<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Andrew Clark, Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Ross Woodard, Chief Marketing Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Chris Spohn, Chief Admissions Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Admissions Floor Tour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>Rocky Sheng, Chief Administrative Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td>Lunch Service / Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Jane McAuliffe, Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>Waypoint Outcomes Panel Discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Constellation Product Demonstration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Diane Thompson, Secretary and General Counsel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Dan Devine, Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Bill Walton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Andrew Clark, Closing Remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Forward-looking Statements**

This presentation may include “forward-looking statements” within the meaning of Section 27A of the Securities Act of 1933 and Section 21E of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. Forward-looking statements are subject to risks and uncertainties and actual results may differ materially from those reflected in the forward-looking statements. Important factors that could cause actual results to differ materially include, but are not limited to, those risk factors discussed in Bridgepoint’s filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission, including the Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q for the quarter ended March 31, 2010 (filed on May 3, 2010). Forward-looking statements speak only as of the date the statements are made. Bridgepoint assumes no obligation to update forward-looking statements to reflect actual results, changes in assumptions or changes in other factors affecting forward-looking information, except to the extent required by applicable securities laws.

**Non-GAAP financial measures**

Some of the financial measures to be discussed in the presentation – including non-GAAP instructional costs and services, non-GAAP marketing and promotional expense and non-GAAP general and administrative expense – are expressed on a non-GAAP basis and have been adjusted as detailed in Bridgepoint’s earnings press release for the quarter and year ended December 31, 2009, which release is attached as Exhibit 99.1 to the Form 8-K furnished to the Securities and Exchange Commission on March 2, 2010. The earnings press release contains GAAP results for the periods presented and required GAAP-to-non-GAAP reconciliations.
Andrew Clark  
Chief Executive Officer

Higher Education – Bridgepoint Education  
•November 2003

Career Education – American InterContinental University  
•Divisional Vice President of Operations, CECO  
•Chief Operating Officer, AIU

Apollo Group – University of Phoenix  
•Regional Vice President  
•Vice President/Campus Director  
•Director of Admissions

Education  
•University of Phoenix, MBA  
•Pacific Lutheran University, BA

Boards/Community Involvement  
•Bridgepoint Education  
•San Diego Symphony  
•San Diego Regional Economic Development Corporation  
•Junior Achievement
Overview of Bridgepoint

Best-in-class model for higher education, providing students an affordable, accessible high-quality education - online and on campus

Enrollment
65,788 students as of March 31, 2010 (56.5% y/y growth)

Online
99% of students enrolled exclusively online

Accreditation
Accreditation through the HLC of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

Degrees
- Bachelor's: 76%
- Masters or Doctorate: 13%
- Associate or Undecided: 11%

Bridgepoint Enrollment Mix
- Business: 44%
- Healthcare / Psychology: 21%
- Education: 20%
- Social Science: 15%
Significant Market Opportunity
Migration to Online Education

• $410 billion postsecondary market

• Online college education fastest growing segment of the market
  – Enrollments grew from 400,000 in 2002 to 1.7 million in 2007, a CAGR of 34%

• Growth of online education is supported by:
  – Large pool of adults without college education, 112 million or 67% of population above age 25
  – 33 million adults in the U.S. with some college experience but no degree

• Obama Administration Goals
  – Provide greater support and access to higher education
  – Reach highest proportion of college graduates by 2020
    – Will require 60 million graduates
    – Current estimates show shortfall of 13 to 16 million graduates
    – Private sector participation critical to achieving goals
## Student value proposition addresses key challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Affordability</th>
<th>Transferability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Tuition Costs</td>
<td>Tuition below Title IV limits</td>
<td>Per BPI research, 1 of 6 institutions in U.S. (and only for-profit) to accept up to 99 transfer credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictions on Credit Transferability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Trusted, Quality Options</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage: Familiarity, trust and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal &amp; Professional Commitments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility: Online delivery; weekly starts; sequential courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Affordability**: Tuition below Title IV limits
- **Transferability**: Per BPI research, 1 of 6 institutions in U.S. (and only for-profit) to accept up to 99 transfer credits
- **Heritage**: Familiarity, trust and community
- **Accessibility**: Online delivery; weekly starts; sequential courses
93% of AU alumni who also attended traditional colleges or universities feel the quality of education at Ashford is the same as, or higher than, such institutions. (1)

97% of AU’s students would recommend AU to others. (2)

Upon graduation, 24% of Ashford’s bachelor’s degree earners have chosen to pursue an advanced degree at Ashford University. (2)

Bachelor’s degree earners saw their salaries increase 16.7% to $44,370. (1)

Graduate degree earners saw their salaries increase 23% to $59,375. (1)

From the point of completion of the second course, we show 4-year graduation rates of 49% and 65% for our undergraduate and graduate school populations, respectively.

