The Inter-University Council sprang from dire necessity. When, in 1873, the Ohio State University began to function, Ohio University and Miami University were old and well established. The appearance of a state-supported competitor was not very welcome. When Kent and Bowling Green were given university status considerably later, the competition grew sharper. Each institution in promoting itself often sought to disparage the others. Inevitably all suffered. None received as much in appropriations from the State as it otherwise might. Nevertheless, the State authorities were not pleased or happy. Conflicting pressures from many sides beset them and dealing with the universities was troublesome and difficult. More important, none of the schools was making the progress the people of the State would like to have seen. The need for harmony and order was apparent to the farsighted.

Some thought the answer was in "one big board," a statewide board of trustees to which the management of all the state universities should be committed.

This expedient was being tried in some other states, but in view of the setting and character of our universities, it seemed of doubtful value in Ohio. Our schools were founded at widely different times and places, had developed strong individual characteristics and had deep-seated jealousies.

Accordingly, it was suggested that, instead, a voluntary association be established to deal with the common problems of these schools, leaving internal affairs to each particular board.
Such a body was established by agreement; it was called
the Inter-University Council. Its membership consisted of the
president, business manager, and one member of the board of trustees
of each constituent school. At first, the membership was limited to
five schools: Ohio, Miami, Kent, Bowling Green, and Ohio State.
Later, when Wilberforce University became (in part) a state institution, it was also taken in.

The approach of the Council to its task was cautious.
Conscious of deep-seated differences the Council decided at first to
limit its discussions to subjects upon which agreement was easy.
After a year or two, it was agreed to present to the Legislature a
joint proposal for building appropriations. Such a joint request
for operating funds was felt to be beyond the limits of agreement.

Late in the Legislative session the Governor called me
as Chairman of the Council and asked whether an agreed set of askings
for current operations could not be presented. This was a challenge.
In an all-night session the challenge was met. An agreed request
was presented and approved.

Since then every approach to the General Assembly has
been made jointly. The effort has succeeded beyond all expectation.
A good deal of preliminary discussion has been required. But, always
an agreement has been reached and with continued success the Council
has grown in the consciousness of its strength. Because they have
been tested out on each other, each school's appropriation requests
are taken with more confidence by the State authorities. Every
school has profited.
For a long time the Council had no formal constitution. It rested upon the initial agreement upon which its members had come together.

In 1952 a generalized constitution was agreed to, the most important provision of which made the chairmanship rotate among the several presidents.

After some sixteen years of experience, I am of the opinion that the Council serves about every useful purpose in coordinating the common interests of the several schools. Local interests are left to local authority.

Any school is free to leave the Council at any time. I am sure none would think of doing so, now.

Howard L. Bevis

Feb. 28, 1955
Ohio’s Public Universities and a New Ohio Economy

Until the mid-1950s, Ohio and other Great Lakes States were the industrial heartland of America. Young people could look forward to graduating from high school and finding high paying jobs in the plants, mills and factories where their fathers and mothers had worked. A high school diploma was sufficient for most of these jobs, which tended to be high-wage, low-skill assembly line positions.

However, changing technologies and global competition have had a dramatic impact on this region’s economy as the Rustbelt states and foreign nations have attracted an ever-larger share of manufacturing plants and jobs. Thus, Ohio’s share of the nation’s manufacturing output fell from 8.5 percent in 1960 to 6.3 percent in 1985, and Ohio last year

Ohio’s share of the nation’s manufacturing output fell from 8.5 percent in 1960 to 6.3 percent in 1985, and Ohio last year 231,000 manufacturing jobs.

231,000 manufacturing jobs. (Note: All dates given in this document are the latest data available at the time of publication.)

In addition, manufacturing, even in a modestly optimistic projection, is unlikely to ever regain its historical relative importance in Ohio.

As a result, Ohio’s ranking on per capita personal income has dropped from 14th among the states in 1970 to 25th in 1987. In 1955, the average per capita income in Ohio was 12 percent above the national average, but by 1986 it had dropped to 6 percent below the national average.

