer students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2016-2018 Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>Enhanced advisor development and recognition</td>
<td>Increase the percentage of advisors who have completed required and optional portions of advisor development and the percentage who receive Level A status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data-driven academic advising</td>
<td>Institute the use of Education Advisory Board’s Student Success Collaborative (a predictive analytics tool to aid retention) by advisors across all academic divisions and campuses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td>Enhanced student financial assistance</td>
<td>Institute a four-year guaranteed tuition, Miami Tuition Promise; increase need-based scholarships for undergraduate Ohio students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of existing programs designed to promote student success</td>
<td>Purchase and launch Civitas, a strategic analytics framework, to assess existing retention initiatives. Conduct in-house student satisfaction survey. Make improvements based upon findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First-generation college student support</td>
<td>Design and launch an optional learning community for incoming, first generation students, which includes peer mentoring, success course, and faculty mentoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International student support</td>
<td>Develop and begin implementing a comprehensive strategic plan for supporting international students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Military student support</td>
<td>Enhance proactive student support services; review and revise policies for military students as needed; create course matches for relevant Military Transfer Assurance Guides, and explore portfolio credit for experiential learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diverse domestic student support</td>
<td>Enhance and extend the “Bridges” program to include social events, success coaching, and intentional engagement with the Miami community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies &amp; Procedures</td>
<td>Scholastic regulation review</td>
<td>Conduct a holistic review of all scholastic regulation policies and procedures (warning, probation, suspension and dismissal), revise as needed, and create improvements in support for students in academic peril (e.g., alternative suspension program) as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priority registration</td>
<td>Review and revise priority registration policy to create greater course availability for students who need it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree requirements</td>
<td>Reduce the credit hour requirement for graduation with a bachelor’s and associate degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>Transition courses</td>
<td>Continue to enhance assessment of UNV 101 and other key introductory courses, and use data to improve course design, instruction and student success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

Miami University ranks nationally (40th in the nation) in Forbes magazine’s list of “Best Value Colleges 2016.” The rankings were done in partnership with the Center for College Affordability and Productivity. Forbes examined the U.S. colleges and universities “that provide students with the most value for the dollar,” and made its assessment in part on the institution’s expected time to degree, drop-out risk, and the value added of the degree.

A recent study conducted by Miami’s Office of Institutional Research which tracked 2014-15 alumni career and educational placement, found the following:

Among 2014-15 alumni:

- 95.5% of Oxford bachelor’s graduates were employed or enrolled in school as of fall 2015.
- 97.5% of regional campus bachelor’s graduates were employed or enrolled.
- 95.9% of master’s degree recipients and 98.1% of doctoral degree recipients were employed or enrolled.

The study relied on a variety of methods to identify alumni placement rates, including online surveys, phone calls, and National Student Clearinghouse records, resulting in a 74.8% graduate knowledge rate for Oxford and a 64.4% rate for the regional campuses.

Significant results from this study include:

- Among alumni who were not enrolled in graduate or professional school, 93.9% were currently employed, including 0.9% who were self-employed or running their own business. Among the 6.1% of alumni who were not employed, 3.2% were looking for a job, 0.8% were not currently looking for a job, and 2.2% had an unknown job-seeking status.
- 53.6% of alumni were working full-time, 3.6% were working part-time, and 36.8% had an unknown full time/part time status.
- 39.5% of employed alumni worked for their current employer previously, most commonly as an intern or co-op student (24.5%).
- 84.9% of employed alumni were working in a position that required a bachelor’s degree or higher.
- The majority of employed alumni reported an annual (vs. hourly) salary, with a median annual salary range of $50,000 - $59,999. Among all employed alumni, 17.7% earn from $40,000 - $49,999 per year, 29.0% earn from $50,000 - $59,999 per year, and 13.5% earn from $60,000 - $69,999 per year.

In 2014, the Ohio Department of Higher Education approved an Ohio Means Internships & Co-ops grant for $748,566. The grant was designed to support key Ohio industries, including bio-health, energy, automotive, advanced manufacturing, polymers, aerospace and aviation, food processing, financial services, information technology, and consumer products. The grant has been used to develop over 140 new co-op and internship placements in Ohio (with over 40 in the start-up community) and to fund related initiatives on both the Oxford and regional campuses.

Below is a list of the initiatives that have been generated as an outgrowth of the grant:

- Every academic department now uses a specially numbered internship courses with variable credit so that internships can be transcripted and tracked.
- A new Cincinnati Digital Innovation Center with a focus on cross-disciplinary internships at local and regional technology companies has been created with a class of enrolled students in the spring 2016 semester.
- Two new employer development committees have been created, consisting of over twenty faculty and staff focused on developing internships for students in underserved majors, particularly in the humanities and creative arts. Faculty members on these committees receive stipends and specialized workshop training.
- A mobile app has been developed for Miami Career Services by a Miami Agile Launchpad student class.
Miami faculty and staff are collaborating with University of Cincinnati and other local schools for OMIC 2.5 with the goal of enhancing internship support.

With the two-year continuation of the co-op/internship state grant funding, Miami’s regional campuses have been focusing on assisting local employers with hiring qualified co-ops and interns in the STEM disciplines, particularly emphasizing engineering and information technology areas. Below is an update on the key regional campus initiatives that have been launched as an outgrowth of the continued state grant funding:

- Since summer 2014, 25 wage subsidies have been disbursed. Employers have been reimbursed at 40% for co-op/internship wages up to a maximum of $2,400 per student.
- A new speakers program was launched this past year which focused on “The Art of Professionalism in the Workplace.”
- A contract with Simplicity has been signed to develop a student-employer database customized career system (called Career Link). Career Link will allow students to upload resumes into a database to be viewed by interested employers.
- A new interviewing workshop book, customized for the regional campus student, has been purchased.
- A new and permanent job coordinator was hired in August 2014.

**CONCLUSION**

Student success is integral to the mission and operation of Miami University. The 2016 *U.S. News & World Report* rankings recognize Miami as the second highest public university in the United States in the category of “Strong Commitment to Undergraduate Teaching.” Only 19 national universities are noted for such commitment. Miami has appeared on this short, elite list since the inaugural year of the rankings in 2009, and has been in the top five among public universities for six years in a row. *Kiplinger’s Personal Finance* magazine listed Miami as one the "100 Best Values in Public Colleges" for 2016, ranking Miami 50th among in-state best values nationwide for public universities and 33rd for public university best values for out-of-state students. Miami has appeared on the list since it was first published in 1998.

Although Miami has attained national prominence for its ability to graduate students on time and prepare them for life beyond college, the university does not intend to rest on its laurels. Miami is and will continue to be vigilant in adopting a data-driven and forward-thinking approach to ensure continuous improvement.
RESOLUTION R2016-46
Local Administration Competency Certification Program

WHEREAS, the Ohio General Assembly enacted SB310 which appropriated $23,900,000 to Miami University for capital improvement projects for the 2016-17 biennium; and

WHEREAS, the Local Administration Competency Certification Program allows institutions of higher education to administer state-funded capital facilities projects pursuant to section 3345.51 of the Revised Code without the supervision, control, or approval of the Ohio Department of Administrative Services; and

WHEREAS, the University desires to continue to participate in the Local Administration Competency Certification Program and administer its own capital facilities projects;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Miami University Board of Trustees authorizes the university’s participation in the Local Administration Certification Program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the appropriate University officials are directed to take all necessary steps to accomplish that purpose, including, without limitation, giving written notice to the Ohio Board of Regents pursuant to R.C. 3345.51 (A)(2), of the Board’s request to administer a capital facilities project within sixty days after the effective date of the section of an act in which the General Assembly initially makes an appropriation for the project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that pursuant to the requirement set forth in R.C. 3345.51(A)(3), the University intends to comply with section 153.13 of the Revised Code, policy and procedure guidelines for contract documents established pursuant to section 153.16 of the Revised Code, and all laws that govern the selection of consultants, preparation and approval of contract documents, receipt of bids, and award of contracts with respect to the applicable project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that pursuant to the requirement set forth in R.C. 123.17 (D)(6), the University agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the State and the Ohio Department of Administrative Services for any claim of injury, loss, or damage that results from the University’s administration of a capital facilities project pursuant to the Local Administration Certification Program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that pursuant to the requirement set forth in R.C. 123.17 (D)(5), the University will conduct biennial audits of the University’s administration of capital facilities projects in accordance R.C. 3345.51(C); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that pursuant to the requirement set forth in R.C. 123.17 (D)(2), the University will select new employees to participate in the Local Administration Certification Program as necessary to compensate for employee turnover.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
RESOLUTION R2016-47

WHEREAS, the Hughes Hall C-Wing Renovation project involves the renovation of the second and third floors of the west wing of Hughes Hall creating swing space for the Pearson Hall Renovation and additional space for the College of Engineering and Computing; and

WHEREAS, the project includes the installation of new mechanical, electrical, data, plumbing, life safety systems, code compliance, lab safety improvements and other ADA upgrades to create flexible multidisciplinary lab spaces; and

WHEREAS, Miami University has identified local funds in the amount of $11,000,000 for the Hughes Hall C-Wing Renovation project; and

WHEREAS, the $11,000,000 budget includes a cost of work estimate of approximately $7,875,000; and

WHEREAS, Miami University has determined that reduced costs, speed of implementation, and coordination may be gained by using the Design Build project delivery method; and

WHEREAS, the receipt of Guaranteed Maximum Price is planned for July 2016; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees desires to award a contract to the most responsive and responsible Design Builder;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby authorizes the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services and Treasurer to proceed with the award of contracts for the Hughes Hall C-Wing Renovation project with a total project budget not to exceed $11,000,000.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
Executive Summary
for the
Hughes Hall C-Wing Renovation
June 23, 2016

The Hughes Hall C-Wing Renovation will create swing space supporting the renovation of Pearson Hall. The project will provide flexible interdisciplinary space on the second floor of C-Wing (west wing) to house occupants of the Pearson Hall renovation. The third floor will be renovated to provide shared multidisciplinary lab space with the College of Engineering and Computing. Once the Pearson Hall renovation is complete, the flexible design allows the space to be used by the College of Engineering and Computing.

The project replaces end of useful life mechanical, electrical, data, plumbing, life and lab safety systems. It includes code compliance improvements and other ADA upgrades, to create flexible multidisciplinary lab spaces. The renovation is to be completed by summer 2017 in anticipation of the first phase of renovations beginning at Pearson Hall.

Funding for this project will be a combination of local funds:

Local $5,500,000 FY 2015 operating budget surplus
Local $5,500,000 Arts & Sciences carry forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project component:</th>
<th>Budget:</th>
<th>Funding Source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Est. Consulting Services:</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Cost of Work:</td>
<td>$7,875,000</td>
<td>Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Owner’s Costs (FFE, A/V, etc):</td>
<td>$1,275,000</td>
<td>Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency:</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>Local Funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $11,000,000
RESOLUTION R2016-48

WHEREAS, the Housing Master Plan called for 7100 beds on the Oxford campus upon completion of the plan; and

WHEREAS, on-campus housing demand has continued to grow during implementation of the Housing Master Plan’s first and second phases creating overflow conditions and leasing of off-campus housing in excess of 300 beds; and

WHEREAS, a recent Housing Master Plan update anticipates a demand of 8100 beds by fall 2018 generating a shortfall of up to 600 beds on campus; and

WHEREAS, construction of a new residence hall(s) is needed to provide sufficient housing options for students; and

WHEREAS, the New North Quad Tennis Court Site Residence Hall project will provide approximately 340 beds on the existing site of the Inter-Collegiate Athletics varsity tennis courts for occupancy in fall semester 2018; and

WHEREAS, the relocation of the varsity tennis courts to the west side of Yager Stadium will support the Athletic Master Plan and is necessary to complete this project; and

WHEREAS, Miami University has determined that reduced costs, speed of implementation, and coordination may be gained by using the Design Build project delivery method; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees previously approved a budget not to exceed $3,500,000 in contracts for the preconstruction phase of the project including the planning, design, cost estimating, and other services necessary to prepare the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP); and

WHEREAS, Miami University has identified funds in the amount of $38,500,000 for the New North Quad Tennis Court Site Residence Hall project; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees desires to award a contract to the most responsive and responsible Design Build firm;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees authorizes the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services and Treasurer, in accordance with all State guidelines, to proceed with the award of a contract for the New North Quad Tennis Court Site Residence Hall project with a total project budget not to exceed $38,500,000.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
Executive Summary
for the
New Residence Hall
June 23, 2016

The Housing Master Plan included new residence halls on campus providing swing space for renovating existing residence halls. Upon completion of the multi-year plan, the housing capacity was expected to provide 7100 beds – essentially the same capacity prior to plan implementation. This was considered aggressive at the time given the incoming class had declined significantly over the previous year. Success in enrollment goals since then, improved student retention, growth of new international programs, and continued interest of upper-class students living in on-campus housing has required modification to the original bed count plan as enrollment on campus has reached a record level.

Throughout the implementation of the earlier phases of the Housing Master Plan, additional beds have been designed into the projects. In the East Quad Renovations, nearly 100 additional beds were added beyond the original Housing Master Plan estimates (nearly 50 of these beds were achieved by converting Erickson Dining Hall into residence hall space). The Board of Trustees also approved an addition to Hahne Hall (nearing completion now) as part of the North Quad Renovation project adding over 100 beds.

Efforts have also been made to reduce the need for new beds by creating triples where appropriate sized rooms are available (approximately 75 were incorporated into the three new residence halls on Western Campus). Availability of on-campus housing for upper-class students has been reduced at times to accommodate the increased demand by freshman and sophomores. Finally, modest use of off-campus apartments has enabled the increased demand to be accommodated when necessary. Unfortunately, leasing beds next to campus has not always been possible requiring some students to be housed almost 2 miles from campus.

Current housing demand is nearing 7700 beds, and it is anticipated that 8100 beds will be needed by the fall semester of 2018 creating a shortfall of up to 600 beds.

Several potential building sites were evaluated for constructing a new residence hall to meet the demand. The location of the Inter-Collegiate Athletics tennis courts allows for the construction of an approximately 340-bed facility within the time constraints necessary. The proposed site is adjacent to the North Quad, which is currently off-line for renovations. Necessary utility improvements to accommodate a new residence hall are now being made and will not require further disruption. The site offers close proximity to Martin Dining Hall (currently under renovation with The North Quad Renovations project) and the Garden Commons dining facility. The Campus Planning Committee has approved this location for the construction of a new residence hall.
Funding for this project will be bond funds for the Long Range Housing Master Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project component</th>
<th>Budget:</th>
<th>Funding Source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Est. Consulting Services:</td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
<td>Bond Series 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Cost of Work:</td>
<td>$32,000,000</td>
<td>Bond Series 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Owner’s Costs:</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>Bond Series 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Contingency:</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>Bond Series 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,500,000</strong></td>
<td>Bond Series 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION R2016-49

WHEREAS, the Housing Master Plan called for 7100 beds on the Oxford campus upon completion of the plan; and

WHEREAS, on-campus housing demand has continued to grow during implementation of the Housing Master Plan’s first and second phases generating unfavorable overflow conditions and leasing of off-campus housing in excess of 300 beds in the fall of 2015; and

WHEREAS, it is not cost effective to renovate Swing Hall or construct an addition to Clawson Hall as originally planned; and

WHEREAS, the Housing Master Plan now anticipates a demand of 8100 beds by fall 2018 generating a shortfall of up to 270 beds even with the construction of a new residence hall on the tennis court site; and

WHEREAS, construction of a new residence hall(s) is required to provide sufficient housing options; and

WHEREAS, the New North Withrow Hall Site Residence Hall project involves the construction of a new 270(+) bed residence hall on the existing site of Withrow Court for occupancy in fall semester 2018; and

WHEREAS, Miami University has determined that reduced costs, speed of implementation, and coordination may be gained by using the Design Build project delivery method; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees previously approved a budget not to exceed $2,500,000 in contracts for the preconstruction phase of the project including the planning, design, cost estimating, and other services necessary to prepare the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP); and

WHEREAS, Miami University has identified funds in the amount of $37,000,000 for the New North Withrow Hall Site Residence Hall project; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees desires to award a contract to the most responsive and responsible Design Build firm;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees authorizes the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services and Treasurer, in accordance with all State guidelines, to proceed with the award of contract for the New North Withrow Hall Site Residence Hall project with a total project budget not to exceed $37,000,000.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
Executive Summary
for the
North Quad Withrow Hall Site Residence Hall
June 23, 2016

Completion of the Housing Master Plan anticipated providing 7100 beds on campus – essentially the same capacity prior to plan implementation. Success in enrollment goals since then, improved student retention, growth of new international programs, and continued interest of upper-class students living in on-campus housing has required modification to the original bed count plan as enrollment on campus has reached a near record level.

Current housing demand is nearing 7700 beds, and it is anticipated that 8100 beds will be needed by the fall semester of 2017 creating a shortfall of up to 600 beds with approximately 330 of the bed shortfall to be addressed by the new residence hall on the tennis court site. It is not feasible for a new residence hall to be constructed and ready for occupancy for the fall semester of 2017.

Throughout the implementation of the earlier phases of the Housing Master Plan, additional beds have been designed into the projects. In the East Quad renovations, nearly 100 additional beds were added beyond the original Housing Master Plan estimates. An addition to Hahne Hall (nearing completion now) as part of the North Quad Renovation project is adding over 100 beds.

Efforts have also been made to reduce the need for new beds by creating triples where appropriate sized rooms are available (approximately 75 were incorporated into the three new residence halls on Western Campus). Availability of on-campus housing for upper-class students has been reduced at times to accommodate the increased demand by freshman and sophomores. Finally, modest use of off-campus apartments has enabled the increased demand to be accommodated when necessary. Unfortunately, leasing beds next to campus has not always been possible requiring some students to be housed almost 2 miles from campus.

As shared with the Board in February, a 100-bed addition to Clawson Hall was not a cost effective solution. Review of upcoming hall modernizations in the Housing Master Plan found that Swing Hall is not cost effective to renovate. The Long Range Housing Master Plan has always included the deconstruction of some existing residence halls. Mary Lyon will be deconstructed in the summer of 2016 contributing to the fall 2017 bed shortfall. Wilson Hall is intended to be removed from the housing stock, but is not planned for deconstruction at this time. This creates the need for an additional 270 beds to reach the necessary 8100 beds on campus.

Several potential building sites were evaluated for constructing a new residence hall to meet the demand. The site where Withrow Hall is slated to be deconstructed this summer presents the best opportunity for a new residence hall. The location of the site is considered favorable for several reasons. The location of Swing Hall, adjacent to the site, remains very attractive to our students. The close proximity to key academic buildings, various dining opportunities, athletic venues and events have been identified as important to our students. Further, the site offers significant economy of scale by allowing a single construction manager at risk (CMR) to construct a new residence hall on this proposed site in conjunction with the tennis court site. Coordination of subcontractors, offering larger bid packages, balancing of dirt between the sites, and reduced overhead costs all contribute to more than $2 million in savings. Delaying the project for two years until the tennis court building has been completed would also add about $2 million to the cost of the project while also foregoing the additional room income.