Our retention rate exceeds 60%.

(1) Source: Internal survey – Ashford University Alumni; conducted by Bridgepoint Education
(2) Source: Internal survey – Ashford University students; conducted by Bridgepoint Education
Focus on regulatory compliance

Strong culture of compliance

- Ongoing investment in compliance personnel
- System of checks and balances
- More than 90 individuals focus solely on regulatory compliance

Heavily regulated:

- Higher Learning Commission
- Office of Inspector General
- Department of Education/Negotiated Rulemaking
- Gainful Employment
  - Ashford well positioned on student debt for bachelor’s recipients
Future Growth Opportunities

Expansion of current programs

- Current program mix at Ashford is comprehensive and addresses key degree programs
- New programs to be developed to address high demand degrees such as information services and nursing
- Focus on expansion of graduate programs at both institutions
  - Program approval by HLC

Constellation

- Dedicated learning platform to enhance student learning and eliminate need for text books
- Revenue contribution will grow over next two years as platform expands to address more classes
- Developed internally, all rights owned by BPI, no royalty stream associated with courses

Acquisitions

- Continuous evaluation of opportunities
  - Program specific
  - Domestic channel or geographic expansion
  - International opportunities
2010 Quality Initiatives

Improve student preparedness

• Student Commitment Orientation (Q3 2010)
  • Focus on students with low or zero transfer credits
  • Evaluation of reading, writing and math skills – provides immediate feedback
  • Orientation to the online learning environment
  • Average age increased to 22 for Ashford associate program from 18
  • Full attendance required for first course

Enrollment beta group

• Several scenarios being tested to understand business impact of potential changes in “safe harbors”
• We expect to be well positioned by July 2011
Social Responsibility

Strong partner in the communities that we serve
- Drive recruitment efforts
- Expands brand awareness

Focus of our programs is to benefit teachers, youth and military

Executives are encouraged to participate on local boards of national charities

All employees are given opportunities to volunteer and are recognized for “giving back”
### Experienced management team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Joined BPI</th>
<th>Years in Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Clark</td>
<td>President &amp; Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Devine</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Spohn</td>
<td>SVP / Chief Admissions Officer</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane McAuliffe</td>
<td>SVP / Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Sheng</td>
<td>SVP / Chief Administrative Officer</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Woodard</td>
<td>SVP / Chief Marketing Officer</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene Dackerman</td>
<td>SVP of Human Resources</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Ashbrook</td>
<td>SVP / Chief Information Officer</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Thompson</td>
<td>SVP, Secretary and General Counsel</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Four Core Values:**

- Integrity
- Ethics
- Service
- Accountability
MARKETING
Ross Woodard
Chief Marketing Officer

Higher Education – Bridgepoint Education
• June 2004

Experience
• Interactive Marketing and Advertising - Sports and Fitness Industry

Education
• San Diego State University, BA
Marketing Organization

- Chief Marketing Officer
  - Ross Woodard
- Associate Vice President, Creative
- Director of Marketing
- Director of Public Relations
- Director of Research
- Director of Community Relations
Key Marketing Drivers in Bridgepoint’s Success

• Clear communication of value proposition
• Strategic approach to new program selection
• Continuous optimization of prospect quality
Clear Communication of Student Value Proposition

Ashford Brand Positioning-Online:

Balance your job with online coursework as you earn your Bachelor’s or Master’s degree. You’ll find Ashford University, founded in 1918, is an ideal choice for you whether you’re a working adult or haven’t yet completed your degree. Count on Ashford University to provide a high-quality degree program that is:

Affordable - Benefit from one of the lowest program costs available online. Call 866-711-1700 today to learn more.

Accelerated - Earn your degree in as few as 12-24 months. Classes are 5-6 weeks and are taken one at a time. Plus, you can transfer up to 99 credits toward your Bachelor’s degree. Call 866-711-1700 today to learn more.