Per capita income has dropped to 6 percent below the national average.

Today, most Ohio high school graduates without any postsecondary training face the prospect of low-paying, service-sector jobs or unemployment.

A different Ohio economy based on new technologies, new products and new jobs must compensate for the loss of traditional manufacturing jobs. However, critical to the process of attracting high-tech, knowledge-based industries is the availability of technical, scientific, professional and managerial employees.

The National Alliance of Business predicts that by 1990 three out of every four new jobs will require postsecondary education or training. Even today only 13 percent of high school graduates are employed in professional and managerial fields, while over 65 percent of college graduates are so employed.

In 1968, Ohio’s public universities stretched their resources to educate approximately 300,000 students. However, according to 1968 census data, Ohio ranked 40th in the nation in the percentage of college graduates (13.7 percent of the population) and, as late as last year, was also 40th nationally in state appropriations per student (18 percent below the national average).

Indeed, only 16 cents of every dollar spent on public education goes to higher education.

By 1990 three out of every four new jobs will require postsecondary education or training.

Since research has repeatedly shown that a top consideration in the location of high-tech firms is the availability of educated and skilled labor, it is no coincidence that states with first-rate systems of higher education attract burgeoning high-tech industries.

If Ohio’s spending for higher education continues to rank among the lowest in the nation, it cannot expect to compete with states that have the wisdom and foresight to plan for the labor needs of the new growth industries.

As the year 2000 approaches, Ohio must see that it be a part of the technological renaissance requires a well-educated labor force. According to the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services, employment in manufacturing will decline through 1995, while growth is most likely to occur in three categories: professional, paraprofessional and technical occupations; service occupations; and sales and related occupations.

Many of their new positions will require postsecondary education. For example, the national Council on Competency in Vocational education has projected that an additional 500,000 scientists and engineers will be needed by the year 2010. Ohio will have to educate its citizens to support and attract the industries in which these professionals will work.

Yes, at a time when Ohio needs college graduates, it ranks 35th in the nation in the percentage of high school students who go directly to college. In addition, minorities, particularly Blacks, will become a larger percentage of the state’s future labor force as the baby boomers retire and the number of traditional college age students decline.

Ohio must educate its share of the 500,000 new scientists and engineers the U.S. will need over the next 30 years.

Yet, college attendance among Blacks is low and declining. The enrollment of Ohio Black students declined from 8.9 percent to 7.6 percent between 1977 and 1987 although the number of Blacks in the general population increased.

A primary reason for this disturbing statistic is that Ohio students pay a considerably larger share of the cost of their college education than do students in states known for their well-educated, high technology labor force.

Consequently, Ohio’s comparatively low level of expenditures on higher education leads to a lower participation rate in higher education. Other states make the quest for a higher education more economically attractive. Ohio must act now to assure that all students, regardless of low and income in particular, can afford a college education.

Research and Development and the New Ohio Economy

Ohio’s future performance also will depend upon the technological innovations of its companies — on our ability to increase productivity and stimulate the development of new products and services. Unfortunately, Ohio’s spending for industrial research and development declined between 1973-85, while such spending was expanding by 6.8 percent annually in the nation and by over 30 percent in Illinois and Michigan.

Similarly, Ohio’s per capita share of federal research grants in 1984 was 52 percent below the national average.

Ohio’s public universities are striving to reverse this trend through both applied and basic research efforts, in areas such as information and communication technology, materials technology and bio-technology, which hold great promise for new resources, products and jobs.

Information and Communication Technology

Research in solid state microelectronic, computer and information sciences at The Ohio State University is conducting cutting-edge research in communication and computer science. The focus is on technologies which are complementary and which can be used to develop new technologies which can be used in the future to develop new products and services.