Developing this prominent location does have both advantages and disadvantages. The current design incorporates a large retail dining and gathering space in a desirable and accessible location. The cost to construct this space adds nearly $3 million to the project estimate, but is an advantageous amenity. The Campus Planning Committee (CPC) has approved the deconstruction of Withrow Court, using the site for the construction of a new residence hall, and the potential
deconstruction of Swing Hall. However, the CPC has noted that using this site requires a design and architectural features complimenting the buildings removed and fitting of the prominent location along Tallawanda Street. The design team has found that the appropriate size of the proposed residence hall should be less than 300 beds in this location. While this bed count is responsive to addressing the shortage we are currently experiencing, there are inherent inefficiencies in constructing smaller residence halls. Finally, using the footprint of a deconstructed building has both advantages and disadvantages to construction on a greenfield site. For this location, some of the savings are offset by the need to use engineered fill around the foundation. All of these factors contribute to higher cost of constructing a building in this particular location.

Considering the totality of the information and circumstances, it is recommended to pursue construction in this location.

Funding for this project will be bond funds for the Long Range Housing Master Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project component</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Est. Consulting Services:</td>
<td>$2,301,750</td>
<td>Bond Series 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Cost of Work:</td>
<td>$31,500,000</td>
<td>Bond Series 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. Owner’s Costs:</td>
<td>$1,248,250</td>
<td>Bond Series 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Contingency:</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
<td>Bond Series 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>$37,000,000</td>
<td>Bond Series 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION R2016-50

WHEREAS, the City of Hamilton is proceeding with a new road and intersection project providing a direct link between US 127 and Miami’s Hamilton Campus (“US 127 Project”); and

WHEREAS, the US 127 Project requires a relocation of existing overhead electrical power facilities; and

WHEREAS, the relocation requires the University to grant a new utility easement to Duke Energy of Ohio, Inc. to construct, reconstruct and maintain these lines, a copy of which is attached to this Resolution and incorporated herein (“Utility Easement”);

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees approves the Utility Easement, subject to the terms and conditions set forth therein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services be authorized to sign the Utility Easement.

Approved by the Miami University Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
GRANT OF EASEMENT

Pt. Parcel # P6461012000001

In consideration of the sum of One Dollar ($1.00) and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, THE PRESIDENT AND TRUSTEES OF THE MIAMI UNIVERSITY, (hereinafter referred to as “Grantor”), hereby grant(s) unto DUKE ENERGY OHIO, INC., an Ohio corporation, with a mailing address of 139 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, OH 45202 and its successors and assigns (hereinafter referred to as “Grantee”), a perpetual, non-exclusive easement to construct, reconstruct, operate, patrol, maintain, repair, replace, relocate, add to, modify and remove, electric and/or telecommunication line or lines including but not limited to, all necessary and convenient supporting structures, towers, poles, underground ducts, conduits, wires, cables, manholes, pullboxes, pipes, guy wires with anchors, grounding systems, counterpoises, and all other appurtenances, fixtures and equipment (hereinafter referred to as the “Facilities”), for the transmission and distribution of electrical energy and for technological purposes (including but not limited to telecommunications), both overhead and underground, in, upon, over, along, under, through and across the following described real estate:

Situate in Section 1, Town 1, Range 3 and Section 6, Town 1, Range 2 and being part of Lot 26072 of the revised list of lots in the Sixth Ward of the City of Hamilton, Butler County, Ohio: being part of a tract of land conveyed to the President and Trustees of the Miami University from the City of Hamilton, Ohio by deed dated November 4, 1966, recorded in Official Record Book 856, Page 382 (Instrument Number 6815), in the Office of the Recorder of Butler County, Ohio (hereinafter referred to as “Grantor’s Property”).

Said easement area being described and shown on a survey drawing marked Exhibit “A” attached hereto and becoming a part hereof (hereinafter referred to as the “Easement Area”).

This easement grant shall include, but not be limited to, the following respective rights and duties of Grantor and Grantee:

1. Grantee shall have the right of ingress and egress over the Easement Area, and over the adjoining land of Grantor’s Property (using lanes, driveways, and adjoining public roads where practical as determined by Grantee).
2. Grantee shall have the right to cut down, clear, trim, remove, and otherwise control any trees, shrubs,
overhanging branches, and/or other vegetation upon or over the Easement Area. Grantee shall also have the right to cut down, clear, trim, remove, and otherwise control any trees, shrubs, overhanging branches, and/or other vegetation which are adjacent to the Easement Area but only to the extent such vegetation may endanger, as reasonably determined by Grantee, the safe or reliable operation of the Facilities, or where such vegetation is trimmed consistent with generally accepted arboricultural practices.

3. Any telecommunications equipment installed by Grantee on Grantee’s Facilities shall support the operation of the Grantee’s electric facilities.

4. To the best of Grantor’s knowledge the Easement Area has never been used to discharge, generate or store any toxic, hazardous, corrosive, radioactive or otherwise harmful substance or material. Grantee acknowledges that the Easement Area is part of a manufacturing site and previous operations in some areas may have resulted in contamination of soil in the Easement Area. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this paragraph, Grantor shall be responsible to dispose of any contaminated disturbed soil, in compliance with applicable government regulations. Grantor shall be deemed the generator of such contaminated disturbed soil, and shall therefore be responsible to arrange for disposal of any such contaminated disturbed soil, and to sign any shipping papers or waste manifests associated with said disposal.

5. Grantor shall not place, or permit the placement of, any obstructions, which may interfere with the exercise of the rights granted herein to Grantee. Grantee shall have the right to remove any such obstruction.

6. Grantee shall have the right to pile dirt and other material and to operate equipment upon the surface of the Easement Area and the adjoining land of Grantor’s Property, but only during those times when Grantee is constructing, reconstructing, maintaining, repairing, replacing, relocating, adding to, modifying, or removing the Facilities.

7. Excluding the removal of vegetation and obstructions as provided herein, any physical damage to the surface area of the Easement Area and the adjoining land of Grantor’s Property resulting from the exercise of the rights granted herein to Grantee, shall be promptly paid by Grantee, or repaired or restored by Grantee to a condition which is reasonably close to the condition it was in prior to the damage, all to the extent such damage is caused by Grantee or its contractors or employees. In the event that Grantee does not, in the opinion of Grantor, satisfactorily repair any damage, Grantor must, within ninety (90) days after such damage occurs, file a claim for such damage with Grantee at (a) 139 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, OH 45202, Attn: Right of Way Services, or (b) by contacting an authorized Right of Way Services representative of Grantee.

8. Grantor shall have the right to use the Easement Area and the adjoining land of Grantor’s Property in any manner which is consistent with the rights granted herein to Grantee, and shall comply with all applicable codes when making use of the land near the Facilities.

9. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained herein, Grantor shall not without the prior written consent of Grantee (a) construct or install, or permit the construction or installation of any building, house, or other above-ground structure, or portion thereof, upon the Easement Area; or (b) excavate or place, or permit the
excavation or placement of any dirt or other material upon or below the Easement Area; or (c) cause, by excavation or placement of material, either on or off the Easement Area, a pond, lake, or similar containment vehicle that would result in the retention of water in any manner within the Easement Area.

10. Grantor warrants that it has the necessary authority and title to Grantor’s Property to grant this easement to Grantee, and shall defend and hold Grantee harmless from the claim of any third party that Grantor does not have such authority or title.

11. The respective rights and duties herein of Grantor and Grantee shall inure to the benefit of, and shall be binding upon the respective successors, assigns, heirs, personal representatives, lessees, licensees, and/or tenants of Grantor and Grantee. Easement, Grantor and Grantee, as used herein, shall be deemed to be plural, when required to be so. The exercise of any or all of the rights and privileges of Grantee set forth herein, shall be at the sole discretion of Grantee.

[Signature page(s) follow.]
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Grantor has caused this Grant of Easement to be signed by its duly authorized representative(s), effective the _____ day of _______________, 2016.

THE PRESIDENT AND TRUSTEES OF THE MIAMI UNIVERSITY,
Grantor

By: ________________________________  By: ________________________________

Printed Name: ________________________________

Printed Name: ________________________________

Printed Title: ________________________________

Printed Title: ________________________________

STATE OF ____________________ )
COUNTY OF __________________ )

Personally appeared before me this day ________________________________, 2016, (a) duly authorized representative(s) of Grantor and acknowledged the signing of this Grant of Easement by ______ to be a voluntary act and deed for and on behalf of Grantor, and having been duly sworn/affirmed, state(s) that any representations contained therein are true to the best of ______ personal knowledge.

WITNESS my hand and notarial seal, this _____ day of _______________, 2016

My Commission Expires: ___________  Signed Name: ________________________________

My County of Residence: ___________  Printed Name: ________________________________

This Instrument Prepared by:
Janice L. Walker
Attorney-at-Law
139 E. Fourth St.
Cincinnati, OH 45202

For Grantee’s Internal Use:
Line Name/No:
R/W Tract No:
Job Control# ______
LU#
Prep/Chk: _____  Exec./Rec.: ______
Dwg/Fac. Ref.: ___________
Prepared Date: ___________
BE IT ORDAINED: by the Board of Trustees that the Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2016-17, as presented at this meeting, be and it hereby is enacted with the following current expenditures and transfers for the major purposes as follows:

**General Fund Expenditures:**
- Salaries: $203,988,471
- Staff Benefits: 74,339,593
- Scholarships, Fellowships and Student Fee Waivers: 97,090,941
- Graduate Assistant Fee Waivers: 21,555,771
- Utilities: 14,323,036
- Other Expenditures: 42,508,993

**Subtotal General Fund Expenditures:** $453,806,805

**General Fund Transfers:**
- Debt Service (mandatory transfer): 8,642,559
- General Fee and Other (non-mandatory transfers): 58,033,385

**Total General Fund:** $520,482,749

**Designated Fund:** $45,713,572

**Restricted Fund:** $62,361,610

**Auxiliary Enterprises:**
- Expenditures: $118,286,243
- Debt Service (mandatory transfer): 42,581,890
- Other Transfers (net): 24,087,736

**Total Auxiliaries:** $150,169,445

**TOTAL:** $778,727,376

Provided that the above appropriations include aggregate merit and salary improvement increases for faculty and unclassified staff equal to three percent (3.05%) effective with the beginning of the appointment year; and

Provided further that an additional one percent (1%) is included for faculty salaries for making improvements in the market competitiveness of associate and full professors salaries; and

Provided further that a pool of funds amounting to three percent (3.0%) is included for classified staff salary enhancements and adjustments to scale; and

Provided further that additional institutional funds are set aside for student financial aid, selected support (non-personnel) budgets, and debt service; and

Provided further that the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services and Treasurer, with the approval of the President, may make such adjustments as are necessary in the operating budget within the limits of available funds or within the limits of additional income received for a specific purpose ("restricted funds").

Approved by the Board of Trustees
**June 24, 2016**

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
RESOLUTION R2016-51

WHEREAS, Ohio Governor, John R. Kasich, on February 10, 2015, issued Executive Order 2015-01K establishing the Ohio Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency in Higher Education (Ohio Task Force) to review and recommend ways in which state-sponsored institutions can be more efficient, offering an education of equal or higher quality while decreasing their costs; and

WHEREAS, Am. Sub. HB 64 requires all boards of trustees of Ohio’s state institutions of higher education to complete by July 1, 2016, an efficiency review based on the report and recommendations of the Ohio Task Force and to make a report to the Chancellor of Higher Education within 30 days of the completion of the efficiency review that must include how each institution will implement the recommendations and cost saving measures; and

WHEREAS, the report of the task force included two master recommendations requiring: the savings and new dollars from the efficiency review be employed to reduce the cost of college for students or provide tangible benefits for the quality of students’ education and a five year goal to be established for savings and new resources to be achieved by fiscal year 2021; and

WHEREAS, Miami University with the adoption of this resolution establishes as its five year goal $30 million in increased student scholarships to be met by fiscal year 2021 and has completed or has in progress actions consistent with the efficiency review as outlined in the Ohio Task Force report; and

WHEREAS, the evaluations and recommendations associated with the efficiency review are recommended in cooperation with Miami’s Fiscal Priorities committee; and

WHEREAS, Miami envisions this action not only being important for the five year period required by the report but has also recommended that program reviews be implemented for non-academic programs to better ensure that the Ohio Task Force goals to improve quality and efficiency be continued beyond 2021;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees of Miami University accepts the efficiency review and recommendations that accompany this resolution including the five year goal to increase student scholarships by at least $30 million; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees directs the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services to submit the accompanying report and the related recommendations to the Chancellor of Higher Education by the legislated deadline.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
Ohio’s state-sponsored institutions of higher education have been directed to perform comprehensive reviews of their efficiency and new resource-generation opportunities as outlined by the Ohio Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency. The information compiled during the assessment is to be used to set a five-year goal for achieving new efficiency savings and resource generation to be used to improve student affordability and/or academic quality.

In response to this directive, Miami University performed a comprehensive assessment consistent with the Ohio Task Force’s recommendations. **Miami University’s goal based on this review is to increase its scholarship support for students by at least $30 million, i.e., $6 million per year, for the period 2017 through 2021.** This goal is in addition to controlling the cost of tuition and fees, which continues to be a priority for the university.

Miami’s long-standing commitment to affordability and efficiency is evident in its external evaluations and rankings. Since 1998, Miami has been listed by *Kiplinger’s Personal Finance* Magazine as one of the “100 Best Values in Public Colleges.” Miami is ranked second among public universities in the nation by the 2016 *U.S. News & World Report* for its exceptionally strong commitment to undergraduate teaching and by the same publication as the most efficient, highly ranked university in the nation. These recognitions are partially made possible by adherence to the principles outlined by Governor Kasich in his charge to the Task Force.

Miami’s commitment to affordability and efficiency is also evident in its financial actions during the past eight years. Multiple initiatives focused on affordability and efficiency have led to over $75 million in annual operating improvements, about $70 million in newly endowed student scholarships, and more than $60 million in increased spending on student financial aid each year. Additionally, **Miami’s new strategic plan includes an annual goal to increase productivity and efficiency each year by 0.5%.**

A detailed review of the university’s operations was conducted in accordance with the Ohio Task Force recommendations. Some key observations and recommendations essential to Miami University achieving its new efficiency goal are summarized below according to numbered sections from the Task Force:

**3. Strategic Procurement:** The Governor’s Task Force identified strategic sourcing as one of the primary opportunities for increased efficiency. Miami has adopted a new procurement policy consistent with the Ohio Task Force recommendations and intends to work with the Inter-University Council-Purchasing Group on securing contracts for the commodities identified in the Task Force report and on future group purchasing opportunities. Miami intends to use these agreements for procuring these commodities and services whenever practical.

**4A. Asset Review and Evaluation of Affinity Partnerships and Sponsorships:** As part of Miami’s Strategic Priorities initiative, evaluations of non-core assets and partnership and sponsorship
opportunities were conducted earlier in this decade and several opportunities were pursued and executed. That review was recently updated as recommended in the Ohio Task Force report. The primary opportunity identified in the 2015-2016 assessment was real property that is not contiguous to the Oxford campus. The administration intends to work with its Board of Trustees to further evaluate the essential nature of these holdings and their possible liquidation. Miami is also committed to seeking additional affinity partnerships and sponsorships and is exploring opportunities with strategic technology vendors.

4B. Operations Review: Operation reviews, similar to those recommended in the Ohio Task Force report, were completed for Miami by Accenture in 2011 as part of the University’s Strategic Priorities and its Strategic Assessment of Support Services (SASS) initiatives. As a result of these assessments, Miami identified many opportunities for operational improvement and acted on them. Several of these operations were re-evaluated as recommended in the Ohio Task Force report. The updated reviews failed to identify any additional opportunities for most of the operations, but an opportunity for further improvement in custodial services was identified. Recommendations are being developed for the best path to achieve the custodial improvements.

5A. Cost Diagnostic: A 10-year diagnostic was compiled by both functional area and object of expense. No major issues were identified as costs grew more slowly than the consumer price index for the period, excluding the growth in scholarships that is a strategic priority for the University and the Ohio Task Force. While overall cost growth at Miami University has been held in check for a full decade, certain operations such as Enrollment Management, Intercollegiate Athletics, and University Advancement did experience above-average growth. In the case of Enrollment Management and University Advancement, this growth was important to the attainment of strategic university goals. Growth in Intercollegiate Athletics was disproportionately large when compared to the restrained growth in most academic programs. Spending on Intercollegiate Athletics should be evaluated, definitely slowed and possibly reduced.

It was impractical to fully evaluate the operations that grew at a rate greater than the University average given the limited time available for completing the assessment. Moreover, it is possible that operations experiencing slower growth also offer opportunities for increased productivity or efficiency. The university intends to implement a program review process to assess nonacademic functions, including its auxiliary operations, on a regular cycle. Through these more intensive reviews, the effectiveness and efficiency of these services can be assessed and strengthened on an ongoing basis.

5C. Organizational Structure and Span of Control: Similar assessments to those recommended by the Ohio Task Force were completed by Accenture as part of the 2011 Strategic Priorities and SASS initiatives. The earlier Accenture assessments identified opportunities for improvement that have already been implemented. As recommended by the Ohio Task Force, updated reviews were conducted of the university’s organizational structure and its span of control and resulted in the following conclusions.

(A) The recent reviews confirmed the earlier findings by the Accenture study that the University’s structure and span of control are generally efficient when compared to Miami’s university peers, with only a small number of new opportunities identified for further consideration. Span of control was identified as offering possible opportunities for improvement in two functional areas:
Enrollment Management (especially the Registrar function) and IT Services. Both will be evaluated in greater depth as part of the proposed Program Review process.

(B) The Accenture study found that university staff frequently devote a disproportionate amount of time to transactional processes to the detriment of more strategic activities. The numerous Lean initiatives since that initial assessment have improved but not fully addressed this issue. One factor preventing further improvement has been the inability to implement some Lean recommendations due to inadequate IT support for new application development. Consequently, software application improvements must become an increased focus for IT Services at the University if further improvements are to be made in reducing transactional activities.

(C) The Strategic Priorities committee in 2010 found that the number of academic departments and programs at Miami is generally larger than at similarly sized universities. Improvements have been made as a result of the Strategic Priorities recommendations that align with the university’s academic goals and priorities, but the current study also found that the number of programs and academic departments are generally larger at Miami than at similarly-sized universities. It may be beneficial to engage the university community in further discussions about these patterns to determine if opportunities still exist for a more efficient academic structure that aligns with the university’s academic goals and priorities.

5E. Data Centers: Miami is participating with the Inter-University Council-CIO group to perform an assessment of its data center and disaster recovery needs. Miami intends to contract with the State of Ohio Computer Center (SOCC) or other shared data centers for disaster recovery services and possibly other data center services once such services are more fully built-out by the SOCC and as long as such services lead to lower costs and/or operational improvements. In addition to these opportunities, Miami is working with the Ohio Supercomputing Center and the SOCC on how expand the existing high performance computing strategies, avoiding expensive new investments in Miami’s research computing capabilities.

5F. Space Utilization: The University has completed a preliminary assessment of its space utilization and concluded that there are opportunities for improvements. A more comprehensive review will be conducted in the coming year to develop recommendations for improved space utilization and to better align space allocation and utilization with current and future academic priorities. Preliminary work has already been undertaken to improve classroom and meeting space scheduling and to enhance the information needed to identify course utilization by schedule type and delivery mode.