Convenient - Enjoy the flexibility of online courses...24 hours a day. Online classes are asynchronous, so like email, you can login anytime to participate and post your work in class. Call 866-711-1700 today to learn more.
Validating the Value Proposition

- Marketing Surveys quarterly
- Admission Advisor Feedback
- Content Audit Process
- Competitor Analysis
- Multi-Variant Testing
### Cost Per Credit Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERGRAD COST PER CREDIT</th>
<th>% DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashford (Military):</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMU:</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford University:</td>
<td>$372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Canyon:</td>
<td>$435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Tech:</td>
<td>$445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIU^*:</td>
<td>$461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capella^*:</td>
<td>$465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMUC`:</td>
<td>$499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strayer^:</td>
<td>$506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argosy:</td>
<td>$510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Phoenix:</td>
<td>$530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeVry:</td>
<td>$556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplan^:</td>
<td>$557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ Quarter credits converted to semester credit equivalent.
* Has 2 tuition cost based on number of credits taken. Weighted avg Shown.
` For non-Maryland residents only.
Strategic Approach to New Program Selection

Utilize multiple data points to identify high demand online programs:

• Education Dynamics research on high demand online programs
• Eduventures custom research on new program opportunities
• Internal feedback from admissions team
• Review of internal concentration and specialization data
• Pass high demand program research to academics for review
## Education Dynamics - Top 15 Online Degree Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Business Administration &amp; MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>K-12 Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Health Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Programs currently offered
- Programs don’t fit new program strategy
Online Degree Program Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undergraduate Programs</th>
<th>Graduate Programs</th>
<th>Doctoral Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTD 2010</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Undergraduate Programs
- Graduate Programs
- Doctoral Programs
Concentrations, Specializations and Minors

• Concentration – transfer 12 units in a particular area of study
• Specialization – teach 9-21 units in a particular area of study
• Minor – teach 18 units in a particular area of study

Benefits:
• Add breadth to program offerings
• Serve as research for new program development
• Enables breadth in advertising within academic areas of interest
• Do not require HLC approval
Concentration, Specialization and Minor Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Concentrations</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Specializations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Minors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Specializations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Specializations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuous Optimization Of Prospect Quality

• Primary source of prospect inquiry is interactive media
• Utilize approximately 40-50 prospect sources per month
• 30 day contracts with prospect sources enables flexibility
• Optimize based on conversion and cost per application
• Test 2-3 new prospect sources monthly
• Unlike competitors, little need to advertise in local markets
Marketing Summary

• Strong student value proposition resonates with prospects
• High prospect conversion
• Differentiated Student
ADMISSIONS
Chris Spohn
Chief Admissions Officer

Higher Education - Bridgepoint Education
• January 2004

Career Education Corporation
• Vice President of Marketing & Advertising, American InterContinental University

Apollo Group – University of Phoenix
• Senior Director of Enrollment – Southern California
• Senior Director of Enrollment – Online Campus

Education
• Azusa Pacific University, BA
Comprehensive Training and Staff Development

A student’s path to success

10 Day Comprehensive Training Program (4 major assessments)
• Academic (Programs, School History, Mission Statements, Compliance)
• Recruitment Skills
• Finance Options
• Final Assessment

Post training assessment/monitoring – “Level 2”
• Systems review
• Q&A from training into practice
• Theory into practice

Ongoing coaching/development
• Splitting work with Enrollment Managers
• Formalized “refresher courses”
• Ongoing compliance training
• New Programs Training
Admission Metrics/Measurement

CRM
• Prospect Distribution/Optimization
• Speed to prospect
• Real-time reporting
• Analysis
• AU Advantage

Dedicated recruitment teams
• Programmatic
• Graduation Level
• Live Chat

Skills-based routing
• Military
• Corporate
Enrollment Advisor Growth

- Proactive monitoring procedures

2006 – 2009 Growth 689%
Military Development

315,000 new recruits per year are eligible for education grants
- Army 82,968
- Marines 34,212
- Navy 35,112
- Air Force 26,376
- National Guard 136,000

Focus on referral generation (low acquisition costs)

Strategy includes:
- Military Grant at the $250 per credit level
  - Tuition Assistance, Veteran Affairs, Spouses of Military & DOD Personnel
- Provide book grants for entire program
- Transferability of credits
- Letter-of-Instruction program
- GoArmyEd.com
Military Student Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Student Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>9,181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corporate Development