Research in information processing and other areas is greatly enhanced by the Ohio Supercomputer Center (OSC) located on the campus of The Ohio State University and linked to all Ohio colleges and universities. Thus, it provides an outstandingly shared computing resource for scientists and engineers across Ohio. One of the leading users, for example, is a Youngstown State University chemist who is using the enhanced research capabilities of the supercomputer to perform calculations on molecules to better understand their structure and interaction.

New Materials Technology

New materials technology holds great promise for new products and new markets. For example, The University of Akron’s Polymer Science Program conducts basic research related to product development in paper, plastics, fibers, sealants, adhesives, contact lenses and many other products.

Likewise, Kent State University’s Liquid Crystal Institute conducts research that involves liquid crystal displays as well as research with applications in cosmetics, lubricants and other areas.

Bowling Green State University’s unique Center for Photochemical Sciences is playing an important role in-

Continued on page 8.
Appropriations for Higher Education
1987-88
(Ranking by State)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Appropriations per Student</th>
<th>Appropriations per $1 of State &amp; Local Tax Revenue</th>
<th>Appropriations as a Percent of State &amp; Local Tax Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ohio State University, Kent State University, The University of Toledo, Miami University and Wright State University provide services upon request from both labor and management of Ohio companies. By nurturing cooperative labor-management relationships, these centers help create a more stable and positive work environment.

Materials and biotechnology studies exemplify university research that supports Ohio's economic development, transferring laboratory breakthroughs into competitive products and services.

The Ohio Board of Regents through its Academic Challenge, Research Challenge and Eminent Scholars programs is encouraging the development of centers of excellence on each campus, especially in basic and applied scientific research crucial to Ohio's future economy.

Already the first-round of Research Challenge awards, which totaled $27 million, have resulted in over $107 million in federal grants and other contracts, a four to one rate of return. If properly funded, Ohio public universities can develop the technology for Ohio's future while simultaneously generating more private and federal grant and contract support.

Despite these excellent research efforts by Ohio's public universities, more must be accomplished if Ohio is to remain competitive with other states. Approximately 30 states spend more per capita and per student in the development of their universities.

Research Challenge grants have stimulated a four to one rate of return — bringing more than $100 million to Ohio. Edison centers have attracted more than $140 million in private support.

Ohio's Public Universities and the Quality of Life in Ohio

Ohio's per capita share of federal research grants in 1984 was 42 percent below the national average, but Ohio's public universities are striving to reverse this trend.

The commercial potential of research in these centers is evident in that over 500 Ohio companies have already become sponsors of the Edison Centers. In total, the Edison Programs have created research partnerships which have enabled $100 million in state funds to attract more than $140 million in private support.

In addition to the Edison Programs, the Department of Development administers a grant program for university-based Centers for the Advancement of Labor Management Cooperation. These centers located at The Ohio State University...

Ohio's leaders will continue to come from the ranks of college graduates.

The hope of many parents whereby life for their children will be brighter and better.

In addition to those broad dramatic impacts, universities integrate the quality of life in many other ways. Through environmental and health research, through social service outreach programs, through cultural and athletic events, and through the education of thousands of helping professionals, such as doctors, nurses, dentists, teachers, counselors, social workers and psychologists, our universities make living in Ohio healthier and more comfortable, enjoyable and attractive.

Environmental Research

Ohio's water may be our most plentiful and valuable natural resource, and thus, most important for our long-term environmental and economic health. Many of our universities are working to protect this most precious resource.

Ohio's poor will continue to look to the public universities as a hope for the next generation.

The Ohio State University's Lake Erie Research Center was instrumental in cleaning up Lake Erie. The Water Resources Institute at Kent State University and the Ground Water Management Center at Wright State University, as well as the International Center for Water Resources Management at Central State University have instructional and research programs in environmental biology, aquatic ecology, groundwater geology, surface water hydrology and other areas necessary to address the major environmental problems in water and waste management.

Health Care and Research

Ohio's public university medical centers offer Ohioans the most advanced facilities and technologies and are often, as well, the places of choice for Ohioans who are most gravely ill or least able to pay for their own medical care.