6. Textbook Affordability: An Open Educational Resources committee was appointed by Miami’s provost to develop recommendations for greater standardization of course materials for gateway and high-impact courses. Thus far, the Committee has met with various university groups and conducted surveys of the university community; created a website geared primarily to librarians; joined the Open Textbook Network, a community of educational institutions that promote the use of open educational resources; and developed preliminary recommendations that are being considered by the provost.

Advances in Open Educational Resources are expected to occur gradually given the number of disciplines and courses to be addressed. In order to more immediately impact textbook and course material affordability for students, Miami issued a request for proposals (RFP) to online bookstore
providers in order to evaluate whether shifting the sale of textbooks and materials from its traditional brick and mortar bookstore could improve student affordability. The RFP process indicated a 15-25% cost reduction could be achieved for Miami’s students through an online textbook provider. Miami intends to abandon its traditional approach to offering these materials to students and enter into a contract with an online textbook provider later this year.

7. Time to Degree: Miami University is currently completing revisions to its baccalaureate graduation requirements that will lower the requirements for most degrees by four credit hours. The new graduation requirements will go into effect in fall 2017.

A new comprehensive academic advising plan has also been developed and will be implemented in fall 2016. Some of the advising improvements that are expected include the creation of advising milestones, greater uniformity in the advising philosophy and objectives, ongoing adviser training, an annual recognition program for advising excellence, and periodic assessments of advising outcomes. Additionally, in summer 2016 Miami is implementing EAB’s “Student Success Collaborative Advising Platform.” The enhanced data available through this new tool will assist advisers in earlier identifying students most at-risk for not graduating on time so appropriate intervention can occur with the student.

Miami has reduced tuition by 20% for online courses taken during summer and winter terms. The university has also increased partnerships and articulation agreements with two- and four-year institutions, including with Sinclair and Columbus State community colleges, providing new, supported paths to bachelor’s degrees. Additional agreements are in development.

10. Financial Advising for Students: Miami is implementing a number of improvements in the financial advising it provides to students. A new website will enable students to view information about their existing student loans before deciding if they will enter into new debt. The website will include information on a student’s loan debt history, total amount borrowed and all related costs, and anticipated repayment amounts following graduation. The University is also developing a loan counseling protocol based on student borrowing patterns (i.e., low, medium, high risk). Both of these changes are scheduled to be implemented in summer 2016. Finally, a new financial literacy program for students will be deployed in fall 2016.

The actions developed and being implemented by Miami University are a continuation of the University’s ongoing commitment to providing an affordable and vibrant learning and discovery environment that provides students the opportunity to accomplish extraordinary outcomes.
Introduction

Ohio’s public colleges and universities have been asked to undertake a comprehensive assessment of areas identified by the Ohio Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency. While these recommendations are important for improving access to higher education, lowering student debt, and strengthening student outcomes, each of Ohio’s public colleges and universities is at a different stage in addressing these important issues and these differences will likely affect how an institution’s assessment is conducted and the opportunities that result from the assessment.

For Miami University these priorities have been a focus for the University and its Board of Trustees for the past eight years. In 2009 and 2010 the University not only sought to balance its budget in response to financial issues created by the global recession but it also recognized the need to confront the affordability challenge through more modest tuition increases and increased scholarship support. Over $25 million in budget reductions (see Attachment A) were implemented during this period, while tuition increases were slowed (See Attachment B) and spending on student scholarships was increased (See Attachment C).

While the budget actions taken during 2009 and 2010 responded to the immediate issues that followed the recession, the University and its Board of Trustees recognized that these issues were not temporary and that higher education was entering a transformational period requiring a more sustained approach to affordability and efficiency. As a result, President Hodge appointed a University committee on Strategic Priorities to develop a five-year financial plan in response to the transformation that Miami and all of higher education were undergoing.

The Strategic Priorities plan identified $40 million in new strategies, with $30 million to be generated from increased efficiency and productivity and $10 million from new revenue activity. In addition, the plan called for $50 million in new scholarship endowments contributing to the increased focus on affordability. By the completion of the plan in fiscal year 2015, the $40 million goal in improvements was exceeded by almost 25% or 15% of the non-scholarship, general operating budget (See Attachment D), and the scholarship campaign had grown to $100 million.

The Strategic Priorities plan and recommendations developed by Miami in 2010 align very closely with the Ohio Task force recommendations issued in 2015. Miami was the first among public colleges and universities in Ohio to perform a comprehensive assessment of its administrative operations. This assessment, conducted by Accenture, helped identify administrative efficiencies to augment the goals and strategies developed by Strategic Priorities committee. A summary of the opportunities and outcomes from the Accenture study is provided in Attachment E. Miami was also the first of Ohio’s public colleges and universities to construct a Lean strategy, which has resulted in over 2,000 employees being trained in
Lean principles since 2009 and over 800 projects leading to improvements valued in excess of $40 million. Lean strategies encompass all operating units at Miami.

At the conclusion of the Strategic Priorities initiative in 2015, the University embarked on a new strategic plan, the Miami University 2020 Plan (See Attachment F). The new strategic plan continues the University’s focus on student affordability and on improved efficiency and productivity. This is reflected in the strategic planning goal for increased productivity of at least 0.5% each year. As part of this strategic plan, the University has adopted a tuition guarantee, the Miami University Tuition Promise, for all entering students beginning in the fall of 2016. This provides clarity to students and families about the costs associated with their college education, while keeping the value of scholarships consistent for the four-year period.

The alignment of the University’s strategic plan with the Ohio Task Force report’s recommendations further reflects Miami’s commitment to these priorities both now and into the future.

Master Recommendations—Student Benefit and Five Year Goal

Miami University is committed to advancing the three primary priorities given to the Ohio Task Force by the Governor: (1) to offer a high quality education and student experience; (2) to be more efficient; and (3) to decrease costs for students and their families. The commitment to these important values is evident in the actions taken by Miami University over the last eight years and in its current strategic plan.

Miami intends to continue its commitment to these values and to direct the benefit of the increased productivity resulting from these efforts to its students. In keeping with this expectation and the requirement for a five year goal or target, Miami’s plan is to increase its scholarship support for students by at least $30 million or $6 million per year for the period 2017 through 2021. Combined with the University’s efforts to control the rising cost of tuition, this will help to better ensure that Miami accomplishes the three priorities set out in the Governor’s charge to the Ohio Task Force.

Strategic Procurement

3A- Campus Contracts. Miami University, as recommended in the Task Force report, has amended its procurement policy to require that all university departments prioritize goods and services available through contracts negotiated by the Inter-University Council - Procurement Group (IUC-PG). The amended procurement policy is presented in Attachment G.

3B- Collaborative Contracts. As noted above, the Miami University Board of Trustees has adopted a revised procurement policy requiring all employees to prioritize IUC-PG contracts for all goods and services covered by these contracts. Miami also intends to participate in the IUC-PG’s future contracts for commodities identified in the Governor’s Task Force report as well as other commodities that are similarly available through contracts negotiated by the IUC-PG. The following table summarizes the plan for each commodity specifically identified in the Ohio Task Force report:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good or Service</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copiers and Printers</td>
<td>Miami has adopted the vendor agreement for copier and printer services negotiated by The Ohio State University. The IUC-PG intends to use the OSU agreement as the statewide model agreement. The new contract is effective 7/1/16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>Miami continues to employ the STS PC standards and the model contract negotiated by The Ohio State University. Miami’s IT Services division is evaluating how to further refine the STS standards for administrative computer purchases and will fully participate in the IUC-PG’s exploration of similar standards for monitors, keyboards, mice, cabling, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>Miami currently employs the IUC-PG office supply contract and will fully participate with the IUC-PG in development of office product standards with the potential for further reducing the cost of certain office products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Supplies</td>
<td>Miami is participating in the current data-gathering process for scientific equipment and supplies and intends to adopt the statewide agreement(s) once a vendor or vendors have been selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping</td>
<td>Miami intends to adopt the IUC-PG’s UPS outbound contract for letters and small packages and already uses the E&amp;I Fed Ex contract as recommended by the IUC-PG. Miami will also fully participate in the inbound freight RFP being developed by the IUC-PG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Services</td>
<td>Miami University has entered into a contract with a travel provider and will supply travel information from the provider to the IUC for the purpose of negotiating lower costs for frequent destinations or for volume providers of travel related services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4A Asset Review. Since 2009 Miami University has aggressively pursued assessments of its non-core assets to determine their market value if sold, leased or otherwise repurposed. The following is a summary of the transactions that have already been completed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Core Asset</th>
<th>Outcome from Sale, Lease or Repurpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Radio Station</td>
<td>Leased the broadcast rights to Cincinnati Public Radio in 2010, saving $600,000 in annual operating costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Company redLantern</td>
<td>In 2010, redLantern was sold for a gross sales price of $3,000,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus Banking</td>
<td>Total value of the 2012 contract to the University is $1.2 million over seven years. The new arrangement also made deposits of funds collected by university departments easier and faster with fewer administrative resources required to accomplish these deposits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage “Pouring Rights”</td>
<td>The 10-year contract negotiated in 2014 with an area Pepsi distributor has an estimated value of $8.5 million over the life of the agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>The 2015 sponsorship agreement provides $10 million to the University over 12 years along with improved sports medicine services for Miami’s intercollegiate athletes and students participating in intramural and club sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship Agreements for Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>Miami utilizes IMG to negotiate affinity partnerships for Intercollegiate Athletics which provides an annual value for the University’s athletic programs of $700,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the assessment of non-core assets that was previously completed by the University, the University undertook an updated assessment of the remaining non-core assets as recommended in the Ohio Task Force report. The following assets have been evaluated for the possibility of being sold, leased or otherwise repurposed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Core Asset</th>
<th>Status of Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>The receipt of capital improvement grants from the FAA precludes any immediate sale of the airport site and limits lease opportunities as well, but future opportunities will continue to be evaluated. Miami is also evaluating how it can more efficiently provide air travel that currently occurs through a university-owned plane.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elm Street Facility
This building is being vacated due to high maintenance and operating costs. The University is currently evaluating whether to pursue offers for sale or an exchange of the property.

Miscellaneous Residential Properties not Adjacent to the Oxford Campus
The University is currently evaluating whether to pursue a sale or exchange of residential properties in Oxford not adjacent to the Oxford Campus.

Ox College
In 2001 the University entered into a long-term lease agreement for the former Ox College residence hall with a local community foundation. This agreement enabled Miami to avoid the cost of operating and maintaining the building. The site also includes vacant land that is near the Elm Street building that may increase the attractiveness of the Elm Street building to developers should the University choose to pursue such a transaction. Further analysis is needed to determine the feasibility of selling or exchanging some of this site.

Parking Facilities
The University engaged a consultant to evaluate the operation of its parking facilities and to determine the feasibility of leasing or selling the facilities to a private operator. The consultant’s conclusion was that selling or leasing these parking facilities is not financially viable.

4B Operations Review. As recommended in the Task Force report, the University completed an assessment of non-academic operations to determine if they can be operated more efficiently by a regional cooperative, private operator, or other entity. A summary of the results from these reviews follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Academic Operations</th>
<th>Status of Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dining</td>
<td>Improving the performance of the University’s dining and residence hall operations was identified as a university priority in 2008. A summary of the improvement in the financial performance for these operations is presented in Attachment H. In an effort to achieve further improvement in the dining program, an RFP for management services was issued in late 2014 but the selected vendor was unsuccessful in assuming these responsibilities and is no longer under contract. An updated assessment of the dining operation was completed in 2014 and serves as the blueprint for making further and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>As noted above, the need for improvement in the residence hall facilities and operations was identified in 2008 as an institutional priority. In 2011, the University issued an RFP for a potential P3 housing partnership before undertaking the construction of new residential housing for freshman and sophomore students. The proposal-evaluation committee determined that a P3 partner would not offer a viable alternative to university-constructed housing for freshmen and sophomores. While Miami continues to own and operate housing for freshmen and sophomore students on the Oxford campus, it has generally relinquished upper class and graduate student housing to operators in the Oxford area and thereby avoided the need for a formal P3 agreement that would shift financial risk to the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Center and Student Health Insurance</td>
<td>In 2013, Miami University contracted the management of its student health center with a local hospital provider, resulting in annual savings of about $450,000. The University also annually evaluates its student health insurance policy and continues to find that its hard waiver policy leads to annual savings for those students needing to purchase health insurance. The annual evaluation also verified that more affordable student health insurance opportunities are not available through the Federal Exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care</td>
<td>Child care is already contracted with private operators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Help Desk</td>
<td>IT Services has completed a review of its help desk and found that Miami’s cost per contact is lower than industry providers. Miami is working with other public colleges and universities in Ohio to identify other collaborations and approaches that would further lower the cost of providing this service at Miami or improve the service available to students and employees. Such initiatives include expanding the knowledge base offered and to increase client self-service capabilities. The additional savings from these strategies are not able to be estimated at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to possible help desk collaborations, Miami is working with Wright State University on a collaboration involving video-captioning services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Janitorial Services, Landscaping and Facility Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An assessment of the facility operations was performed by an independent operator earlier this year (See Attachment J). Their report suggests that unless significant improvements and efficiencies can be achieved for the custodial operations within the next 12 months, such services should be contracted with a private operator. The annual savings opportunity is projected to be about $1.6 million. Similar opportunities were not found to exist for facilities maintenance or the grounds operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real Estate Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because Miami’s real estate holdings are largely rural, it is not financially practical to place them under the oversight of a real estate management company.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The print center, due to a need to repurpose this space for expanded lab space in Hughes Hall, is being closed. Services will be provided through print shops in the Oxford or nearby communities. The annual operating savings is estimated to be $200,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4C Affinity Partnerships and Sponsorships. These opportunities were addressed as part of the above review. No immediate opportunities were identified but future opportunities are continuing to be considered. One area of opportunity identified are partnerships with strategic technology vendors.

Administrative Cost Reforms

5A Cost Diagnostic. A 10-year cost diagnostic was completed for Miami University as recommended in the Governor’s Task Force report. This review included an analysis of spending by functional category and by object of expense. The diagnostic confirmed that the many efforts by Miami University over the past eight years have been effective in slowing the annual rate of growth in spending. Spending per student, net of student financial aid, actually declined from its peak in 2008 (See attachment K), and the increase in actual spending over the entire ten-year period rose at a rate slower than the annual growth in the consumer price index. The summary of the cost diagnostic analyses is provided in Attachment L.

While the cost trends observed over the last decade are generally quite favorable, this review did identify a small number of areas where costs have grown faster than the overall trend at Miami. Most of these areas align with the strategic priorities of the University during this period. It also is possible that opportunities for increased productivity or improved efficiency may exist in areas that grew slower than the average rate of growth. For all administrative functions and cost centers, a deeper analysis could potentially identify opportunities for improvement. For this reason, the University intends to implement
a program review process for assessing nonacademic functions and programs on a regular cycle. Through these reviews, the effectiveness and sufficiency of these activities can be properly assessed and improved.

A summary of this analysis that was completed follows:

Cost Diagnostic
Spend Categories that are Outliers
Oxford Educational and General Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area or Cost Center</th>
<th>Growth Rate above the University Average Rate of Growth</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP Enrollment and Student Success</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>Increased spending on enrollment management has been a major factor in the growth in the number and quality of students enrolling at Miami.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Fees</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>Audit contracts are awarded by the Auditor of State, but a cost reduction may be possible at the next contract renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Communications</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>Increased spending on marketing has contributed to the growth in number and quality of students enrolling at Miami.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Hosting</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
<td>Increased spending on travel is consistent with university priorities such as increased international opportunities for students, national student recruitment, and fundraising growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Fees</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>The growth is reasonable given the growth in the amount invested by the University and the Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>There also has been growth in donor contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>No new E&amp;G debt has been issued since 2007. E&amp;G debt will continue to be closely scrutinized going forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Employment</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
<td>This is a strategic priority for the University as increased student employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assist students in meeting their financial obligations, aiding retention, and gaining professional experiences that benefit them in their preparation for future professional opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area or Cost Center</th>
<th>Growth Rates above the Auxiliary Average Rate of Growth</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>This is the result of increased regulation and litigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>This is partially due to increased regulation and also to a greater emphasis on employee programs (such as wellness) that have helped to slow the growth in employee benefit costs. Accenture also identified HR as an operation where the current level of spending is below best practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost Diagnostic

**Spend Categories that are Outliers**

**Oxford Auxiliary Operations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area or Cost Center</th>
<th>Growth Rates above the Auxiliary Average Rate of Growth</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Services</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>Increase is due to rise in the cost of maintaining the university plane and the related services. Along with the airport, this cost center will continue to be evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>11.21%</td>
<td>This is the result of the residential and dining facility renewal program mentioned earlier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>8.86%</td>
<td>This is due to increased utilization of graduate students in Recreational Center operations and ICA. This cost aligns with the university’s educational priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goggin Ice Center</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>This is a result of the increased cost of operating a new and much larger ice arena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Growth Rate</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td>This is due to growth in tuition which impacts scholarship costs for Intercollegiate Athletics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics, especially when combined with the growth in related facility costs, continues to increase its cost at a faster rate than most university operations. This growth, even though consistent with other similar athletic programs, is disproportionately large when compared to the restrained growth in most academic programs and should be evaluated, definitely slowed, and possibly reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Services</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>Growth is exclusively due to cost increases for bus transportation used by students and staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5B Ohio Department of Higher Education Productivity Measure. The Ohio Department of Higher Education has provided its productivity measure for Miami University, and the University will use these ratios as part of its approach to monitoring its progress towards improved efficiency and affordability for its students.

5C Organizational Structure, Span of Control, and Staffing Trends. Over the past eight years, Miami University has a made considerable effort to improve its efficiency and productivity in providing administrative services. One measure of this effort is the student-to-staff ratio, which improved by 36% during the last eight years (See Attachment M).

As part of the overall organizational review, a comparison of Miami’s organizational structure was made to Ohio’s other four-corner schools and to five other public universities with similar enrollment and missions (See Attachment N). Additionally, a span-of-control review was completed for the major divisions of the University (See Attachment O). These recent analyses confirmed the earlier analysis by the Strategic Priorities Task Force, the Strategic Assessment of Support Services (SASS) committee, and the review by Accenture for the SASS committee that the University’s organizational structure is as efficient or more efficient than other similar universities. However, a small number of opportunities for possible improvement follow:

1. One of the shortcomings identified with the University’s organizational design during the earlier reviews is the disproportionate amount of time devoted by staff to transactional processing to the detriment of more strategic activities. The improvement in the student-to-staff ratio since these earlier studies is evidence of the significant progress that has been made towards a more productive organization, but there remain opportunities for further reductions in transactional tasks. Several Lean projects have identified opportunities where software application
improvements would lead to reduced transactional work. To date, insufficient application support from IT services has prevented such improvements from being implemented. It is recommended that software application improvements become an increased focus for IT Services.

2. Both the Strategic Priorities committee and the Accenture study performed for the SASS committee noted that the numbers of academic departments and programs at Miami are generally larger than at similarly sized universities. Progress has been made in these areas since the report, but there may be additional opportunities for an improved academic organizational structure that aligns with the university’s academic goals and priorities. It may be beneficial to engage the university community in a broad discussion of the potential benefits of more flexible and possibly more efficient department and program structures. Such changes may better position Miami University to adjust to the rapid expansion of knowledge in a technology driven, global society and to the rapid development of new or interdisciplinary fields in response to such a society. These changes may also better convey to students and grantors the possibilities offered through the University’s departments and programs.