Focus on companies that offer $3,000 a year or more Tuition Assistance

Two-part Strategy
• Corporate / Development
• National Accounts

Offer strong value proposition:
• Transferability of credits
• Corporate training assessment
• Leverage of Tuition Assistance dollars

Build brand awareness through customer service initiatives
• Formal Corporate Partnerships
• National Alliances
• Theory into practice
Top Accounts with Minimum of $5,000 Tuition Assistance
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS
Admissions
Floor Tour
Rocky Sheng
Chief Administrative Officer

Higher Education – Bridgepoint Education
• January 2004

Apollo Group – University of Phoenix
• VP Campus Director
• Senior Director of Enrollment
• Director of Enrollment
• Enrollment Advisor

Educator
• University Classroom

Education
• University of Phoenix, MA
• San Diego State University, BA
Operations Organization

Chief Administrative Officer
Rocky Sheng

VP of Data Analytics
- Director of Institutional Research
  - Associate Director of Institutional Research

VP of Iowa Online Center
- Associate Director of Student Services
- Associate Director of Financial Services

Divisional Vice President of Finance
- Assoc. Dir. of Financial Aid & Policy & Compliance
- Associate Directors of Financial Services

VP of Real Estate
- Director of Facilities

Director of Student Services - UoR
- Associate University Registrar - UoR
- Director of Student Affairs
- Director of Policy & Implementation
- Registrar - AU
- Director of Matriculation
- Associate Directors of Matriculation

VP of Administrative Services - BPE

VP of Business Solutions - BPE

VP of Student Services

Vice President/CEO
Waypoint Outcomes

Divisional VP of Student Services

Associate Director of Military Student Services

Associate Directors of Student Services
Team Approach / PODS

POD Make-up
- 15 Enrollment Advisors
- 2 Academic Advisors
- 3 Financial Services Advisors
- Scalable POD Approach

POD Value
- Accountability
- Seamless integration
- Individual / Team goals
- Service-oriented
- Communications
- One point of contact
Student Services

- Academic Advisors
- Student Services Coordinators
- Performance Metrics
- Active Case-Load Percentages
  - Drops
  - Re-entries

Financial Services

- Financial Service Advisors
- Associate Financial Service Advisors
- Performance Metrics
- ACS
Registrar’s Office

• Performance Metrics
• Admissions Coordinators
• Transcript Aging Report
• Matriculation Coordinators
• MC Report
• OAP / CVUE Validations
Retention Focus

- Performance Metrics
- POD Architecture
- Retention Committee
- SOS Letter Strategy
- Ombudsman Department
Ashford University Retention

- 2006-07: 62%
- 2007-08: 63%
- 2008-09: 62%
Data Analytics / University Services

- Institutional Research
  - IPEDS
  - Surveys

- Policy and Implementation
  - Communications Review Committee
  - Catalog

- Student Affairs
  - ADA
  - Alumni
Facilities

California
• Current Corporate square footage – 590,000
• 2010/2011 additional square footage – 275,000

Iowa
• Call center square footage – 37,000
• Campus buildings square footage – 286,000
• Acquired open space – 128 acres

Colorado
• Campus buildings square footage – 31,500

Space Planning
Facility Management
Liaison to building management and brokers
Graduation

Two graduation ceremonies annually in May & December
- Held at the Clinton campus in the gym

May 2010 Graduation
- 680 online graduates
- 41 campus graduates
- 2,696 family and guests

December 2009 Graduation
- 239 online graduates
- 39 campus graduates
- 1,314 family and guests

Total online graduates to date to attend a campus ceremony exceeds 1,800
Total online graduates to date exceeds 10,000
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS
ACADEMIC QUALITY
Jane McAuliffe, Ph.D.
Chief Academic Officer

Higher Education – Bridgepoint Education
• July 2005

EDMC – Argosy University
• President, Argosy-Sarasota
• Vice President of Academic Affairs, Argosy-Sarasota
• Program Chair/Department Head, Argosy-Atlanta

Career Education – American InterContinental University
• Vice President of Academic Affairs, AIU-Atlanta

Apollo Group – University of Phoenix
• Dean
• Associate Dean
• Program Chair/Department Head
• Curriculum Developer
• Instructor