In addition to educating Ohio's future physicians, our medical colleges conduct much research that holds great promise for alleviating disease and improving life. For example, the Medical College of Toledo is conducting neurological research that will help us better understand Alzheimer's disease.

The University of Cincinnati Medical Center recently received a $16.5 million Program of Excellence grant for the study of genetic causes of heart and lung disease.

Also, the Northeastern Ohio Universities College of Medicine's research in molecular biology provides more information about cancer.

At The Ohio State University's College of Medicine, the fourth largest in the United States, research in human vaccine and protein engineering can be applied to areas as diverse as the diagnosis and treatment of malignancies, the problems of contraception, AIDS, and of course, prevention of other infectious diseases.

Outreach Programs

Ohio's public universities have many academic programs which focus their research and service activities on providing outreach and assistance to citizens, governments and other groups.

The Ohio Urban University Program, with its focal point at
Ohio's natural resources will continue to be protected and enhanced by Ohio's public universities.

A counterpart to the Urban University program, the Rural University Program, which serves smaller communities near Athens, Oxford and Bowling Green, has provided the Ohio Corporation of Appalachian Development with strategies for employment and business creation to assist those with lower incomes in rural areas.

The School of Law at The University of Akron through its Law Clinic provides public service to indigent and underrepresented sectors of the community. In addition, the Joint Center for Taxation Studies assists the state with tax policy studies directed toward legislative changes regarding state, local, and federal taxes.

Similarly programs exist throughout the public university system. It would be rare not to find professional schools offering their expertise to their surrounding communities.

In health care and other areas of service, Ohio's public universities permeate the state, serving virtually everyone in some way. At Bowling Green State University, the College of Musical Arts with its recognized emphasis in contemporary music has targeted the New Music Festival, begun in 1980, for increased visibility and participation by faculty and students in the community.

Fiscal Impact of Ohio's Public Universities on Ohio's Economy

Total = 8.0 Billion

Employee Expenditures $3 Billion

Business, Construction & Visitors Expenditures $1 Billion

A total of 107 Miami University graduates are currently active in coaching or administrative work at the professional or collegiate level. With its international team, Bowling Green State University has gained attention on the international level.

Most helping professionals who work in Ohio—nurses and doctors, teachers and counselors—are graduates of Ohio's state colleges and universities.

During the 1983-84 season, Bowling Green State University became the first member of the Mid-American Hockey Association to win the national title. Individually and collectively, these sporting events make Ohio a more attractive and enjoyable place for students and for all Ohio citizens.

The Helping Professions

The quality of life throughout the state of Ohio is enhanced by the availability of helping professionals such as doctors, nurses, teachers, social workers, counselors, and dentists, who are trained in our universities and whose professional skills and expertise make life in Ohio more attractive and enjoyable.

For example, Ohio medical colleges and schools had over 5,000 students enrolled in medicine at 1983-84. Moreover, 100% of all practicing dentists in Ohio are graduates of The Ohio State University, and the vast majority of practicing Ohio veterinarians are also graduates of The Ohio State University, Bowling Green State University, The Ohio University, and the University of Cincinnati.

Fiscal Impact of Higher Education on Ohio's Economy

Ohio's public universities have a dramatic impact on Ohio's economy through their employee and student expenditures and through the universities' business expenditures and capital construction projects. In addition, the alumni of Ohio's public universities continually contribute to the state's economic well being with their increased earning power made possible by their educational attainment.

Of the more than 1 million alumni of Ohio's public institutions, two-thirds reside in Ohio, and these college graduates

Continued on page 15.
Continued from page 9.

mean a higher standard of living for Ohio
citizens. In 1986, the average college
graduate's monthly income was almost
$1,000 higher than the income of an
employee with only a high school diploma.

During the fiscal year
1987-88, the employees
of Ohio's public universities
had a spendable income of
over $1.5 billion.