3. The implementation of the University’s “one-stop” student support center successfully responded to one of the major opportunities identified in the SASS committee report. While service to students has been greatly improved through this new service delivery model, the recent span-of-control review suggests there may be some opportunities to restructure the traditional offices that comprise the new Enrollment Management division. Specifically, the Registrar’s Office was identified as an outlier in the current span-of-control review.

4. Another area of improvement identified by the 2011 SASS committee was the design of the IT organization. Again, much improvement has been made in the IT organizational structure since 2011, but the current review continues to identify the span of control for IT services as being smaller than higher performing IT organizations. Further opportunities may still exist and should be evaluated.

5D Health Care Costs. The Ohio Task Force identified employee health benefits as an opportunity, but that study will be conducted through a statewide initiative led by the Ohio Department of Higher Education.

5E Data Centers. Miami participated with the Inter-University Council (IUC) in the development of best-fit criteria for the deployment of disaster recovery services and other data center operations (See attachment P). Miami will continue its participation with the IUC in evaluating these criteria and their use in determining which services should be deployed to the State of Ohio Computer Center (SOCC) once the appropriate investments have been made to prepare that center for these services. Miami currently utilizes Wright State University for its disaster recovery services but intends to contract with the SOCC for these services once additional universities can be accommodated at the SOCC or with another state-wide shared data center should hosting in one location be found to be a substantial risk.

Miami is also pursuing increased use of the Ohio Supercomputing Center (OSC) and the SOCC for research computing as well. This includes high performance computing strategies involving the OSC such as “condo computing” now offered at the SOCC as an affordable solution to providing increased research computing capacity. These enhanced research computing capabilities won’t reduce the cost of existing services but will help to avoid future costs.
5F Space Utilization. Miami had undertaken the study of its space utilization prior to the Ohio Task Force recommendation. While opportunities for greater efficiency appear to exist, the work to date has identified the need for more comprehensive review. In anticipation of this comprehensive review, Miami’s Division of Enrollment Management and Student Success Office and the University Registrar, in consultation with the Provost’s Office, have begun to examine course and classroom data to: (1) broadly understand how we currently schedule and utilize instructional and meeting spaces across campus, and (2) identify additional potential multi-use spaces that could be used more comprehensively. Further, preliminary work is being done to better consolidate and centralize how classroom and meeting spaces on campus are scheduled with the goal of using one scheduling system. Finally, the University Registrar is making improvements to the capacity to readily identify courses by schedule type and delivery mode, which is information that typically informs the type of instructional space required.

Textbook Affordability

6A Negotiate Cost. Miami is reviewing proposals for a provider of online textbook and course materials and expects to select the University’s partner in the coming weeks. The shift from the University’s traditional bookstore approach to providing these materials through an online provider recognizes that online services can offer students access to textbooks and materials, as conveniently as campus stores, while lowering the cost to students by 15-25%. The transition to the new service will be completed by fall 2017.

6B Standardize Materials for Gateway Courses. An Open Educational Resources Committee was appointed by Miami’s Provost to develop recommendations for greater standardization of course materials for gateway courses and high-impact courses. Thus far, the Committee has met with various university groups and conducted surveying of the university community; created a website geared primarily to librarians, which includes discipline-related resources; joined the Open Textbook Network, a community of educational institutions that promote student success and affordability through the use of open textbooks; and developed a preliminary set of recommendations for how to move the initiative forward, which are currently under consideration by the Dean of the Libraries and Provost.

6C Develop Digital Capabilities. The Open Educational Resources Committee (see 6B above) was also charged with studying options for greater use of digital course materials and coordinating with statewide groups on how to share these materials across Ohio’s public colleges and universities. Recommendations are still in preparation and the final report is not yet available.

Time to Degree

7A Time to Degree: Education Campaign. Students can leverage information about their requirements and degree paths in multiple ways: (1) A student can run a Degree Audit Report at any time, which alerts students as to which requirements have been met, are in progress, or still need to be met; (2) academic plans are developed in consultation with the academic advisor and in the UNV 101 course; (3) the General Bulletin includes requirements for each degree program and is available online; and (4) the EAB Student Success Collaborative provides information to each academic advisor when students are not making progress toward completing their primary major in a timely manner, allowing for more proactive advising and intervention. After completing a pilot in two of the six academic divisions at Miami, the EAB Student Success Collaborative will be launched university-wide in fall 2016.
7C: Time to Degree: Standardize Credits for Degree. Miami had previously taken and is currently taking steps to increase college completion rates and reduce average time-to-degree. Miami’s 2015 revision of its general education program reduced the credit-hour requirements for a degree. Over 60% of academic programs have developed and publicized pathways for completion in three years (https://miamioh.edu/academics/three-year-pathways/index.html). Finally, we are working to reduce the credit-hour requirement for graduation with a bachelor’s degree by an additional four credit hours, to be implemented beginning fall 2017.

7D Time to Degree: Data Driven Advising. A new comprehensive academic advising plan has been developed and implemented beginning fall 2015. The plan includes consistent advising philosophy, required advising milestones, ongoing advisor training, annual recognition of advising excellence as well as clear outcomes. Additionally, Miami is implementing (Summer 2016) EAB’s Student Success Collaborative software advising platform across all undergraduate academic programs to assist with identifying students most at-risk for not graduating on time. This technology provides information for advisors to intervene and provide preemptive support to students based on actionable and student-specific data. Advisors can use this software to track advising sessions, take and record notes, and identify students for advising interventions. This comprehensive advising plan includes annual assessment of advising efforts using multiple measures (national surveys, graduation/retention rates, advisor training completion rates, and internal surveys). The first annual assessment report was created in April 2016 with suggested steps for improvement to be implemented beginning fall 2016.

7E Time to Degree: Summer Programs. Miami’s implementation of wait-listing beginning in fall 2016 will better enable unmet course demand to be met. Miami actively reviews high-demand courses for possible expansion in both summer and winter terms, along with discontinuation of low-enrollment courses. In addition, Miami reduced tuition for online courses taken during summer and winter terms.

7F Time to Degree: Pathways Agreements. Miami has taken significant steps to increase its partnerships and articulation agreements with two- and four-year institutions, including a new website and partnership database and online approval protocol. Current articulation agreements are in place with Sinclair and Columbus State Community Colleges, and Miami continues to expand program guides to create more academic program connections (2+2) at each location. Miami is currently developing a new articulation agreement with Cincinnati State, and discussions are also being held with Tri-C & Lakeland Community Colleges. Partnership agreements and the quality of partnerships are reviewed annually by a university-level committee.

8 Duplicative Programs: Program Review. The IUC Provosts group has submitted reports regarding low enrollment courses and considerations for consolidating programs. Miami University does not offer any competency-based degree programs at this time and has no immediate plans for development of such degree programs. University of Cincinnati, Ohio State University and Miami University are exploring opportunities for collaboration on offering foreign language classes. Miami and Ohio University (Classics Departments) are already engaged in a cooperative venture that puts Miami and OU students virtually in the same classroom (http://miamioh.edu/cas/academics/departments/classics/).

9 Co-located Campuses. There are no co-located campuses associated with Miami University’s regional campuses.
Policy Reforms

10A Financial Advising. Miami University is implementing a number of improvements in the financial advising it provides to students. A new website will allow students to view information about their personal loan debt. This improvement will enable students to access their loan debt history, total borrowing costs, and anticipated repayment amounts following graduation. The University is also developing a loan counseling protocols based on student borrowing patterns (i.e., low, medium, high risk). Both of these changes are scheduled to be implemented in summer 2016. A financial literacy program for students will also be deployed in fall 2016.

10B Policy Reform Obstacles. This recommendation is the responsibility of the Ohio Department of Higher Education and the Inter-University Council.

10C Policy Reform – Real Estate Sales. This recommendation is the responsibility of the Inter-University Council and the Ohio General Assembly.

10D Policy Reform – Insurance Pools. This recommendation is the responsibility of the Inter-University Council and the Ohio General Assembly.
Executive Order 2015-01K

Establishing the Ohio Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency in Higher Education

WHEREAS, Ohio’s future economic growth depends upon a well-educated work force and college graduates; and

WHEREAS, national figures show that the costs to students and their parents associated with higher education have increased substantially over the last 35 years, rising several times higher than the general rate of inflation over the same period of time; and

WHEREAS, the substantial rise in higher education tuition prices has led to a similar rise in student loan debt. In 2013, outstanding student loan debt nationally was well over $1 trillion, surpassing—for the first time ever—the amount of outstanding credit card debt (then $857 billion); and

WHEREAS, increasing operational efficiency in our state-sponsored institutions of higher education can lower their costs of providing post-secondary instruction, which in turn should help them provide an even higher quality of education at a more affordable cost to Ohioans;

NOW THEREFORE, I, John R. Kasich, Governor of the State of Ohio, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the State of Ohio, do hereby order and direct that:

1. The Ohio Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency in Higher Education (the “Task Force”) is hereby established to review and recommend ways in which state-sponsored institutions of higher education, including four-year universities and two-year community colleges, can be more efficient, offering an education of equal or higher quality while at the same time decreasing their costs. This can be done only if institutions of higher education become more efficient and productive in the use of their assets, personnel and resources. The Task Force shall provide me with a report with recommendations regarding how our state institutions of higher education can operate more productively and efficiently, so that, over the long term, tuition prices remain affordable.
2. In conducting its review and developing its report with recommendations, the Task Force shall examine the following areas:

   a. Administrative staffing levels, bureaucracy and related costs;
   b. Teaching loads for professors not significantly involved in research;
   c. Organization of departments, with a view toward ways to reduce overhead;
   d. Space utilization, including space for commercializing innovations that derive from research;
   e. Opportunities for shared services, energy savings, shared procurement opportunities and other cost-saving efficiencies;
   f. Low-enrollment and low-performing programs and courses at the graduate and undergraduate levels;
   g. Asset utilization and opportunities for monetization;
   h. Other potential sources of revenue that do not result in increased cost for students, such as affinity agreements, commercialization opportunities and intellectual property auctions;
   i. Standard course requirements for degree completion;
   j. Use of technology to reduce cost for students; and
   k. Best practices for Ohio’s community colleges that are located within the same regional campus as a university.

3. The Task Force shall be comprised of nine members, five members to be appointed by the Governor, two to be appointed by the Speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives, one representative from each party, and two to be appointed by the President of the Ohio Senate, one senator from each party. The Governor shall designate the Chairperson of the Task Force from among the appointed members.

4. Staff support and resources necessary for the Task Force to fulfill its obligations as outlined in this Executive Order shall be provided through the Ohio Board of Regents (Ohio Department of Higher Education). This shall include space to gather and consider information necessary for developing the recommendations and report called for in this Order. The Chairperson and members of the Task Force shall serve without compensation for their work on the Task Force, but may be reimbursed for their reasonable and necessary travel expenses in the conduct of Task Force business.

5. In gathering information to prepare its report, the Task Force shall engage presidents and members of boards of trustees of state-sponsored institutions of higher education for their perspectives on the topics listed above, and may seek advice and input from such other persons or entities as the Task Force finds helpful to its work as outlined in this Order.
6. The Task Force shall assemble as often as its members deem necessary to facilitate timely completion of the report with recommendations in the areas specified by this Order. The Task Force shall submit its report to the Governor and the General Assembly by October 1, 2015. The report with recommendations shall be shared with presidents and boards of trustees of state-sponsored institutions of higher education.

I signed this Executive Order on February 10, 2015, in Columbus, Ohio, and it will expire upon the submission of the Task Force’s report and recommendations pursuant to this order.

[Signature]
John R. Kasich, Governor

ATTEST:

_____________________________
Jon Husted, Secretary of State
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Ohio Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency

Oct. 1, 2015
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Our charge

Gov. John R. Kasich called on this task force to recommend solutions for institutions of higher education based on three key simultaneous needs:

- to be more efficient both in expense management and revenue generation
- while offering an education of equal or higher quality
- and decreasing costs to students and their families

Scope: Both two-year and four-year public institutions


[For the full language of the governor's executive order, see Appendix A]
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Why action is needed

Families are struggling to afford college across the nation, and this issue is becoming more urgent as student debt levels continue to rise.

The effects are troubling:

- Some students aren’t able to pursue the education they need to reach their full potential.
- Debt is forcing some graduates to delay important milestones in their lives, including home ownership and marriage.
- And our economy is suffering because the workforce lacks the skills needed to meet employers' needs.

Ohio has seen the same trends and concerns as the rest of the nation, but our leaders — in government, higher education and the private sector — are determined to find solutions that address college affordability while enhancing the quality of education.

Ohio students who attend our public colleges and universities face tuition prices that are among the most costly in the country, despite a decade of aggressive controls.

How Ohio ranks: In-state tuition and fees

Average tuition and mandatory fees 2014-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>National average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-year institutions</td>
<td>$4,484</td>
<td>$3,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year institutions</td>
<td>$10,100</td>
<td>$8,851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17% higher than national avg.

14% higher than national avg.

Ohio’s four-year institutions have limited in-state tuition increases more than any other state since FY06, and our two-year schools have among the lowest increases.

Yet Ohio’s universities have the 12th-highest average cost of in-state tuition and mandatory fees. And our community colleges have the 16th-highest prices.¹

Tuition is only one piece of the cost equation for students, who also can face significant expenses for campus housing, dining, textbooks and fees that support academic programs or campus operations.

Together, these expenses encompass the total cost to attend. In ways direct and indirect, students and their families pay all of these costs.

For some students, need- and merit-based financial aid offers relief. But many other students turn to loans to support their education.

The result?

Too many graduates leave Ohio universities with a heavy burden of student debt. Other students fail to complete their degrees.

More of our graduates carry student debt than is true nationally, and the average debt load is larger than for graduates nationwide.

It’s clear that tuition caps (whether imposed by institutions or by the state) are not doing enough to reduce the burden on Ohio’s families. These measures provide short-term relief for families, but they do not address the financial dynamic at the root of the problem.

That’s why this task force was created: to investigate the cost side of the equation.

In other words, how can Ohio’s two- and four-year institutions find efficiencies, locate new
resources and otherwise innovate to lower costs and reduce the financial burden on students?

In recent years, Ohio’s system of higher education has become a national model for collaborative solutions:

- The state developed a performance-based funding formula, devised by working with public colleges and universities, to distribute state support based on student progress.
- Institutions work together to prioritize capital construction projects.
- Ohio’s institutions of higher education collaborate through a variety of technology resources, including OARnet, the Ohio Supercomputer Center and OhioLINK.
- Through the Inter-University Council of Ohio, Ohio’s colleges and universities work together on joint purchasing and a variety of other cost-savings measures.

But more must be done.

In this report, the Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency recommends tangible action steps for Ohio’s public colleges and universities to address these issues while maintaining high quality for students.

The task force believes strongly that affordability is always a function of price and quality. One determines what students pay, and the other determines the value they receive for their time and money.

To reflect the diverse nature of Ohio’s public institutions, our recommendations include a range of approaches — some can be addressed with statewide action, while others will need to be reviewed at each institution.

Affordability is not merely an issue for the students of Ohio — the economic well-being of the state is at stake.

“The economy of Ohio is increasingly reliant on skills and knowledge that can only be obtained through postsecondary education,” notes the Lumina Foundation. But among working-age Ohioans, 37.5 percent hold a two- or four-year degree, trailing the national average of 40 percent.\(^2\)

This is why the task force is recommending mandates when possible. The goal is to encourage a faster pace of change among Ohio’s colleges and universities.

There is no single solution that will solve the entire affordability riddle, but these recommendations will help our institutions reduce their costs — and, ultimately, relieve the financial pressure on families.
Summary: The recommendations

Master recommendation 1 | **Students must benefit**: Savings and/or new dollars generated from these recommendations must be employed to reduce the cost of college for students. Any other uses must have tangible benefits for the quality of students’ education.

Master recommendation 2 | **Five-year goals**: Each institution must set a goal for efficiency savings and new resources to be generated through fiscal 2021, along with a framework for investing those dollars in student affordability while maintaining or improving academic quality.

STRATEGIC PROCUREMENT

Recommendation 3A | **Campus contracts**: Each institution must require that its employees use existing contracts for purchasing goods and services.

Recommendation 3B | **Collaborative contracts**: Ohio’s colleges and universities must pursue new and/or strengthened joint purchasing agreements in copiers and printers, computers, travel services, outbound shipping, scientific lab equipment and office supplies.

ASSETS AND OPERATIONS

Recommendation 4A | **Asset review**: Each institution must conduct an assessment of its non-core assets to determine their market value if sold, leased or otherwise repurposed.

Recommendation 4B | **Operations review**: Each institution must conduct an assessment of non-academic operations that might be run more efficiently by a regional cooperative, private operator or other entity. This review should include dining, housing, student health insurance, child care, IT help desk, janitorial, landscaping, facility maintenance, real-estate management and parking.

Recommendation 4C | **Affinity partnerships and sponsorships**: Institutions must, on determining assets and operations that are to be retained, evaluate opportunities for affinity relationships and sponsorships that can support students, faculty and staff.

ADMINISTRATIVE COST REFORMS

Recommendation 5A | **Cost diagnostic**: Each institution must produce a diagnostic to identify its cost drivers, along with priority areas that offer the best opportunities for efficiencies.

Recommendation 5B | **Productivity measure**: The Department of Higher Education should develop a common measurement of administrative productivity that can be adopted across Ohio’s public colleges and universities.
Recommendation 5C | **Organizational structure**: Each institution should review its organizational structure to identify opportunities to streamline and reduce costs.

Recommendation 5D | **Health-care costs**: To drive down costs and take advantage of economies of scale, a statewide working group should identify opportunities to collaborate on health-care costs.

Recommendation 5E | **Data centers**: Institutions must develop a plan to move their primary or disaster recovery data centers to the State of Ohio Computer Center.

Recommendation 5F | **Space utilization**: Each Ohio institution must study the utilization of its campus and employ a system that encourages optimization of physical spaces.

**TEXTBOOK AFFORDABILITY**

Recommendation 6A | **Negotiate cost**: Professional negotiators must be assigned to help faculty obtain the best deals for textbooks and instructional materials, starting with high-volume, high-cost courses. Faculty must consider both cost and quality in selecting course materials.

Recommendation 6B | **Standardize materials for gateway courses**: Institutions must encourage departments to choose common materials, including digital elements, for gateway courses that serve large volumes of students.

Recommendation 6C | **Develop digital capabilities**: Institutions must be part of a consortium to develop digital tools and materials, including open educational resources, that provide students with high-quality, low-cost materials.

**TIME TO DEGREE**

Recommendation 7A | **Education campaign**: Each institution must develop a campaign to educate its full-time undergraduates about the course loads needed to graduate on time.

Recommendation 7B | **Graduation incentive**: Institutions should consider establishing financial incentives that encourage full-time students to take at least 15 credit hours per semester.

Recommendation 7C | **Standardize credits for degree**: Institutions should streamline graduation requirements so that most bachelor’s degree programs can be completed within four years or less and most associate degree programs can be completed in two years or less. Exceptions should be allowed because of accreditation or quality requirements.

Recommendation 7D | **Data-driven advising**: Institutions should enhance academic advising services so that students benefit from both high-impact, personalized consultations and data systems that proactively identify risk factors that hinder student success.
Recommendation 7E | **Summer programs**: Each campus must develop plans to evaluate utilization rates for summer session and consider opportunities to increase productive activity.