Educator
• Private and Public K-12 Classroom
• University Classroom (traditional and online)

Education
• Arizona State University, Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction (focus in Special Education)
• Arizona State University, MA
• Arizona State University, BA
University Board of Trustees

Ashford University
Local and Historical Representation
• Sister Ruth Cox, Sister of St. Francis
• Ms. Donna Oliver, Former President and CEO Mercy Medical Center, Iowa
• Polly Bukta, Former Speaker Pro-Tem, Iowa House of Representatives

National Representation
• Dr. Peter Ewell, VP, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
• Dr. Peter Negroni, Senior VP, College Board
• Ms. Karen Steinberg, SVP Council for Adult and Experiential Learning
• Dr. Bill Wenrich, Chancellor Emeritus, Dallas County Community College
• Mr. Dino D’Auria, Chairman, EVP Regional Manager, Pacific Western Bank
• Dr. Paula Kelly, VP of Development, Monarch School (school for homeless and at-risk children) and former academic leadership in entrepreneurial education and international business

University of the Rockies
Local and Historical Representation
• Lieutenant Colonel Dr. Donald M. Bird, Chairman, Chemistry Department Head, United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, original board member
• Dr. Dick W. Gee, original board member and faculty
• Stephen R. Dierks, original board member, community representative, Financial consultant

National Representation
• Jeffrey C. Jensen, Entrepreneur
• Steve Isbister, BPE VP Compliance
• Dr. Deborah Blue, Chancellor, Contra Costa Community College, California
• Ms. Lori Trofemuk, Labor Relations Advocate, Office of Labor Relations, UCSD
Regional Accreditation -
Higher Learning Commission

Ashford University
• 1950 Originally accredited
• 2006 Comprehensive Visit – received full 10 years of re-accreditation
• 2010 Focused Visit

University of the Rockies
• 2003 Originally accredited
• 2008 Comprehensive Visit – received 7 years of re-accreditation

Ashford and Rockies Self Studies were both selected as model documents by HLC

Two Ashford Staff HLC Assessment Mentors

President of AU and Chairman of UoR Board are HLC consultant-evaluators
Programs and Course Development

- Focused on ensuring superior learning outcomes
- High demand fields
- Developed by faculty/specialists in that field of study
- Curriculum teams support faculty and academic leadership in development
- Courses formally reviewed annually to ensure effective instruction and relevancy in today’s workplace
- Standardized to ensure quality, scalable and consistent results
- Both universities have courses endorsed by Quality Matters
Program Development Process

Marketing Data Programs in Demand Strategic Plan

New Program Task Force: Proposed Rollout Schedule

Program Structure & Courses Deans, Prog. Directors, Faculty

To Higher Learning Commission

YES

NO

Approval Process, Governance (College, Curriculum, Faculty & Board)

Courses Built: Content, Assignments, etc.

Review: Select Faculty/Experts to Develop Course; Dean, Prog. Dir, Curr. Coord Monitor Development

Seek HLC Approval

HLC Approval?

NO

YES

Review of Each Course and Upload into eCollege

Yes

Prog. Structure
Write Program Outcomes
Write Course Description
Course Outcomes
Select Textbooks

Review: Dean Program Director Curriculum Coord.
Academic Support for Students

Personal Writing Coach

• Undergraduate students assigned Teaching Assistant in beginning courses to serve as personal writing coach
• Assists faculty in evaluating writing assignments using interactive rubrics to deliver feedback

Tutors

• Unlimited access to Smarthinking, an online tutorial service for writing, math, statistics and accounting
• 9,834 hours of tutoring services utilized by students in 2009

Writing Center

• Virtual writing tutor where students can interact with an avatar 24/7
• Sample essays
• Automated thesis sentence developer
• APA guidelines and samples
• Automated citation and reference generator
• Tutorials for the online library, MS Word and PowerPoint
Faculty Selection Process

Faculty Candidate Screening & Evaluation (Resume, Transcripts, Interview)

New Faculty Training Three Interactive Courses

Candidate Review: Candidate Performance, Approach, Interactions & Technical Skills

New Faculty Interview
Role of Student
AU Policies
AU Expectations
Interaction with AU Team

New Faculty Orientation
Role of Student
AU Policies
AU Expectations
Interaction with AU Team

New Faculty Practice Course
Practical Applications of Previous Courses
Class Facilitation
L&D Team Monitor