Thus, the college graduate makes
about $1,200 more a year than the high
school graduate, or approximately a
halff
million dollars more across a lifetime.
Given this average increased earning
power, graduates of Ohio's public uni-
versities residing in the state add more
than $7 billion annually to Ohio's econ-
y
omy and its base.

During the fiscal year 1987-88, the
employees of Ohio's public universities
had a spendable income of over $1.5 bil-
lion. These dollars translate into direct
spending into the Ohio economy plus in-
direct spending of another $1.5 billion an-
nually. Thus, through their direct and
indirect spending, employees of Ohio's
public universities contribute at least
$3 billion annually to Ohio's econ-
y
omy.

Ohio's public universities provided
education to a total of 290,216 students in
the 1987-88 fiscal year. Based upon esti-
mates of expense budgets per student, these
students spent over $1.6 billion in the
1987-88 academic year.

In 1986, the average col-
lege graduate's monthly in-
ncome was almost $1,000
higher than the income of
an employee with only a
high school diploma.

With additional indirect spending, the
students attending Ohio's public institu-
tions spent nearly $4 billion on their
room, board, transportation and personal
costs, fees and books were
excluded from these projections since
they are primarily institutional revenues.

Total Annual Impact
of Ohio's Public Universities

Employee Expenditures $3 Billion
Business Construction
& Visitors Expenditures $1 Billion
Student Expenditures $4 Billion

Admitted Earning
Power of Alumni $7 Billion

The Ohio State University's campus dur-
ing 1987 and spent more than $30 mil-

$15 Billion

However, out-of-state students generate
millions of dollars not only by their ex-
penditures for room, board, transportation
and personal expenses, but also by the
out-of-state tuition and fees they pay
while attending Ohio's universities.

Ohio's public universities provided
education to a total of 290,216 students in
the 1987-88 fiscal year. Based upon esti-
mates of expense budgets per student, these
students spent over $1.6 billion in the
1987-88 academic year.

For example, at Miami University
during the 1987-88 academic year, there
were 4,177 non-Ohio undergraduate stu-
dents enrolled. These students spent $22
million on instruction, general fees and
tuition plus $4.8 million on room and
board for a total of $26.8 million.

Public universities' business expendi-
tures within Ohio during the 1987-88 fis-
cal year were over $500 million. Given
the multiplier effect, the responding or
indirect spending of this expenditure is
more than $700 million annually. Addi-
tionally, the universities' construction and
renovation projects, which are predomin-
antly undertaken by Ohio contractors,
have put approximately $1.20 million an-
nually into the Ohio economy.

Visitors to the state campuses who
attend professional, cultural and athletic ac-

tivities generate still more revenues for
the state's economy. For example, ap-
proximately 3.5 million visitors were on

The cumulative economic impact of
Ohio's public universities annually is $15
billion.

The cumulative economic impact of
Ohio's public universities annually is $15
billion. This projection is based upon em-
ployee direct spending and indirect re-
spending, students direct and indirect
spending annually, construction and vis-
itors expenditures, plus the $7 billion of
added earnings power spent annually by
the graduates of Ohio's public universities
residing in the state. Of course, this added
earnings power contributes dra-

naturally to Ohio's tax base.

The public universities of Ohio contrib-
ute to the economic well-being of the
state in numerous ways. Whether it be the
added earnings power of the alumni or the
direct and indirect spending of the
employees, students, and business ex-
penditures, the universities are a vital ele-
ment of the economy. The additional
expenditures of visitors to the various

Campuses plus the garnering of external
funding provide revenues to the state that
would not otherwise be possible.

More to
Accomplish for
Ohio's Future

While Ohio's public universities have
accomplished much, they must do even

more to assure Ohio's future. Other states
recognize the critical role of higher edu-
cation in the development of their econ-
y
oms and thus are working to improve
their universities. If Ohio is to compete
effectively, its universities must remain
competitive. However, as noted earlier,
Ohio ranks 40th among the states in ap-
propriations per student.