Recommendation 7F | **Pathway agreements**: Ohio institutions should continue to develop agreements that create seamless pathways for students who begin their educations at community or technical colleges and complete them at universities.

Recommendation 7G | **Competency-based education**: Institutions should consider developing or expanding programs that measure student success based on demonstrated competencies instead of through the amount of time students spend studying a subject.

**DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS**

Recommendation 8 | **Program review**: Institutions should consider consolidating programs that are duplicated at other colleges and universities in their geographic area.

**CO-LOCATED CAMPUSSES**

Recommendation 9 | **Joint oversight boards**: The state should establish joint oversight boards between co-located community colleges and regional campuses of universities with a mandate to improve efficiencies and coordination while maintaining the differentiated mission of each.

**POLICY REFORMS**

Recommendation 10A | **Financial advising**: Ohio’s colleges and universities should make financial literacy a standard part of students’ education.

Recommendation 10B | **Obstacles**: The Department of Higher Education and/or state legislature should seek to remove any roadblocks in policy, rule or statute that inhibit the efficiencies envisioned in these recommendations.

Recommendation 10C | **Real estate sales**: State law should be updated to streamline the process for how public institutions sell, convey, lease or enter into easements of real estate.

Recommendation 10D | **Insurance pools**: State law should be clarified related to the IUC Insurance Consortium, which buys property and casualty insurance on a group basis for most institutions.

**IMPLEMENTATION**

Recommendation | **Implementation**: The chancellor of the Ohio Department of Higher Education and the state’s public colleges and universities should make use of existing groups (including the state’s Efficiency Advisory Committee and institutional efficiency councils) and resources to coordinate next steps from these recommendations.
How to read this report

The task force recognizes that solutions in higher education cannot be one size fits all.

But what works at one institution may work at others, and many solutions should be applied to groups of institutions that are similar because of geography, mission or other factors.

This report is designed to be a practical plan that will empower Ohio’s public institutions of higher education and state leaders to move smoothly from the report to action steps. To that end, the task force has identified an action grid that spells out for each recommendation:

- **Scope**: Statewide, regional or institutional
- **Type of institution**: 4-year, 2-year or both
- **Time frame**: Immediate, 1-3 years or 3-5 years
- **Type of action**: Collaboration vs. individual institution vs. state/statutory
Master recommendations

**Background:** Over the past decade, efficiency and affordability efforts at Ohio colleges and universities have restrained increases in tuition costs, but too many other costs have continued to rise. These include fees for housing and dining, student life, and other academic costs.

The task force strongly believes that institutions need to redouble their efforts and ensure that the benefits of cost savings or new revenue generation strategies directly benefit students through lower costs or improved services. Moreover, the focus on affordability should extend beyond the specific recommendations of this report to produce a new culture of cost consciousness in higher education.

**Master recommendation 1 | Students must benefit:** Savings and/or new dollars generated from these recommendations must be employed to reduce the cost of college for students. Any other uses must have tangible benefits for the quality of students’ education.

The task force is allowing some flexibility in the use of these dollars, but the intent of this recommendation should be unmistakable: Savings should be redirected to have a clear and direct benefit for students, and primarily in the form of making college more affordable.

To ensure accountability, institutions must track both the savings and how they are redeployed, including for these uses:

- Reductions to the total cost of attendance (tuition, fees, room and board, books and materials, or related costs — such as technology)
- Student financial aid
- Student success services, particularly with regard to completion and time to degree
- Investments in tools related to affordability and efficiency
- Improvements to high-demand/high-value student programs

**Master recommendation 2 | Five-year goals:** Each institution must set a goal for efficiency savings and new resources to be generated through fiscal 2021, along with a framework for investing those dollars into student affordability while maintaining or improving academic quality.

Ohio’s colleges and universities are diverse, but each should be making affordability and efficiency key priorities. By developing five-year plans to invest new and redirected dollars toward lowering the cost of college, our institutions can accelerate their efforts on this front.
Implementation: The new state budget already calls on the board of trustees of each public college and university in Ohio to complete an efficiency review based on this report by July 1, 2016, and an implementation plan within 30 days of completing the review.³

The task force echoes that responsibility in its master recommendations and throughout this report: Boards are ultimately responsible for the success of their institutions.

For these master recommendations, each board must:

- Direct its institution to track redeployable dollars on an annual basis and report how those efficiency savings and new revenues are being used to lower student costs while maintaining or improving educational quality. Boards must report annually to the Ohio Department of Higher Education, based on a template that the department should develop.

- Set five-year goals for efficiency savings and new resource generation, and track progress toward those goals on an annual basis. These data, including the use of these funds, should be part of the annual reports to the Department of Higher Education.

The Department of Higher Education should produce an annual report for the public to detail the progress of the state’s colleges and universities to redirect savings toward student affordability.

The task force believes in avoiding duplication, including in our efficiency recommendations. Therefore, we recommend that the Department of Higher Education incorporates its annual efficiency reports as part of the existing process to survey institutions on efficiency measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master recommendations</th>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Type of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings benefit students</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year goals</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case studies:

- The Ohio State University's president set a five-year goal of $400 million in savings and new revenues to support affordability and excellence. This 2020 Vision plan calls for expanding need-based aid by at least $100 million over that span, including a $15 million increase for fiscal 2016.

- Bowling Green State University has been able to expand a high-demand academic area by outsourcing its flight program. The private operator, which took over in 2014, provided about $3.5 million for a new flight training center, new simulation equipment and a new hangar as well as to acquire plans previously owned by the university. These and other investments have doubled student enrollment in BGSU's aviation studies program in less than two years.

- Ohio University plans to use proceeds from the sale of seven surplus properties to expand the amount of student financial aid. The university plans to invest the proceeds to support OHIO Match, a fundraising campaign in which Ohio University provides 50 cents for every dollar donated to support certain scholarship endowments.
Recommendations | Strategic procurement

**Background:** Ohio colleges and universities already collaborate to lower costs and increase efficiencies. The purchasing group at the Inter-University Council of Ohio, which includes representatives of the Ohio Association of Community Colleges, has generated a number of achievements over the years:

- 34 current joint contracts and price agreements
- $648 million in reported annual joint purchasing activity
- $138 million purchased through State of Ohio contracts

Likewise, Ohio is a member of the Midwestern Higher Education Compact, and many institutions are part of other consortia that can lower the cost of goods and services. But Ohio’s colleges and universities would generate more savings through greater collaboration — statewide, regionally and among institutions with shared interests.

Individual campuses could increase their savings simply by requiring employees to use existing contracts. In too many cases, the decentralized nature of higher education leads to different buying patterns among campus units. Ultimately, that increases costs and weakens the institution’s negotiating power because purchasing managers cannot guarantee the size of spend with their contracted vendors.

By consolidating the spend — both on individual campuses and among multiple institutions — and focusing on fewer vendors, Ohio’s colleges and universities can reduce cost while maintaining or improving service levels.

**Recommendation 3A | Campus contracts:** Each institution must require that its employees use existing contracts for purchasing goods and services, starting with the areas with the largest opportunities for savings. To ensure transparency about these decisions, institutions must report the utilization rates of existing contracts annually to their boards of trustees.

**Recommendation 3B | Collaborative contracts:** Ohio’s colleges and universities, working collaboratively through the IUC Purchasing Group, must pursue new and/or strengthened joint purchasing agreements in the following categories:

- **Copier/printer services:** A joint contract for copier/printer services across the state institutions could dramatically reduce costs. The bundled scale would do more than provide volume discounts on new multifunction devices — an operator would provide increased reporting on usage patterns, providing analytics that can be used to manage demand and enhance sustainability efforts.
o **Opportunity description:** Ohio’s colleges and universities can generate savings by consolidating their spend, standardizing replacement cycles and better managing demand. In some cases, desktop printers may be replaced by multifunction devices that are more efficient.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Statewide collaboration, with possible expansion to regional or national contracts. Every public college and university should move to a single provider of copier/printer supply and services.

- **Computer hardware (standard office use):** Ohio institutions spent $1.8 million on PCs in fiscal 2014 through the IUC joint contract, but that’s a fraction of the projected $79 million spend statewide on computer hardware. For standard (non-Apple) configurations of office computers, the opportunity to focus spending on a few makes and models would offer substantial opportunities for savings.

  o **Opportunity description:** Ohio institutions should work together to identify a common set of computing packages that will meet most office needs, with the goal of creating a short list of standard setups that can be put out to bid with a guaranteed spend (such as at least 80 percent of applicable purchases) with a single vendor. This consolidation should yield stronger competitive bids while also providing for cost savings on maintenance and other factors.

  o **Nature of recommendation:** Statewide collaboration, with possible expansion to regional or national contracts. Every public college and university should participate in a single bid for standard computer equipment. Each institution should also establish parameters for identifying legitimate exceptions to this contract, such as computers needed for research and scientific purposes.

- **Travel services:** Ohio institutions use a variety of agencies to provide travel services, adding unnecessary cost to a category that would benefit from guaranteed volume.

  o **Opportunity description:** An existing IUC Purchasing Group contract offers strong savings for vehicle rentals, but travel agency services remain an untapped area for a statewide consolidation of spend. This category was identified by several institutional councils as a top action step on procurement. Other related categories, such as relationships with airlines and hotel chains, could also provide opportunities down the line, but there are more regional issues to consider with these categories.

  o **Nature of recommendation:** Statewide collaboration, with possible expansion to regional or national contracts. Every public college and university that uses a travel management agency should move to a single agency with the capability to customize services based on each campus’s policies and needs. Campuses should collaborate to simplify and standardize travel policies to reduce costs.
Outbound shipping: Most of the outbound shipping service among Ohio institutions is divided among two national vendors. By consolidating to a single vendor — and adding mandates at individual campuses to use this contract across campuses — Ohio colleges and universities could better leverage their spend.

- **Opportunity description:** Most Ohio institutions either use the state contract or a consortium arrangement for outbound shipping among one of the major national competitors in this sector. But few mandate use of the approved vendor, dividing the spend and limiting opportunities to better manage demand. A secondary opportunity may exist in inbound shipping, particularly if the same vendor is used for both inbound and outbound freight. Any contract should ensure quality requirements needed for scientific/lab shipments.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Statewide collaboration, with possible expansion to regional or national contracts. Every public college and university should be on a single statewide contract for outbound shipping, particularly with regard to nonscientific packages.

Scientific Supplies and Equipment: Ohio institutions use at least 114 vendors for scientific and lab equipment, suggesting strong opportunities to consolidate this spending.

- **Opportunity description:** The largest vendors in our study capture about 16 percent to 20 percent of the spend, with nearly half the total divided among smaller providers. But experts say larger vendors dominate most categories of scientific supplies and equipment.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Statewide collaboration, with possible expansion to regional or national contracts. This contract is most likely to be used predominantly by research institutions. Every public college and university should use a limited number of statewide contracts for scientific equipment.

Office Supplies and Equipment: A small number of national vendors account for most of the spending on office supplies at Ohio institutions, reflecting a significant opportunity to consolidate contracts to yield savings.

- **Opportunity description:** Experts suggest that a joint contract on office supplies could generate savings of up to 14 percent for Ohio institutions.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Statewide collaboration, with possible expansion to regional or national contracts. Every public college and university should be on a single statewide contract for office supplies.

**Benefits:** In these six categories, Ohio’s public colleges and universities could collectively save tens of millions of dollars a year based on current spending — which doesn’t account for the
effect of increasing utilization within each campus. Increased buying power would also give institutions better leverage on service quality.

Other considerations: The value of combined purchasing power always has to be weighed against potential tradeoffs, including service quality and specialized needs. Consolidating vendors may also have the effect of de-coupling some procurement categories from other priorities, including regional economic development considerations.

We have focused our recommendations on areas where we believe the benefits are likely to outweigh these considerations. When possible, these joint contracts also should be opened to private colleges and universities in Ohio, which rarely would have the volume of spend to obtain optimal pricing.

Implementation plan: Each institution should immediately mandate that employees use the institution’s current contracted vendor(s) unless there are tangible financial or operational reasons that consolidation would be harmful. This is an opportunity to save money simply by consolidating the spend at individual institutions into existing negotiated contracts. Furthermore, this exercise will set the stage for effective negotiation of cross-campus agreements that fully leverage the size and scope of Ohio’s colleges and universities.

For collaboration among campuses, the IUC Purchasing Group should determine the best strategy for joint contracts in the recommended target areas. The task force recognizes that the Purchasing Group has a successful history, but the group could reap larger savings if more institutions participated in joint contracts.

The Purchasing Group should use its resources to identify the best process — including how to best tap specialized expertise — for expanded joint contracts on a timeline that corresponds to current contract cycles and needs of the institutions. The Purchasing Group may consider whether statewide or regional contracts make the most sense. Among the options that may be considered are:

- Negotiating new contracts in these areas
- Signing on to the best contract held by an Ohio institution
- Using state of Ohio contracts
- Utilizing regional or national consortia to obtain the best deals

The Purchasing Group already strives to allow private institutions to participate in joint contracts, and that philosophy should continue so that members of the Association of Independent Colleges & Universities of Ohio can hold down costs for their students.
If the Purchasing Group determines that the parameters for any of the expanded joint contracts described in this report would not serve the best interest of Ohio institutions, it should recommend an alternative approach.

To preserve local control and allow for legitimate cases where joint purchasing may not make sense for a particular college or university, institutions should be given the opportunity to opt out. We recommend the following conditions:

- The power to opt out rests with the institution’s board of trustees. A board should provide a written explanation, including its reasons for choosing not to participate, to the IUC Purchasing Group and the chancellor of the Ohio Department of Higher Education.
### Strategic procurement recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus areas</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Type of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional mandates to use current contracts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copier/printer services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer hardware</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbound shipping</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific equipment/supply</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case study:**

- **Mandated use:** Ohio State required that employees purchase office supplies through its contracted vendor in 2010, when the utilization rate was about 50 percent. By 2015, utilization had increased to more than 95 percent. That improvement saved the university $2.5 million over four years and enabled the university to negotiate an even better contract when it was rebid in 2015. The new contract offers $5 million in savings over seven years, including $1 million that was distributed as student financial aid.
Recommendations | **Assets and operations**

**Background:** Ohio's institutions have accumulated assets and developed operations over time based on a variety of circumstances. The question now is whether all of these reflect their institution's needs and mission.

Some assets may serve a long-term purpose but are underutilized. Others could be sold or leased to provide new resources for the institution's primary mission.

Nonacademic operations that were originally developed to serve student or campus needs may not be the most efficient way of delivering those services. In some cases, collaboration among institutions would reduce operating costs and provide better scale for purchasing. In others, private operators may be able to offer better service at a lower cost.

Finally, some assets or operations that are funded by institutions could be better supported through sponsorships, affinity relationships or other kinds of partnerships.

**Recommendation 4A | Asset review:** Each institution must conduct an assessment of its non-core assets to determine their market value if sold, leased or otherwise repurposed. Where opportunities exist, colleges and universities must consider coordinating these efforts with other Ohio institutions to reap larger benefits of scale.

- **Benefits:** Colleges and universities can reduce maintenance, energy and other costs related to unneeded assets, and produce dollars that can be reinvested in the core mission by monetizing them. Depending on the type of asset and its role on a campus, institutions can consider a variety of options for disposal, including a sale, lease, demolition and others.

  For non-core assets that should be retained, institutions should evaluate whether private partnerships would enhance the value and/or provide additional financial support. In some cases, institutions may find partners where a sponsorship or affinity relationship would generate student scholarships, internships, research grants or other opportunities for students, faculty and staff.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Initially institutional, with opportunities for collaboration

- **Other considerations:** Institutions should take a long-term approach to monetizing assets and be wary of short-term considerations. That philosophy should be reflected both in the decision to monetize and the use of the proceeds. Institutions should carefully evaluate the pros and cons of monetizing, including whether an asset will be needed in the future. Where opportunities can be realized, institutions should carefully evaluate the best use of those dollars for long-term gain. For instance, a targeted investment in an
institution’s endowment (funding scholarships or core academic needs) would provide a recurring benefit instead of using one-time funds to fulfill an immediate need.

**Recommendation 4B | Operations review:** Each institution must conduct an assessment of non-academic operations that might be run more efficiently by a regional cooperative, private operator or other entity. These opportunities must then be evaluated to determine whether collaboration across institutions would increase efficiencies, improve service or otherwise add value. This review must encompass these nonacademic areas and any others identified by an institution:

- Dining
- Housing
- Student health insurance
- Child care
- IT help desk
- Janitorial
- Landscaping
- Facility maintenance
- Real-estate management
- Parking

**Benefits:** Beyond the academic mission of each institution, Ohio’s colleges and universities have taken on important but non-core operations to serve their students and communities. However these services evolved, they represent an area of duplication that is costly to institutions and, ultimately, students. Other operators, whether they are private or public collaborators, who specialize in those fields, may be able to provide them more efficiently. Colleges and universities should consider opportunities to outsource these operations if service levels can be maintained at an appropriate standard.

**Nature of recommendation:** Institutional, with opportunities for regional or statewide collaboration

**Other considerations:** Any transition to a private vendor should be carefully evaluated by experts to ensure the correct checks and balances exist on service levels, financial obligations and incentives.

Institutions also need to consider the implications for employees. In some cases, they may be retained by a private operator who takes over a university operation, but staff members often value their connection to a public employer. Likewise, there may be implications for compensation and benefit packages. Some institutions have responded to these concerns by providing employees affected by privatization an opportunity to remain in different roles.
This review should be coordinated with the cost diagnostic (Recommendation 5A) and organizational structure (Recommendation 5C) reviews to identify opportunities to consolidate operations within a campus. At some schools, there are similar operations run by different units that could be combined in shared service models.

**Recommendation 4C | Affinity partnerships and sponsorships:** Institutions must, on determining assets and operations that are to be retained, evaluate opportunities for affinity relationships and sponsorships that can support students, faculty and staff. Colleges and universities can use these types of partnerships to generate new resources by identifying “win-win” opportunities with private entities that are interested in connecting with students, faculty, staff, alumni or other members of their communities.

- **Benefits:** Affinity and sponsor relationships, which may be amplified across institutions, can create new resources, internships, career opportunities, research grants or other benefits to students, faculty and staff. Often, alumni can participate in these relationships in a way that is mutually beneficial — for instance, companies may guarantee resources for an institution in exchange for the ability to market to alumni, who in turn are offered special discounts if they opt in for services.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Institutional, with opportunities for regional or statewide collaboration

- **Other considerations:** Institutions need to retain a careful balance between seeking support for their students, faculty and staff while protecting their interests. Campuses should not be commercialized to the degree that they are blanketed in corporate logos and advertising, nor should students, faculty and staff be barraged by advertising as they pursue their academic careers. Put simply, institutions will need to ensure that any and all supportive partnerships are properly scoped.

**Implementation plan:** Each institution should complete an initial review of assets and the listed operations to consider whether they should be retained, run differently or subject to disposal. The review should be presented to each institution’s board of trustees for review and direction.

We encourage institutions to work collaboratively to simplify the evaluation process, perhaps by using the Inter-University Council Purchasing Group to negotiate a statewide contract with consultants. This would provide consistency in the approach and lower the per-institution cost.