Classroom & Professional Development

Faculty Development Monthly Courses-skill Enhancement
Topic Selections for Specific Skills
Mandatory Training (i.e. FERPA)

Approved
YES
NO
Notification

Approved
YES
NO
Notification
Online Adjunct Faculty Growth

2006 – 2009 Growth 930%

- 2006: 236
- 2007: 851
- 2008: 1,132
- 2009: 2,430
Faculty

Quality of core faculty drive success
• Evaluate and train new faculty
• Provide ongoing classroom support
• Focus on continued professional development
• Create a sense of community across the nation

Strong academic credentials
• 87% of AU faculty teaching graduate courses are terminally degreed
• 100% of UoR faculty are terminally degreed
• Average faculty member has 10 years teaching experience
Assessment of Learning
Assessment

Model
- Mission driven
- Faculty owned
- Higher Learning Commission Assessment Academy
- Course outcomes map to program outcomes and ultimately institutional outcomes

Multifaceted system of measurement
- Direct Measurements
  - Course embedded assessments
  - Capstone course evaluations
  - Tests and exams
  - Portfolio evaluations
  - Papers/projects
  - Critical thinking exams
- Indirect Measurements
  - End of course surveys
  - Faculty survey data
  - External survey data (Noel-Levitz)
  - External reviews
- Transparency
  - Quality Matters
  - Transparency by Design
Survey Results

End of Course Survey
- **85%** of students surveyed rated the quality of the course material as “**Very High Quality or High Quality**”
- **84%** of students surveyed rated the quality of the course as “**Very High Quality or High Quality**”
- **85%** of students surveyed rated the quality of the instructor as “**Very High Quality or High Quality**”

Noel-Levitz 2009 Adult Learner Inventory Survey
- Ashford University outperformed the national average

![Bar chart showing recommend to others and overall satisfaction ratings for Ashford University (6.42) and national average (6.27) compared to Ashford University (6.19) and national average (6.01).]
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS
Agenda

• What is Waypoint?
  • Andrew McCann CEO, Waypoint Outcomes

• How is Waypoint USED?
  • Ashford University: Feedback and Data Gathering
  • Baldwin-Wallace: NCATE Accreditation
  • Drexel University: Observational Assessment
  • Seton Hall University: NCATE Accreditation & Feedback via Blackboard
  • The Wharton School: Writing Feedback

• Q&A
Rose Maylie
English 103
Dr. James Faulkner
09/27/07

Fiesta’s Hood

Junot Diaz’s Fiesta 1980 is a clear example of a modern day version of the story “Red Riding Hood”. At a close examination there are a number of connections with the old tale of little red riding hood and Fiesta 1980.

One could say that the simplistic elements of the antagonist wolf and the hero little red as symbolic elements that can be linked obscurely in any story, and they would be right, but the ties in with Fiesta 1980 are more than just obscure. One argument is that Red Riding Hood is a story about good triumphing over evil and that can be linked to most stories. Fiesta 1980 and Red Riding Hood are about more that the innocent winning over the evil “big bad wolf”. The core elements of both stories contain the basic ideas of the main character’s struggle with a journey and a twist at their destination.

Junior’s struggle is with his father. He is scared of his father and the initial danger to him is the car ride to the party. The party is his destination and if he can make it there before he throws up and gets beaten by his dad he feels like he will win or “I’m OK, I said, keeping my eyes straight ahead. I definitely didn’t want to trade glances with Big P. (Fiesta 422). In the same way Red main journey is through the dense dark, foreboding forest. I have been in the Black Forest of Germany, where the Grimm brothers based a lot of their tales including Red Riding Hood and it can be very intimidating at times because of the density and lack of light in the forest. Her encounter with the wolf...
Waypoint Takes the Feedback Process off the Page…