Indeed, only 16 cents of every state tax
dollar, not including federal and local
revenue, goes to higher public education.
While the universities have accomplished
much even with this comparatively low
level of funding, they must receive at least
the average level of support nation-
ally if Ohio is to begin to realize its po-
tential. With adequate funding, Ohio's public
universities can:

- Deliver a college education that is
  affordable and available for Ohio's
  citizens;
- Provide the technical, scientific, man-
  agerial and professional employees who
  will be critical in Ohio's future economy;
- Create new knowledge and research
  which can be transferred to new products
  and services;
- Develop a first-class system of higher
  education recognized for its high quality
  and responsiveness to state needs.

In a global marketplace in which in-
dustries and jobs are becoming increas-
ingly dependent upon a state's ability to
educate its citizens to at least the bache-
lor's level, adequate support of higher ed-
ucation must be imperative. Our public
universities remain our best invest-
ment in Ohio's future.
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OSU public records battle heats up for a second time

By Julie Havelka
Lantern staff writer

It could be called an open-and-shut case. Professors want employee records open to the public. The university wants them shut.

This is partly in response to an Ohio Supreme Court decision last summer, William Calvin James, an assistant professor in the Department of Geological Sciences, sued Ohio State to get access to his promotion and tenure file after he was unsuccessful in earning tenure.

The Court ruled that promotion and tenure file of professors fell under the Public Records Law, making them open to any member of the public. The Court also ruled James was entitled to see his file, as well as the files of other professors.

Yesterday, members of the American Association of University Professors denounced efforts by Ohio State to privatize these records.

The Inter-University Council, a lobbying organization of public universities, is trying to amend the Public Records Law to restrict public access to university records.

John Blackburn, associate professor in the Max M. Fisher College of Business, said the Inter-University Council is trying to get the Public Records Law amended to prohibit access to promotion and tenure files, in addition to administrative search documents, donor profile records, personnel files, library circulation records and intellectual property.

"The university would be able to operate in secrecy," Blackburn said. "They're (IUC) asking for a massive change in the Public Records Law that would make it impossible for people to find out what's going on around this place."

Blackburn said professors are concerned most about prohibiting access to promotion and tenure files.

"I've had professors come to me and say that they have felt empowered because of the Supreme Court's decision that allows them access to not only their promotion and tenure files, but also the evaluation files of other professors, so they can see if there's any favoritism going on around this place."

"I'm not sure we're going to change everything we'd like to change, but my guess is we're going to have more support on the intellectual property issue."

--- Herb Asher

He said university spending, for example, should be public record. "We're trying to come up with very carefully defined exemptions in certain areas for records," Asher said. "I would be very distraught to see any university effort to protect those from public inspection," Edmund said.

Edmund said publishing documents and the salary of professors especially teacher evaluations should be kept public.

"I would be very distraught to see any university effort to protect those from public inspection," Edmund said.

Edmund said keeping recommendation letters of professors confidential will assure high-quality faculty.

"We'd have lesser quality people getting tenure because people would be less likely to point out flaws in a candidate under a system where they know that everyone can read what they've written," Edmund said.
Regents may tie debts to instructional subsidy

By Tom Spring

Ohio State has joined other members of the Inter-University Council in asking the state to delay enacting a plan to fund debt service on buildings through the Board of Regents' formula for distributing instructional subsidies. The Regents have proposed that debt service, money paid to retire bonds issued by the state for construction projects, be paid through university budgets rather than from a state-wide account.

President Gee and Ohio University President Robert Gibbons told the Senate Finance Committee on May 10 that the Regents did not consult with them until April 27, leaving inadequate time to study and respond to the Regents' proposal.

"We support the concept of assigning debt service back to the campuses," said Herb Asher, special assistant to Gee for legislative affairs, "but we wish that the implementation discussions and consultations had begun a year ago before we sign off on it, we want to know how it's going to work."