For affinity and sponsorship opportunities, institutions should seek out possible collaborations across campuses and share best practices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus areas</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Type of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset review</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations review</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affinity and sponsorships</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case studies:

- **IT help desk**: Cuyahoga Community College outsourced help desk calls (excluding faculty-based classroom technology issues) in 2010. This work included self-service improvements that have cut the annual volume of calls in half by 2015. Those efficiencies have generated $250,000 a year in annual cost savings by reducing the need for IT Help Desk equipment and staff.

- **Dining services**: Bowling Green State University outsourced its dining services to a private operator in 2008, when students bought fewer than 10,000 meal plans. That partnership has increased use of its dining services — more than 12,000 meal plans were purchased in 2015, despite a 3.5 percent decline in undergraduate enrollment since 2008. Students also benefitted from a cost standpoint: For three of the past six years, there were no increases to dining plan rates.

- **Parking**: The Ohio State University outsourced its parking operation in 2013, receiving a $483 million up-front payment for a 50-year concession with a private operator. The payment was invested in the university’s endowment, which through fiscal 2016 has provided $83 million in distributions for student scholarships, faculty recruitment in priority fields, capital investments and campus transportation options.

- **Copier/printer service**: Since 2010, Cuyahoga Community College has outsourced copier/printer service with a private vendor that also helps to better manage demand. The contract initially provided savings of $300,000 annually. Since a contract extension in October 2014, Tri-C is reaping savings of $426,000 a year.
Recommendations | **Administrative cost reforms**

**Background:** Not surprisingly, more than 60 percent of the expenses at Ohio’s public colleges and universities are devoted to employee salaries and benefits.

At universities, 38 percent are devoted to noninstructional staff. At community colleges, staff costs account for 29 percent of expenses.\(^4\)

Many of these staff members are providing functions that directly benefit students — including academic advising, health counseling, enrollment, financial aid, veterans services and the like. But any opportunities to increase administrative productivity or reduce staff costs can free funding to lower costs for students or bolster academic quality.

**Recommendation 5A | Cost diagnostic:** Each institution must produce a diagnostic to identify its cost drivers, along with priority areas that offer the best opportunities for efficiencies. This diagnostic must identify, over at least a 10-year period:

- Key drivers of costs and revenue by administrative function and academic program;
- Distribution of employee costs — both among types of compensation and among units;
- Revenue sources connected to cost increases — whether students are paying for these through tuition and fees, or whether they are externally funded;
- Span of control for managers across the institution — how many employees managers typically oversee, by the manager’s function; and
- Priority steps that would reduce overhead while maintaining quality — which recommendations would have the most benefit?

- **Benefits:** Colleges and universities cannot effectively control their costs without a detailed look at their finances. This analysis should provide a starting point for improving operational efficiencies.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Institutional

- **Other considerations:** The financial systems at many institutions may not easily yield the data for this analysis, which amplifies the need for standardization on the analysis and outcomes. Therefore, institutions should consider using the Inter-University Council Purchasing Group to seek a joint contract for the analytical work that this diagnostic would require. This could reduce the cost per institution and standardize findings.
Institutions will need to prioritize areas of possible efficiencies on a variety of factors. These should include funding sources — for instance, to distinguish areas such as sponsored research, where growth would reflect success in attracting funding, and other areas that might be cost centers. Also, some areas might be growing because of legal requirements or other obligations outside of an institution’s control.

- **Implementation plan:** Each institution must review and develop an action plan from the findings, although institutions may collaborate to reduce the cost. For instance, a group of institutions could identify a representative example that could be used to generate findings that would be applied across the group. For each institution, the board of trustees must approve the action plan stemming from the review.

**Recommendation 5B | Productivity measure:** The Department of Higher Education should develop a common measurement of administrative productivity that can be adopted across Ohio’s public colleges and universities. While the measure should be consistent, each institution should have latitude to develop its own standards for the proper level of productivity in its units. This will allow, for instance, for appropriate differences between productivity in high-volume environments vs. high-touch ones.

- **Benefits:** A common measurement will empower better analytics of productivity and cost-savings opportunities within and across campuses. Ohio has the opportunity to be a national leader on this front — our administrative productivity metric could become the national standard in higher education.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Statewide, with application by institutions

- **Other considerations:** Institutions will need to analyze administrative productivity rates within their colleges and units to establish baseline data before new standards could be put in place. Over time, this data could provide better comparison data across institutions, but variations across Ohio’s colleges and universities are to be expected.

- **Implementation plan:** The Department of Higher Education must develop an administrative productivity metric that can be applied across Ohio’s public institutions. Each institution must develop a plan to apply the agreed-upon measure across its campus.

**Recommendation 5C | Organizational structure:** Each institution should, as part or as a consequence of its cost diagnostic, review its organizational structure in line with best practices to identify opportunities to streamline and reduce costs. The institutional reviews also should consider shared business services — among units or between institutions, when appropriate — for fiscal services, human resources and information technology.
➢ **Benefits:** When institutions can flatten their organizational structures while maintaining a focus on quality, they improve their cost structure and enhance operational efficiency. In other words, institutions should look for opportunities to scale back bureaucracy that does not add value.

➢ **Nature of recommendation:** Institutional

➢ **Other considerations:** The task force recognizes that there may not be a one-size-fits-all solution to organizational structure, but the cost diagnostic and standard productivity measures recommended in this report should aid in benchmarking that will demonstrate when institutions have opportunities to streamline. When an institution is out of line with benchmarks, leaders should understand whether they are receiving additional value for the additional cost.

➢ **Implementation plan:** Each institution should produce an organizational review that is ultimately approved by its board of trustees. This may be conducted as a second phase of the cost diagnostic and productivity measure work, or in conjunction with those initiatives. Institutions may benefit from a national best-practice review as a precursor of this work.

The operations review (recommendation 4B) should also be a useful element of this work, as it may identify operations within an institution that could be centralized to add efficiencies.

**Recommendation 5D | Health-care costs:** Like other employers, colleges and universities have experienced rapid growth in health-care costs. To drive down costs and take advantage of economies of scale, the Department of Higher Education should convene a working group to identify opportunities to collaborate.

➢ **Benefits:** Ohio’s colleges and universities repeatedly cited health-care benefits and related administrative services as key opportunities for efficiencies. Suggestions from institutional efficiency councils ranged from collaborating on statewide or regional health-care benefits for higher-ed employees to working together on administrative aspects of these benefits. A study group of experts in health-care, human resources and finance could identify achievable opportunities to reduce costs and/or restrain the growth rate.

➢ **Nature of recommendation:** Statewide, with recommendations that could be targeted to regions or types of institutions

➢ **Other considerations:** Collaboration on health-care benefits will need to consider regional differences in provider networks, the existence of academic medical centers, and competitive considerations in compensation packages, among other issues.
Implementation plan: The Department of Higher Education should convene a working group to study opportunities for streamlining and cost-savings in health care. The department should consult with the Department of Insurance on this work, and this working group should consider possible connections with the state of Ohio that would be mutually beneficial.

Recommendation 5E | Data centers: Institutions must develop a plan to move their primary or disaster recovery data centers to the State of Ohio Computer Center.

- **Benefits:** The State of Ohio Computer Center provides a high-quality, secure environment at a lower cost than standalone data centers at each campus. This facility can offer better economies of scale and is better positioned to employ people with the specialized skills needed to efficiently operate it. Increased volume from higher-education institutions also could produce additional savings on service and power.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Institutional, with statewide collaboration

- **Other considerations:** Each institution will need to determine the best timing and manner for this move, based on its IT needs and capital investments. Institutions will need to consider disaster requirements and operational capabilities as part of their move planning, with the goal that all institutions share a common disaster-recovery site. Institutions should also explore best practices for sharing of common infrastructure elements and the potential to use cloud technology.

- **Implementation plan:** Each institution will need to make its own plan, but collaboration among the chief information officers of Ohio institutions could assist in coordination.

Recommendation 5F | Space utilization: Each Ohio institution must study the utilization of its campus and employ a system that encourages optimization of physical spaces.

- **Benefits:** Under-utilized buildings and other spaces require energy, maintenance and other services that are inefficient. A system that tracks space utilization empowers an institution to find solutions to these problems, whether by adjusting class schedules, seeking out alternative uses of these spaces, or reducing the physical imprint of an institution.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Institutional

- **Implementation plan:** Institutions, working through the Inter-University Council Purchasing Group, should seek a joint contract for space utilization systems that can reduce the cost for institutions that currently do not employ these.
### Administrative cost reforms recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus areas</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Type of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost diagnostic</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity measure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational structure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-care working group</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data center</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space utilization</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Case studies:

- **Productivity:** Miami University has an active Lean program focused on operational efficiencies that has completed 510 projects since 2010 valued at $30 million. These projects have allowed the university to maintain and enhance service to its students while reducing headcount by 9.9 percent from fall 2008 through fall 2014. When accounting for enrollment changes during this period, that reflects a 19 percent decrease in staff members per student.

- **Space utilization:** Stark State College has employed a space utilization system since 2014 that has allowed the institution to improve course schedules and building utilization. This investment of less than $50,000 a year resulted in an 11 percent improvement in lecture-room utilization from spring 2014 to spring 2015. The system also is used to evaluate course offerings each term to ensure that an optimal number of sections are offered to meet student demand.

- **Reduced footprint:** After completing a master plan study of its space needs, Bowling Green State University plans to reduce its campus footprint by 300,000 square feet by 2017. The university expects to be able to reduce another 100,000 square feet by 2020 to optimize building usage and reduce operational costs. This is expected to generate utility, maintenance and daily operational savings of $5.50 per square foot, or $1.65 million in fiscal 2014 numbers.
• **Joint administrative group:** In July 2015, Northwest State Community College and Terra State Community College created a joint administrative group to reduce cost and devote more resources to academic programming and student success. Northwest State and Terra State are community colleges that are 75 miles apart, so this arrangement represents an example of how institutions can find creative solutions to lower costs while maintaining their individual missions. Administrative functions will be handled from a third site with shared officials and services, but Northwest State and Terra State will continue to provide education and workforce development in their distinct service areas.5

• **Data center:** The Ohio State University avoided $40 million in capital costs and is saving $1 million a year in operational costs by moving to the State of Ohio Computer Center.
Recommendation | **Textbook affordability**

**Background:** Textbooks can cost the average university student $1,225 a year and a full-time community college student $1,328 a year.⁶

These costs have risen dramatically.

From 1996 to 2004, the cost of new textbooks increased an average of 6 percent a year. That was more than twice the pace of inflation.⁷ The trend has continued unabated in recent years, with new textbook prices climbing 6 percent a year between 2002 and 2013 while general household prices increased at an average of 2 percent annually.⁸

Textbook rental programs and digital options offer some opportunities for relief, but these alternatives are still emerging as solutions for many students.

Because textbooks are a reflection of an individual student’s field of study, and the choices made by the faculty in those courses, students may not know the true cost of their education until they have enrolled in classes.

Clearly, improving the affordability of textbooks and other course materials offers a direct way to lower the cost of education for students.

**Recommendation 6A | Negotiate cost:** Professional negotiators must be assigned to help faculty obtain the best deals for students on textbooks and instructional materials, starting with high-volume, high-cost courses. Faculty must consider both cost and quality in the selection of course materials.

- **Benefits:** Institutions often employ professional negotiators in their business units, but they are not always connected to the process of purchasing academic materials. By working collaboratively, faculty and negotiators can employ business practices — such as seeking competitive presentations by publishers to department faculty — to drive down costs and improve offerings for students.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Institutional

- **Other considerations:** Faculty must use their subject matter expertise to judge the quality of materials, but business officials can add value to the negotiation over price and other terms. Institutions must ensure that negotiators have a clear mission to provide faculty with support while representing students’ need for affordable materials. Faculty should continue to focus on academic quality, but they also should be asked to consider cost as part of their selection of course materials.
Implementation plan: Institutions must assign professional negotiators — such as members of their business operations — to assist faculty in their dealings with publishers. Academic leaders should prioritize the use of these negotiators to courses with high volumes of students and/or high cost of materials.

Recommendation 6B | Standardize materials for gateway courses: Institutions must encourage departments to choose common materials, including digital elements, for gateway courses that serve large volumes of students.

- Benefits: Many students take the same common courses in the early stages of their degrees, so institutions can effectively reduce costs for large numbers of students by targeting these gateway courses. Standardizing materials, including using digital options, for these courses would improve the availability of used materials and allow institutions to negotiate better prices on behalf of their students.

- Nature of recommendation: Institutional

- Other considerations: Coordination between institutions would amplify the effects of standardization here, and raise the possibility of enhanced joint purchasing of course materials to reduce their cost to students. Common materials would also enhance articulation and transfer among institutions statewide. Institutions should always aim to maintain the highest quality materials and respect academic freedom.

- Implementation plan: Academic leaders at each institution should home in on high volume courses and work with faculty who teach those courses to come to common agreement on materials. When possible, faculty should consider the development or selection of digital materials that can reduce costs.

Recommendation 6C | Develop digital capabilities: Institutions must be part of a consortium to develop digital tools and materials, including open educational resources, that provide students with high-quality, low-cost materials.

- Benefits: Institutions should seek to harness their own intellectual property to create and adapt learning materials for their students. This can reduce the cost to students and may provide revenue opportunities by offering tools and materials to other institutions.

- Nature of recommendation: Institutional, with opportunity for statewide collaboration

- Other considerations: If all Ohio institutions were part of the same collaborative, our public colleges and universities could more easily share materials and tools. The task force recognizes that institutions may have already made a variety of choices on this front, but it encourages collaboration across the state’s colleges and universities.
Implementation plan: Institutions should tap the expertise of chief information officers at Ohio institutions to determine whether a single consortium offers a cost-effective solution. Each institution must then consider whether to participate or use an alternative system and report its decision to its board of trustees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus areas</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Type of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate cost</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardize materials</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop digital capabilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case studies:

- **Negotiate cost**: The University of Cincinnati employs negotiators from its Division for Administration and Finance as well as experts from its bookstore to support faculty in negotiating textbook prices. These tactics have paid off in savings to students that average $100 per course. For fall semester of 2015, UC students are expected to save $400,000 to $500,000 compared to list prices for electronic materials in certain high-enrollment courses. The cost is included in students’ tuition and fees, so students automatically have access to these materials. Professors report a significant educational benefit because this structure means no students skip or delay buying materials.

- **Consider cost**: Columbus State Community College students have saved $2.3 million since July 2013 through a variety of measures, including learning seminars to educate faculty about options to make course materials more affordable. Other strategies include the development of digital content, price negotiations, textbook rentals and expanded availability of used materials.

- **Develop digital capabilities**: The Ohio State University is a member of Unizin, a nonprofit consortium owned by universities that develops digital resources and tools for higher education. By virtue of Ohio State’s membership in Unizin, other colleges and universities in Ohio can join for an annual fee. Members can make use of shared tools and materials that Unizin develops or acquires based on level of entry into the consortium.
Recommendation | **Time to degree**

**Background:** One of the most effective ways that colleges and universities can lower costs for students is to ensure that students complete their degrees in an efficient manner. While students can use college to investigate possible career paths and interests, that intellectual exploration must be balanced against the cost.

Students can save thousands of dollars by completing their degrees on time — the result of taking the appropriate number of credit hours per term, with smart scheduling to ensure they are on track to meet their program requirements. Avoiding costs associated with an extra term or two is a powerful way to avoid student debt.

**Recommendation 7A | Education campaign:** Each institution must develop a coordinated campaign to educate its full-time undergraduates about the course loads needed to graduate on time (two years for most associate degrees and four years for most bachelor’s degrees).

- **Benefits:** Undergraduates who take 12 credit hours in a semester are considered full time based on federal financial aid rules, but they would need to take an average of 15 credit hours per semester to graduate on time in most programs. Nearly half the full-time students at Ohio’s community colleges, regional campuses and university main campuses took fewer than 15 credit hours in the fall semesters of 2011-13.⁹

- **Nature of recommendation:** Institutional, with opportunity for statewide collaboration

- **Other considerations:** This campaign would be explicitly aimed at full-time undergraduates. Working adults and other part-time students may not be able to accelerate their studies because of job, family or other pressures, so advising and other strategies will be needed to encourage their progress toward a degree. Also, some full-time programs require more than 15 credit hours per semester to stay on track.

- **Implementation plan:** Each institution must implement a campaign with its students by incorporating messages during the advising process and at regular touch points throughout their college careers. Institutions should consider working together to develop a standard “tool kit” that each institution could customize to its needs. This collaboration could save time and money — and provide a standard message across the state.

**Recommendation 7B | Graduation incentive:** Institutions should consider establishing financial incentives to encourage full-time students to take at least 15 credits per semester.

- **Benefits:** Ohio institutions that have implemented incentive programs report that their students have increased progress toward degree completion. Increased success rates may also benefit institutions because Ohio’s success-based funding formula awards State Share of Instruction dollars as a result of their students’ progress to degree.
**Nature of recommendation:** Institutional

**Other considerations:** Incentive programs are less likely to have a big impact on student choice at institutions with high on-time graduation rates and instead may be rewarding existing behavior. Therefore, each institution should evaluate the potential benefit of these programs to improving time to degree for students.

The upfront costs of these programs may be balanced by increased state support through the subsidy model, but the actual cost/benefit will vary by institution. Therefore, a broad expansion of these programs may not be sustainable without state support.

**Implementation plan:** The leadership of each institution should consider the applicability to its campus.

**Recommendation 7C | Standardize credits for degree:** Institutions should streamline graduation requirements so that most bachelor’s degree programs can be completed within four years or less and most associate degree programs can be completed in two years or less. Exceptions should be allowed because of accreditation or quality requirements.

**Benefits:** The requirements of academic programs obviously affect the amount of time that students spend earning a degree. Streamlining the requirements — when permitted both on the academic needs of the program and accreditation rules — would allow students to more quickly move from school to work.

**Nature of recommendation:** Institutional

**Other considerations:** The benefits of streamlining course requirements must always be measured against the legitimate academic needs of each program.

The Ohio Department of Higher Education recently updated its program review manual, which includes mandatory reviews when bachelor’s degree programs exceed 126 hours and associate degree programs exceed 65 hours. Institutions are already recalibrating credit requirements to these rules, and that work should continue.

**Implementation plan:** Academic leaders at each institution should continue to review the graduation requirements of programs that exceed the standard levels established by the state Department of Higher Education.

**Recommendation 7D | Data-driven advising:** Institutions should enhance academic advising services so that students benefit from both high-impact, personalized consultations and data systems that proactively identify risk factors that hinder student success.

**Benefits:** Predictive analytics have the potential to prevent problems before they occur, by identifying early signals of problems or opportunities to course-correct during a
student’s academic career. When combined with proactive advising — sometimes called "intrusive advising" to reflect that advisors take the initiative to interact with students — this process can help guide students through their academic careers.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Institutional, with opportunity for statewide collaboration
- **Other considerations:** The cost of implementation and training for academic advisers will create a significant upfront investment of time and money. Also, proactive advising will need to be carefully applied to show students the best path forward in their chosen academic careers — not to create roadblocks to a challenging field.
- **Implementation plan:** Each institution must implement a data-driven analytics system, as well as training for advisers on how to use the data to provide high-impact interventions. A statewide contract, perhaps in conjunction with OARnet and/or financial support from the state, could lower the cost to make this kind of system accessible across Ohio’s public colleges and universities. Institutions should consider working collaboratively through a group of chief information officers and Inter-University Council Purchasing Group to negotiate a statewide contract.