"The devil will be in the details and we want to look at them closely," said William J. Shurtleff, vice president for finance. "Our concern is that money be distributed in an equitable and fair manner. We have an established campus and we need a greater amount of money to renovate old facilities."

Gee and Gibbons asked the Senate to delay placing the proposal into statute until universities have considered it and the state has reviewed the Regents' overall formula for distributing instructional subsidies. The review is to be conducted and completed by July 1, 1996.

"We're proposing a review of the funding formula in general," Gee told the committee. "The old formula is simply not compatible with the new world of quality."

For some time, Ohio State and other universities with stable enrollments have been at odds with the Regents over the funding formula because the distribution is based on enrollment, rather than on how well universities meet their missions and objectives.

The move to make universities accountable for debt service on new construction complicates the picture. Currently, the state funds debt service as a line item in the Regents' budget.

The Regents contend that money spent on capital projects is unavailable for educating students. Because debt service is paid on the state level, universities have no incentive to be conservative in planning new facilities. The annual tab for debt service on higher education projects has risen to over $300 million at a time when instructional subsidies have declined.

Last year, the state approved $104 million in capital projects for Ohio State, 17 percent of the state total awarded.

The Regents proposed to give universities more control over and accountability for capital spending decisions. A study commission, established by the Legislature in 1993, agreed and asked the Regents to consult with universities on distribution.

"Discussions of how the proposal would be implemented are just now beginning, and we believe it would be premature to lock this provision in statute at this time," Gibbons said. "The only mechanism for implementation that has been suggested would embed the debt service costs within the instructional subsidy line, making even more complex the understanding of the formula distribution and its impact on different institutions."

Gibbons said that making revising the subsidy formula and changing capital funding inseparable issues that the state should consider together in the review of funding higher education.

Among the concerns cited by the Inter-University Council:

- Neither the bill nor the formula ensures that any savings from reduced debt service would go to instructional subsidies.
- Neither guarantees that universities won't be forced to use instructional subsidies to pay debt service on community projects. In the past, the Legislature has tied non-academic projects such as the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and American Flora to nearby campuses to satisfy constitutional bonding requirements.

Gee urges more support

By Tom Spring

Ohio's public universities are asking the Ohio Senate to add $55 million for higher education in the two-year state budget.

The Inter-University Council is seeking $30 million for instructional subsidies, $19.4 million to help improve technology on campus to enhance instruction and performance, and $5.6 million to guarantee each university at least a 3 percent increase in base operating support. Inflation is currently about 3.6 percent.

IUC is composed of Ohio's 13 public universities and two free-standing medical colleges.

Under the House-passed version of the budget, Ohio State would benefit with a 3.1 percent increase for the Columbus campus, based on the Board of Regents' formula for distributing instructional subsidies to colleges and universities.

Speaking before the Senate Finance Committee on May 10, President Gee said, "Higher education is the single most important economic engine driving our state. Our impact extends to numerous areas that stimulate spending, jobs, taxes, out-of-state revenues and community services."

He added that Ohio's public universities and medical colleges — and their employees, students and visitors — spent nearly $5.5 billion in Ohio during 1991, producing a total economic impact of $10.72 billion, or more than nine times the state's $1.19 billion investment in higher education.

"If we were on the New York Stock Exchange, we would be the hottest stock in America," Gee said.

The $55 million would help enhance Ohio's investment in higher education's economic engine, according to Gee and Robert Gibbons, president of Ohio University.

Gibbons told senators that adding $15 million per year to the instructional subsidies would help universities strengthen programs and services that were hurt by budget cuts in recent years.

Adding $10.8 million in fiscal 1996 and $8.6 million in fiscal 1997 would help campuses deal with a three-year "half-life" of technological equipment used in instructing students. "Our universities must make tremendous investments to provide the learning environment and experiences rightfully expected by students and their future employers in today's highly competitive marketplace," Gibbons said.