**Recommendation 7E | Summer programs:** Each campus must develop plans to evaluate utilization rates for summer session and consider opportunities to increase productive activity. In particular, institutions should consider adding summer-session options for high-demand classes and bottleneck courses that are required for degree completion.

- **Benefits:** Too many campus resources are lightly used during the summer, and too many in-demand courses are unavailable during the standard fall-spring academic year. Increasing summer activity could address both issues.
- **Nature of recommendation:** Institutional
- **Other considerations:** Even with more summer availability, some students will not be able to take advantage because of their need to work or gain professional experience. Others may see adverse consequences to financial aid packages. Faculty schedules will also need to be addressed, since many focus on research during the summer.

Last, any increase in academic offerings will need to consider the impact on capital improvement plans for student housing and other facilities. This work often takes place during the summer session, when it is less disruptive to students.

- **Implementation plan:** The board of trustees of each institution should identify opportunities to expand the number of high-demand and core courses available during summer session.
Recommendation 7F | **Pathway agreements:** Ohio institutions should continue to develop agreements that create seamless pathways for students who begin their educations at community or technical colleges and complete them at universities.

- **Benefits:** Programs that have articulation agreements help students succeed by providing them with an academic roadmap that spells out the appropriate coursework they should take at a college that will fulfill requirements needed to complete their bachelor’s degree at a university. In these agreements, the institutions ensure that their academic requirements are aligned. Students benefit from a clear pathway to a degree as well as cost savings by starting at a less-expensive institution.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Institutional collaborations

- **Other considerations:** In developing articulation agreements, colleges and universities must ensure that they have aligned quality and content issues to enhance student success.

- **Implementation plan:** Institutions should work collaboratively to increase the number of articulation agreements, such as 2+2 arrangements, among Ohio colleges and universities.

Recommendation 7G | **Competency-based education:** Institutions should consider developing or expanding programs that measure student success based on demonstrated competencies instead of through the amount of time students spend studying a subject.

- **Benefits:** Competency-based programs can help students, particularly working adults or other nontraditional students, complete degrees more efficiently by allowing them to work at their own pace instead of on a classroom schedule. These programs are typically more affordable for students because they use technology, including online modules, in the educational process.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Institutional

- **Other considerations:** Institutions will need to ensure that the quality of competency-based programs meets their standards. Competency-based programs also tend to be more prevalent in certain kinds of fields.

As part of the state budget bill for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, institutions are encouraged to work with the chancellor of the Department of Higher Education to consider offering competency-based programs and present plans by July 1, 2016.

- **Implementation plan:** Each institution should evaluate opportunities to develop or expand competency-based programs, in consultation with the Department of Higher Education.
### Time to degree recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus areas</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>4-year</th>
<th>2-year</th>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>1-3 years</th>
<th>3-5 years</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>State/Statutory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education campaign</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation incentive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardize credits</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data-driven advising</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway agreements</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency-based education</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Case studies:**

- **Graduation incentive**: Since fall 2013, Cleveland State University has offered a 2 percent tuition rebate and $200 textbook credit to students who take at least 30 credit hours over three semesters and meet success and enrollment requirements. In the first two years of the program, an average of 2,865 undergraduate students qualified, and the program cost $1.14 million annually, funded through Cleveland State’s operating budget. This program will continue through the conclusion of students’ fourth year of enrollment. Freshmen who entered in the fall of 2015 are the last eligible class for the program.

Starting in fall 2015, Cuyahoga Community College began offering a graduation incentive to students taking at least 15 credit hours in fall or spring semesters. The incentive equates to a 50 percent discount on any credit hours over 12 in these semesters, so a student taking 15 credit hours would receive $156.81 per semester. To redeem the incentive, students must enroll in the subsequent semester for at least 12 credit hours and maintain at least a 2.0 grade point average.
- **Competency-based education**: Sinclair Community College received federal funds from the Department of Labor to launch Accelerate IT, an online program that allows information-technology students to earn certificates and degrees by working at their own pace. Sinclair and partner institutions that received the grant expect that the program will allow them to serve more students in these fields.¹⁰
Recommendations | Duplicative programs

**Background:** Low-enrollment and duplicative programs have long been a concern in Ohio because these academic programs are considered costly to maintain.

Most recently, the state legislature directed institutions to study low-enrollment programs by January 2016 and every five years thereafter to identify opportunities for collaboration with other institutions that are geographically nearby.

That provision in the state budget for fiscal years 2016 and 2017 focuses on low-enrollment programs but does not address duplicative programs.

**Recommendation 8 | Program review:** Institutions should consider consolidating programs that are duplicated at other colleges and universities in their geographic area.

- **Benefits:** Colleges and universities could reduce administrative costs while honing their academic focus by consolidating duplicative programs that do not create a distinct advantage for their institutions. On co-located campuses, reducing duplication could particularly provide benefits for students.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Institutional collaborations

- **Other considerations:** Where there are high-demand programs across the state, duplication may make sense as a way of serving Ohio students and the state economy. However, there may be other areas where duplication is not serving the distinct missions of each school. There, consolidation would allow each institution to focus on what it does best while still providing an option for students in the region.

- **Implementation plan:** The Department of Higher Education should identify duplicative programs within each region of the state, with particular attention to co-located campuses. Institutions should then review any programs not covered by the current low-enrollment review ordered by the legislature to identify opportunities to consolidate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus areas</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Type of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review duplication</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>4-year</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>2-year</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Duplicative programs recommendation
Recommendations | Co-located campuses

**Background:** On seven campuses throughout Ohio, two- and four-year schools are co-located. In each instance, a community or technical college shares a campus with a regional campus of a university.

As of the fall semester of 2014, these campuses served 45,070 students, with two-thirds of the enrollment at community colleges.\(^\text{11}\)

Over the years, groups have repeatedly called on these institutions to work better together. For instance, the Co-located Campuses Review Project Report said in 2004 that operations should be “reviewed regularly to identify unnecessary duplication, better control expenses and identify new opportunities to share infrastructure and resources.”

Yet, state higher education leaders agree that co-located campuses demonstrate an uneven record of success in working together. While campuses across the state should be working more closely together to reduce costs and improve the educational offerings to their students, there is a special onus on institutions that share a campus.

**Recommendation 9 | Joint oversight boards:** The state should establish joint oversight boards for co-located community colleges and regional campuses of universities. This advisory board’s mandate should focus on improving efficiencies and coordination among the institutions.

- **Benefits:** A formalized oversight group that represents both institutions allows each to maintain its distinct mission but can collectively identify areas for streamlining, consolidation, shared services and positions, or other efficiencies. The net effect should be lowered costs for students or improved offerings.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Statutory

- **Other considerations:** Joint coordinating boards should also be encouraged among institutions with similar missions in a geographic region. These groups could identify and recommend shared services and other efficiency measures that could reduce costs for campuses.

- **Implementation plan:** The legislature, working with the state Department of Higher Education, should develop language to identify how these joint oversight boards should work — including the possibility that the state appoints independent members to the oversight board who are not aligned with either institution. Each institution must follow the direction of the Department in naming members to the oversight boards.
### Co-located recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus areas</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Type of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint oversight boards</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ✓ indicates present
- - indicates absent
Recommendations | Policy reforms

Background: The task force recognizes that there are debates, both at the state and federal level, about the appropriate role and level of government support for higher education. Those are valid and important discussions.

Instead of wading into that debate, the task force has focused on where it could best add value to the discussion of affordability and efficiency among Ohio’s colleges and universities. Our mission was to recommend practical action steps to help Ohio’s public colleges and universities better serve their students from a cost and effectiveness perspective.

The task force believes strongly that federal reforms are needed to address a variety of issues related to student loans and debt.

We encourage state leaders and Ohio’s congressional delegation to advocate for reforms that support student success — including ensuring that institutions that benefit from federal dollars help students complete credentials that improve their prospects in life. In addition, Congress and the administration should provide more oversight over student loans to ensure responsible borrowing and to ensure the appropriate level of student responsibility.

Recommendation 10A | Financial advising: Students ultimately determine how much to borrow, but the task force calls on Ohio’s colleges and universities to help educate students about those choices by providing financial literacy services.

- **Benefits:** The task force heard stories throughout its work about students who took on debt for reasons other than their education because they don’t understand the consequences that debt can take after graduation. Financial advising services can help students recognize how debt would affect their lives after college.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Institutional, with opportunities for statewide collaboration

- **Other considerations:** This program could be built into existing academic advising, financial aid, career services or be part of a broader financial literacy program that goes beyond the question of student debt.

- **Implementation plan:** Institutions should develop financial literacy programs aimed at helping students understand the possible consequences of student debt, particularly in light of the earning potential of their chosen field of study. This area is particularly ripe for a collaborative approach to develop a statewide program, including the possibility of offering a basic online service that can be reinforced during in-person sessions with advisors.
Beyond this, we are recommending changes to state laws that inhibit the efficient operations of state institutions of higher education.

**Recommendation 10B | Obstacles:** The state Department of Higher Education and/or state legislature should seek to remove any obstacles in policy, rule or statute that inhibit the efficiencies envisioned in these recommendations.

- **Benefits:** By carefully removing roadblocks to streamlining and other efficiency measures, the state can support institutions in their efforts to reduce costs and improve the quality of students’ education.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Statutory

- **Implementation:** The chancellor of the Ohio Department of Higher Education should review any areas that might prohibit the implementation of recommendations in this report and make recommendations for appropriate remedies. Institutions should take the initiative to highlight any potential reforms.

**Recommendation 10C | Real estate sales:** State law should be updated to streamline the process for how public colleges and universities sell, convey, lease or enter into easements of real estate. Institutions should be able to transfer property with the approval of their board of trustees and the chancellor of the Ohio Department of Higher Education, while still ensuring legislative oversight/approval by requiring certain transactions be approved by the state Controlling Board.

- **Benefits:** Current state law surrounding real-estate sales and easements is cumbersome and can limit opportunities to negotiate the most advantageous deals for colleges and universities. Under current state law, Ohio’s public colleges and universities cannot enter into easements or sell, convey or lease real estate without having legislation passed by the Ohio General Assembly, which can hinder effective negotiations and/or discourage potential buyers who are unwilling to wait for a bill. Updating this process would provide significant administrative efficiencies while improving institutions’ ability to maximize our assets.

- **Nature of recommendation:** Statutory

- **Other considerations:** Parameters could allow more flexibility for smaller transactions while maintaining executive and legislative oversight on larger ones — for instance, a dollar threshold below which boards and the chancellor’s office could approve real-estate transactions.
➢ **Implementation plan:** The Department of Higher Education should propose recommendations to the state legislature to streamline the process of disposing of real estate and/or easements.

**Recommendation 10D | Insurance pools:** Most state universities buy their property and casualty insurance on a group basis through the IUC Insurance Consortium, which in FY15 saved members more than $5 million. This function could be handled more effectively through a different legal framework. Therefore, existing statute should be modified to more closely resemble the authority granted to political subdivisions (in ORC 2744.081).

➢ **Benefits:** Updating ORC 3345.202 would confirm that: The IUC-IC is an insurance pool and not an insurance company; the IUC-UC is exempt from all state and local taxes; and each member institution is not liable under a joint self-insurance pool for any amount in excess of amounts payable pursuant to the written pooling agreement.

➢ **Nature of recommendation:** Statutory

➢ **Implementation:** The chancellor of the Ohio Department of Higher Education and the General Assembly should review proposed legislation to facilitate the work of the IUC Insurance Consortium. In addition, the IUC-IC should form a not-for-profit entity to protect member institutions from legal entanglements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus areas</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Type of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial education</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstacles</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance pools</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation | How to move forward

As this report indicates, there is no simple panacea that would improve the affordability and efficiency of higher education in Ohio.

Instead, it will take creativity and drive among our public colleges and universities to provide high-quality education at a cost that doesn't drive students into crippling debt. The state will need to support these efforts, both through legislative relief and other means.

Collaboration among all the stakeholders will become increasingly important to share information, resources and best practices that can spread among Ohio's public colleges and universities.

To ensure that our recommendations can be translated into action, the task force has worked to distribute responsibility to the appropriate parties. We have purposely avoided spelling out all the details for our recommendations under the belief that goals are more effective than strict mandates which can hamper creative approaches.

We see three main actors in carrying out our recommendations:

- **Boards of trustees**: For work to be done at the institution level, we are asking boards of trustees to direct and/or review the progress of these endeavors.

- **The Department of Higher Education**: The Department can use its statewide reach and cross-institutional impact to share best practices, connect colleges and universities to one another, and provide resources to support our institutions.

- **The Inter-University Council Purchasing Group (including members of the Ohio Association of Community Colleges)**: These groups already have developed an infrastructure for our higher education leaders to work together on effective solutions, such as joint procurement, that can lower costs. To that end, we view the IUC and OACC as vital partners who can implement recommendations in a collaborative fashion.

Beyond these organizations, the task force believes that there needs to be a central hub to track recommendations of this report and oversee the areas for which more study is needed.

**Recommendation | Implementation**: The chancellor of the Ohio Department of Higher Education and the state's public colleges and universities should make use of existing groups and resources to coordinate next steps from these recommendations. In particular:

- The chancellor should utilize the existing Efficiency Advisory Committee (Section 369.540 of Am. Sub. H.B. No. 64) to coordinate next steps.
• Where results should be reported statewide, information gathering should be incorporated into the existing efficiency survey conducted by the Department of Higher Education.

• Efficiency councils at each college and university should continue to provide input on the progress of these steps and identify others going forward.

➢ **Benefits:** This report calls for further study or work in several areas, and the advisory committee already encompasses representatives of all public institutions in Ohio and works with the Department of Higher Education. The Efficiency Advisory Committee could be utilized to coordinate areas that need further study or coordination to ease implementation, such as:

  o Standard productivity measure (recommendation 5B)

  o Health-care costs (recommendation 5D)

  o Develop digital capabilities (recommendation 6C)

In addition, the Efficiency Advisory Committee could work with the Inter-University Council Purchasing Group to simplify, standardize and reduce the cost of implementation of the following recommendations:

  o Assets and operations reviews (recommendations 4A-C)

  o Cost diagnostic (recommendation 5A)

  o Space utilization (recommendation 5F)

Each institution, as part of the task force’s work process, was asked to either form or assign an existing efficiency council to provide input on topics of interest. These groups were invaluable in providing insights on the most pressing issues facing Ohio institutions and the areas of most potential.

To that end, we recommend that these institutional councils continue to act as sounding boards for statewide collaboration and coordination. Similarly, we recommend that each institution rely on its council to advise and/or implement recommendations for its campuses.

**Timeline:** The biennial state budget for fiscal years 2016 and 2017 requires the board of trustees for each institution to complete an efficiency review based on this report by July 1, 2016, and an implementation plan within 30 days of submitting that review.

Some work can clearly begin in advance of that July 1 deadline, while other recommendations would take more time to implement.
The chart below provides a summary of the implementation responsibilities for each recommendation. Where more time is needed to implement, that is reflected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation (Deadline if not July 1, 2016)</th>
<th>Boards of Trustees</th>
<th>Dept. of Higher Ed.</th>
<th>IUC Purchasing Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Savings to students (July 1, 2017)</td>
<td>Redeploy new dollars to affordability and quality</td>
<td>Develop template, collect data and produce annual reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report annually to DHE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Five-year goals</td>
<td>Develop goals through FY2021 for efficiencies and new resources</td>
<td>Develop template, collect data and produce annual reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Procurement</td>
<td>Mandate on-campus utilization, and participate (or not) in joint purchasing agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Assets and operations (Dec. 31, 2016)</td>
<td>Review assets, operations and opportunities for affinity/sponsor relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint contract?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A: Cost diagnostic (Dec. 31, 2016)</td>
<td>Produce cost diagnostic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint contract?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B: Productivity measure</td>
<td>Apply measure</td>
<td>Develop measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C: Organizational structure</td>
<td>Order review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D: Health care</td>
<td></td>
<td>Convene working group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E: Data centers</td>
<td>Develop plan to move</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint contract?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5F: Space utilization (Dec. 31, 2016)</td>
<td>Order review</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint contract?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation (Deadline if not July 1, 2016)</th>
<th>Boards of Trustees</th>
<th>Dept. of Higher Ed./ State legislature</th>
<th>IUC Purchasing Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6A: Negotiate textbook cost</td>
<td>Assign negotiators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B: Standardize materials</td>
<td>Direct academic leaders to develop plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C: Develop digital capabilities</td>
<td>Join consortium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A: Education campaign</td>
<td>Develop and implement campaign (15 credits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B: Graduation incentive</td>
<td>Study options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7C: Standardize credits</td>
<td>Order review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7D: Data-driven advising</td>
<td>Implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7E: Summer programs <em>(Dec. 31, 2016)</em></td>
<td>Develop plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7F: Pathway agreements</td>
<td>Develop agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7G: Competency-based education</td>
<td>Consider programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Duplicative programs <em>(Dec. 31, 2016)</em></td>
<td>Consider consolidation Identify programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Co-located campuses</td>
<td>Develop legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Policy reforms</td>
<td>Financial education Develop legislation Remove obstacles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other topics of interest

Individual members of the task force and other stakeholders expressed interest in other topics that could not be explored in the time frame available.

These are among the areas that were identified:

- **Alumni support**: In framing affordability and efficiency goals, institutions should consider the role that alumni could play in enhancing those efforts. Institutions that demonstrate strong participation from alumni in this regard could leverage those results to obtain additional support.

- **Benefits**: Beyond the health-care benefits to be addressed by a work group (Recommendation 5D), Ohio institutions should consider a broader study of other non-pension benefits where coordination may lead to efficiencies.

- **College Credit Plus**: Expansion and refinement of this program, so that more students can earn college credits while in high school, would reduce the cost of higher education and enhance students’ ability to complete their degrees on time.

- **Construction reform**: In 2011, the state enacted construction reforms that benefitted higher education. The new methodologies allowed for greater efficiencies and ease of completion, thereby saving time and money. But many other opportunities exist to reduce the cost of capital projects and allow for greater efficiencies.

- **Differentiated tuition**: Currently, institutions are required to set a single tuition rate for all students, without the ability to differentiate by class rank. More flexibility on this front might allow institutions to lower costs for underclassmen (but might increase costs for upperclassmen).

- **Energy efficiencies**: Institutions could drive down energy costs and become more sustainable through conservation efforts. The task force was impressed by many of the efforts at the University of Cincinnati to creatively attack this problem, including finding opportunities during unrelated capital projects to improve building sustainability.

- **Enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems**: Institutions would benefit from economies of scale and operational efficiencies if more operated on the same ERP systems. Given the complexity and scale of these systems, a statewide approach would be a daunting project across Ohio’s colleges and universities. But there may be opportunities to begin coordination among similar institutions as they update their systems.
• **Optimizing building assets**: Colleges and universities may be able to better leverage their physical space through partnerships with other institutions of higher education as well as government, civic organizations and other groups.

• **Part-time students**: Ohio's colleges serve a variety of students, not just “traditional” students who attend full-time and begin their degree directly after graduating from high school. Some of the recommendations in this report will benefit all students, but a special focus is needed to support the success of part-time students, including working adults.

• **Remediation**: Students enrolled in remedial courses graduate in far fewer numbers and spend more time in school, driving up student debt. Colleges should continue exploring ways to reform current remediation practices and policies so that there are differentiated options for students based upon their needs, including co-requisite and parallel remediation. A program in Tennessee has had promising results by allowing high-school seniors who earn low ACT scores on the math section to receive math mediation while still in high school. ¹³

• **3+1 Programs**: Some institutions have developed articulation agreements that allow students to spend three years at a community college and a fourth year at a university to complete a bachelor’s degree. As part of the emphasis on multiple pathways to a degree, this concept deserves further study.
Appendix A | Executive order

Executive Order 2015-01K

Establishing the Ohio Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency in Higher Education

WHEREAS, Ohio’s future economic growth depends upon a well-educated workforce and college graduates; and

WHEREAS, national figures show that the costs to students and their parents associated with higher education have increased substantially over the last 35 years, rising several times higher than the general rate of inflation over the same period of time; and

WHEREAS, the substantial rise in higher education tuition prices has led to a similar rise in student loan debt. In 2013, outstanding student loan debt nationally was well over $1 trillion, surpassing—for the first time ever—the amount of outstanding credit card debt (then $857 billion); and

WHEREAS, increasing operational efficiency in our state-sponsored institutions of higher education can lower their costs of providing post-secondary instruction, which in turn should help them provide an even higher quality of education at a more affordable cost to Ohioans;

NOW THEREFORE, I, John R. Kasich, Governor of the State of Ohio, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the State of Ohio, do hereby order and direct that:

1. The Ohio Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency in Higher Education (the “Task Force”) is hereby established to review and recommend ways in which state-sponsored institutions of higher education, including four-year universities and two-year community colleges, can be more efficient, offering an education of equal or higher quality while at the same time decreasing their costs. This can be done only if institutions of higher education become more efficient and productive in the use of their assets, personnel and resources. The Task Force shall provide me with a report with recommendations regarding how our state institutions of higher education can operate more productively and efficiently, so that, over the long term, tuition prices remain affordable.
2. In conducting its review and developing its report with recommendations, the Task Force shall examine the following areas:

   a. Administrative staffing levels, bureaucracy and related costs;
   b. Teaching loads for professors not significantly involved in research;
   c. Organization of departments, with a view toward ways to reduce overhead;
   d. Space utilization, including space for commercializing innovations that derive from research;
   e. Opportunities for shared services, energy savings, shared procurement opportunities and other cost-saving efficiencies;
   f. Low-enrollment and low-performing programs and courses at the graduate and undergraduate levels;
   g. Asset utilization and opportunities for monetization;
   h. Other potential sources of revenue that do not result in increased cost for students, such as affinity agreements, commercialization opportunities and intellectual property auctions;
   i. Standard course requirements for degree completion;
   j. Use of technology to reduce cost for students; and
   k. Best practices for Ohio’s community colleges that are located within the same regional campus as a university.

3. The Task Force shall be comprised of nine members, five members to be appointed by the Governor, two to be appointed by the Speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives, one representative from each party, and two to be appointed by the President of the Ohio Senate, one senator from each party. The Governor shall designate the Chairperson of the Task Force from among the appointed members.

4. Staff support and resources necessary for the Task Force to fulfill its obligations as outlined in this Executive Order shall be provided through the Ohio Board of Regents (Ohio Department of Higher Education). This shall include space to gather and consider information necessary for developing the recommendations and report called for in this Order. The Chairperson and members of the Task Force shall serve without compensation for their work on the Task Force, but may be reimbursed for their reasonable and necessary travel expenses in the conduct of Task Force business.

5. In gathering information to prepare its report, the Task Force shall engage presidents and members of boards of trustees of state-sponsored institutions of higher education for their perspectives on the topics listed above, and may seek advice and input from such other persons or entities as the Task Force finds helpful to its work as outlined in this Order.
6. The Task Force shall assemble as often as its members deem necessary to facilitate timely completion of the report with recommendations in the areas specified by this Order. The Task Force shall submit its report to the Governor and the General Assembly by October 1, 2015. The report with recommendations shall be shared with presidents and boards of trustees of state-sponsored institutions of higher education.

I signed this Executive Order on February 10, 2015, in Columbus, Ohio, and it will expire upon the submission of the Task Force’s report and recommendations pursuant to this order.

John R. Kasich, Governor
Appendix B | Our process

To develop our recommendations, the task force sought insights and experiences of higher education leaders throughout the state as well as national experts.

- **Meetings:**
  - June 23 (in Columbus): Priority-setting and data review
  - July 21 (at Cuyahoga Community College): Procurement and time to degree
  - Aug. 17 (at the University of Cincinnati): Assets, academic efficiencies and productivity
  - Sept. 2 (at Bowling Green State University): Administrative efficiencies, IT, co-location
  - Sept. 23 (at Columbus State Community College): Finalize recommendations

- **Speakers:** 23 people offered their insights. They represented universities, community colleges, regional campuses as well as national experts.

- **Data:** Analyzed savings opportunities, particularly with regard to procurement

- **Insights:** Coordinated with the Department of Higher Education to collect data and insights

- **Institutional surveys:** Asked institutional efficiency councils to provide suggestions for possible action steps throughout the task force process.

- **Feedback:** Consulted with a statewide Advisory Panel, representing public colleges and universities, to obtain feedback throughout the process.

Information about all task force meetings was published online at [www.ohiohighered.org/ae](http://www.ohiohighered.org/ae).
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Resolution R2016-52
Endowment Spending

WHEREAS, Miami University receives and manages contributions of cash, securities, life insurance, personal property, and real estate in its endowment; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees desires to continue the policy of supporting University operations and scholarships through the distribution of income and realized gains from the endowment; and

WHEREAS, Miami University Resolution 2010-4 established an amended Spending Policy effective with the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010, and authorized such Policy to remain in effect until formally modified by the Board of Trustees; and

WHEREAS, Miami University Resolution 2010-4 also directed the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services to annually evaluate the variables underlying the spending formula and to present recommendations as to the spending formula to be used for the fiscal year; and

WHEREAS, the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services has presented his recommendations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, and the Finance Committee has accepted those recommendations; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees, has considered the proposed Spending Policy, with the care that an ordinarily prudent person in a like position would exercise under similar circumstances, considering the following factors:

1. The duration and preservation of the endowment fund;
2. The purposes of the institution and the endowment fund;
3. General economic conditions;
4. The possible effect of inflation or deflation;
5. The expected total return from income and the appreciation of investments;
6. Other resources of the institution;
7. The investment policy of the institution;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The Board of Trustees hereby authorizes that the spending distribution for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2016, be computed according to the following formula:
The weighted average spending formula is to be comprised of two elements: a market element, given a 30% weight in the formula, and an inflation element, given a 70% weight in the formula. The market element is to be computed by multiplying the market value of the investment portfolio on March 31, 2016 by a long-term sustainable spending percentage of 4.5%. The inflation element is to be computed by increasing the prior year's actual spending distribution by the annualized increase in the Consumer Price Index as of March 31, 2016.

If, however, the June 30, 2016 market value of an individual endowment fund account is below the cumulative value of all gifts contributed into that account, then only the pro rata share of realized dividends and interest allocated to that account may be distributed instead of the amount determined by the spending calculation.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
MIAMI UNIVERSITY
SPENDING FORMULA DECISION POINTS
FISCAL YEAR 2016

1. Considerations
   With the care that an ordinarily prudent person in a like position would exercise under similar circumstances, we have considered the following factors:
   - The duration and preservation of the endowment fund;
   - The purposes of the institution and the endowment fund;
   - General economic conditions;
   - The possible effect of inflation or deflation;
   - The expected total return from income and the appreciation of investments;
   - Other resources of the institution;
   - The investment policy of the institution.

2. Market Element
   - Monte Carlo simulations were used to project the probabilities of maintaining intergenerational equity using different market elements and different risk/return assumptions.
   - FY 2004 - 2015 formulas used 4.5%.
   - Outcomes from this approach have been satisfactory.
   - **Recommended for FY 2016: Stay with the 4.5% multiplier.**

3. Inflation Element
   - Monte Carlo simulations were used to study the impact of changes in the inflation rate.
   - FY 2004 - 2014 formulas used the Consumer Price Index (CPI).
   - FY2015 used +0.1%, since the prior 12-month change in CPI was negative.
   - CPI for the 12-month period ending March 31, 2016 is again positive.
   - **Recommended for FY 2016: Use CPI as the inflation value.**

4. Underwater Funds
   - The status of funds that have fallen below gift value are evaluated throughout the year.
   - Prior practice has been to approve distributing just the earned dividends and interest from underwater funds, rather than the calculated amount.
   - **Recommended for FY 2016: Distribute just earned dividends and interest instead of full calculated distribution for underwater funds.**
Resolution R2016-53

Quasi-Endowments

WHEREAS, from time to time, Miami University accumulates financial balances through the receipt of large, unrestricted gifts and the prudent management of resources; and

WHEREAS, the Provost, the Deans, the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services, and the Vice President for Advancement periodically identify a portion of these funds that can be utilized to create quasi-endowments to establish a source of long-term funding for strategic initiatives; and

WHEREAS, Resolution R2015-45 established the Miami University Quasi-Endowment Policy; and

WHEREAS, the Dean of the Farmer School of Business desires to establish a quasi-endowment to promote academic excellence, funded from division carry forward, and to be used for the funding needs of Farmer School of Business as determined annually by the Dean; and

WHEREAS, the Dean of the Farmer School of Business desires to establish a quasi-endowment to promote faculty excellence, funded from the business course surcharge, and to be used for support of FSB faculty compensation as determined annually by the Dean; and

WHEREAS, the Dean of the Farmer School of Business desires to establish a quasi-endowment for the needs of the Department of Economics, funded from unrestricted gifts, and to be used for the funding needs of the Department of Economics as determined annually by the Dean and Department Chair; and

WHEREAS, the Dean of the Farmer School of Business desires to establish a quasi-endowment for the needs of the Department of Marketing, funded from unrestricted gifts, and to be used for the funding needs of the Department of Marketing as determined annually by the Dean and Department Chair; and

WHEREAS, the Dean of the Farmer School of Business desires to establish a quasi-endowment for the needs of the Department of Marketing, funded from designated funds, and to be used for the funding needs of the Department of Marketing as determined annually by the Dean and Department Chair; and

WHEREAS, the Provost and the Senior Vice President for Finance and Business Services of the University, with the concurrence of the Finance and Audit Committee, has recommended approval of this plan;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees approves the creation of the FSB Academic Excellence Fund quasi-endowment in the amount of $2,090,000.00 from division carry forward, the FSB Faculty Excellence Fund in the amount of $4,185,000.00 from the business course surcharge, the Economics General Fund quasi-endowment in the amount of $50,000.00 from unrestricted gifts, the Marketing General Fund
quasi-endowment in the amount of $50,000.00 from unrestricted gifts, and the Marketing
Academic Excellence Fund quasi-endowment in the amount of $125,000.00 from designated
funds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the annual distributions of the FSB Academic
Excellence Fund be used for the needs of the Farmer School of Business as determined by the
Dean of the Farmer School of Business; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the annual distributions of the FSB Faculty
Excellence Fund be used for the support of compensation for the faculty of the Farmer School of
Business as determined by the Dean of the Farmer School of Business; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the annual distributions of the Economics General
Fund be used for the support of the Department of Economics as determined by the Dean of the
Farmer School of Business and the Department Chair; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the annual distributions of the Marketing General
Fund be used for the support of the Department of Marketing as determined by the Dean of the
Farmer School of Business and the Department Chair; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the annual distributions of the Marketing
Academic Excellence Fund be used for the support of the Department of Marketing as
determined by the Dean of the Farmer School of Business and the Department Chair.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016
T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
RESOLUTION R2016-54

Reappointment of John Altman as a National Trustee

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees re-apPOINTS John Altman for a second three-year term as a National Trustee, ending June 30, 2019.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
RESOLUTION R2016-55
Reappointment of Terry Hershey as a National Trustee

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees re-appoints Terry Hershey for a second three-year term as a National Trustee, ending June 30, 2019.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
RESOLUTION R2013-56

Resolution of Appreciation for Dean Pratt

WHEREAS, G. Michael Pratt served as the first ever regional dean, overseeing Miami’s Hamilton and Middletown Regional Campuses and West Chester’s Voice of America Learning Center; and

WHEREAS, Dean Pratt is a Middletown native and graduate of Middletown High School, who attended Miami University Middletown in route to a Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology from Miami University; and

WHEREAS, Dean Pratt is an internationally-renowned battlefield archeologist, whose efforts at the Fallen Timbers Battlefield and Fort Miamis National Historic site in Ohio, and at the River Raisin Battlefield in Michigan, helped each location in achieving National Park status; and

WHEREAS, Dean Pratt is also an expert forensic anthropologist, dedicated to applying his skills to better the community, having served as a member of the National Disaster Medical System, responding to the Tri-State incident in Georgia, and to Hurricane Katrina, and who has also assisted the FBI, state and local law enforcement with field investigation in Ohio and Michigan; and

WHEREAS, Dean Pratt applied his leadership skills to dramatically advance Miami University’s Regional Campuses; over the course of his tenure, the Regional Campuses transitioned from offering primarily Associate Degrees to now offer more than a dozen Bachelor degrees and a Master of Science in Criminal Justice; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Campuses have responded to the needs of the community and Miami’s students to enhance the offerings and opportunities in the delivery of quality health care, through new degrees and the opening of the Greentree Health Science Academy; and

WHEREAS, through Dean Pratt’s leadership, the Regional Campuses also saw the founding of the English Language Center, the implementation of merit scholarships, and the establishment of the College of Professional Studies and Applied Sciences; and

WHEREAS, through Dean Pratt’s efforts, the Regional Campuses are now well-positioned to enter the future to quickly respond to the evolving needs of the region, to better serve Miami students, and to partner with community leaders to advance Southwestern Ohio.
NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the members of the Miami University Board of Trustees do hereby express to Dean G. Michael Pratt their sincere gratitude and warm regard for his service and leadership to Miami University; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the members of this Board offer their best wishes for his continued good health and success in all future endeavors, and extend an open invitation to Mike and Patty to visit often in the years ahead.

Done, by the Miami University Board of Trustees, this Twenty-Fourth Day of June, Two Thousand Sixteen at Miami University, in the City of Oxford, County of Butler, State of Ohio, during the Two Hundred and Seventh year of the University’s Charter.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
RESOLUTION R2016-57

Resolution of Appreciation for
David C. and Valerie L. Hodge

WHEREAS, President David C. Hodge and Ambassador Valerie L. Hodge have inspirationally led Miami University for the past decade; and

WHEREAS, Miami University has excelled under their thoughtful leadership to become nationally celebrated for its strong commitment to undergraduate teaching; and

WHEREAS, in the face of severe economic challenges, the Strategic Priorities Task Force was formed to not only weather the Great Recession, but to spark a renaissance, and today Miami University is recognized as first in the nation in providing an exceptional, high value education; and

WHEREAS, the sound strategic planning and financial leadership during their tenure enabled an unprecedented transformation of the Oxford campus. With the renovation and expansion of numerous existing buildings, the rebirth of Gaskill and Rowan Halls to become the Armstrong Student Center - the new focal point of the Miami experience - combined with the construction of entirely new facilities, such as the Farmer School of Business Building, the Indoor Sports Center, and six residence and dining halls, the Hodges have ensured the student experience will be greatly enhanced for many generations to come; and

WHEREAS, to make this Miami experience more economically accessible for Ohio’s students, the Miami Access Fellowships were established; and

WHEREAS, to improve affordability for all, tuition increases were dramatically limited, and then the Miami Tuition Promise was implemented to guarantee level tuition and fees for four years, providing families with certainty regarding the cost to attend Miami University; and

WHEREAS, to ensure Miami’s continued success in the future, the bold and innovative Miami 2020 plan was implemented, which united the entire Miami Community in the quest to achieve the vision of offering "the best undergraduate experience in the nation, enhanced by superior, select graduate programs;" and

WHEREAS, to better meet the needs of the Hamilton and Middletown Regions, Miami students, and the State of Ohio, the Regional Campuses became an Academic Division, able to create the programs and degrees vital to their communities’ success and growth; and,
WHEREAS, the Hodges remarkable tenure also saw the adoption of the Code of Love and Honor, and “I Am Miami,” which define the culture to which we aspire, and are in keeping with the values so treasured by this Board and all Miamians.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the members of the Miami University’s Board of Trustees do hereby express their sincere gratitude and deepest appreciation for David and Valerie Hodge’s commitment, service and leadership; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the members of this Board offer their best wishes for their continued good health and success in all future endeavors, and extend an open invitation to David and Valerie to visit often in the years ahead.

Done, by the Miami University Board of Trustees, this Twenty-Fourth Day of June, Two Thousand Sixteen at Miami University, in the City of Oxford, County of Butler, State of Ohio, during the Two Hundred and Seventh year of the University’s Charter.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
RESOLUTION R2016-58

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves continuation of the current $432,022 salary, as the Academic Year 2016-2017 salary for President David Hodge; and, as per the terms of the Miami University Presidential Employment Agreement, a strategic accomplishment bonus payment of $200,000, to be contributed to the Supplemental Qualified Retirement Plan (SQRP).

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
RESOLUTION R2016-59
Honorary Degree to Valerie L. Hodge

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Board of Trustees hereby approves the awarding of an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws (LL.D.) to:

Valerie L. Hodge
University Ambassador
2006 to 2016

in recognition of her exceptional service to Miami University. Valerie tirelessly served Miami during a period of exceptional success, marked by many great achievements, outstanding accomplishments and extraordinary recognition, of which a few highlights include; the opening of the Armstrong Student Center, the successful completion of the ambitious For Love and Honor Campaign, and a fall 2016 entering class which is the most academically accomplished and diverse class in the history of Miami University. Valerie Hodge embodies the values of For Love and Honor; and she will be deeply missed.

Approved by the Board of Trustees
June 24, 2016

T. O. Pickerill II
Secretary to the Board of Trustees
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2020 Plan Fundraising Update

FY Goals

FY13: $33,800,000
FY14: $37,200,000
FY15: $40,900,000
FY16: $45,000,000
FY17: $49,500,000
FY18: $54,400,000
FY19: $59,900,000
FY20: $65,800,000
FY’16:

- Goal: $45,000,000
- Raised to date: $48,000,000 (107% of goal)
Fundraising Focus FY’16
Miami Promise Scholarship Campaign goals

- FY’15: $18.0 million -- $19.8 million raised
- FY’16: $18.0 million -- $17.8 million received to date
- FY’17: $18.7 million
- FY’18: $20.7 million
- FY’19: $24.6 million
Miami Promise Scholarship Campaign
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Graduating Champions Campaign

- $80 million campaign publicly announced
- Raised $57.2 million to date
Graduating Champions Campaign
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The Humanities Center

- Fundraising target: $1.5 million (NEH Challenge Grant, by July 2019)
- Goal to qualify for $150,000 FY’16 match: $450,000
- Total raised this FY: $486,000
- Total raised since challenge began: $636,500
Presidential Transition & Campaign Planning

- President and Renate Crawford “Roll Out”
  - Heavy involvement of volunteers
- Comprehensive Campaign Planning
  - Wealth Screening complete
  - Staffing models being developed
  - Brief our next president on 7/27/16
  - Campaign timing
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