...and Makes it Interactive and Fast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identifies Central Ethical Issue</td>
<td>3.00 (20.0%)</td>
<td>-/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 3 Points: Clearly Identifies Central Ethical Issue and Explains it Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 2 Points: Clearly Identifies Ethical Issue But Misses Some Important Issue or Fails to Explain Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 1 Point: Ethical Issue Vaguely Described or Issue is Not Central to Case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 0 Points: No Issue Identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identifies Relevant Stakeholders</td>
<td>3.00 (20.0%)</td>
<td>-/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Exhaustively Identifies Central Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Identifies Some But Not All Main Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Identifies Merely a Single Stakeholder Constituency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Fails to Identify Any Main Stakeholder Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Identifies Reasonable Alternatives</td>
<td>3.00 (20.0%)</td>
<td>-/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Clearly Explains All Reasonable Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Explains Some But Not All Reasonable Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Discusses Only One Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ No Reasonable Alternatives Identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identifies Major Stakeholder Impacts of Alternatives</td>
<td>3.00 (20.0%)</td>
<td>-/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Identifies Major Impacts of Each Alternative; Provides Evidence to Support Claimed Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Identifies Some Impacts of Each Alternative; Provides Some Evidence for Claimed Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Identifies Some Impacts for Some Alternatives; Provides Little Evidence for Claimed Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Identifies Few or No Impacts for Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And Shareable...
To Create Authentic, Meaningful Data…
...and Exceptional Feedback

Ashley,

See comments below.

The writing, at the sentence level (grammar etc.) is competent - with a few false notes (see attached).

Given this subject matter you needed to be more purposeful in how you lead your audience through your opinion. We get a stream-of-consciousness take on it (i.e. whatever comes to mind in your linear, chronological telling of the evening) rather than a processed, “I’ve thought about what happened and here’s the way I see it” approach. You could rearrange your evidence, add some analysis to clarify the logical flow of your opinion, and wind up with a much more compelling essay.

1. **Intellectual Ambition**
   (Good) You have identified an original argument and begun to analyze it.
   Your approach is misleading, though: you set us up to see Sororities as potentially being different than their portrayal in the movies, then get us ready for the “adventure” of your evening - but nothing happens, you are bored, and your suspicions are confirmed. If you play this a little more consciously, you’ll have a more compelling essay.
   For instance, Americans in 2008 want to believe that no stereotypes are true. So if you describe the open mind you maintained to start, but more clearly down on the side of Sororities-Stereotype, then you’ll have a more argumentative (and non-politically correct) position.

2. **Project Content**
   (Good) You discuss some interesting examples and evidence.

3. **Attention to Audience**
   (Good) Overall, you’ve done good work to develop a project that is appropriate for your audience: your academic peers and your instructor.

4. **Writing: Grammar, Style, and Organization**
   (Good) For the most part, your writing is concise and clear.
   - Organizing the points you want to make in a more mindful way (rather than random or a simple chronological principle) will help you make a more compelling argument.
   - Check out this resource for more info: [http://www.utoronto.ca/ucwriting/organizing.html](http://www.utoronto.ca/ucwriting/organizing.html)
   - Your writing is uneven - sometimes clear, but other times in need of considerable editing.

5. **Assignment Checklist**
   - Complete.
   - Professional delivery of a complete assignment - nice job!
   - See attached document for highlighted text and comments.
   - Look for hyperlinks in the document with the format: AIM#, where AIM represents my initials and the number is the number of the comment. Click the hyperlink in your document to jump to the

✔ Returned to the LMS gradebook with two clicks

✔ 2011:
Selected Clients

- Texas A&M University
- Dallas Baptist University
- University of Virginia
- Manhattan College
- Drexel University
- Saint Mary’s College of CA
- The Wharton School
- Blendedschools.net (K12)
- Baker College

- Ashford University
- Seton Hall University
- South Carolina State University
- Fairleigh Dickinson University
- Somerset Community College
- San Jose State University
- Bournemouth University (UK)
- Baldwin-Wallace College
- University of North Carolina
Baldwin-Wallace College

Presenter:    John DeGennaro
             Manager of Edu Tech. Svcs.

Waypoint Launch: January 2009

Primary Application:
  • Assessment in education programs
  • NCATE accreditation
Ashford University

Presenter:            Jim Jeremiah
                     VP Academic Affairs

Waypoint Launch:    June 2008

Primary Application:
  • 8 core, writing intensive introductory courses
  • Training and management of 500 Tas
  • HLC Accreditation
Seton Hall University

Presenter: Paul Fisher
Director, TLT Center

Waypoint Launch: September 2006

Primary Applications:
• NCATE accreditation in graduate education
• Peer review
The Wharton School

Presenter: Dr. Anne Greenhalgh

Waypoint Launch: August 2006

Primary Application:
• Management 100/101
• Feedback on writing and thinking skills
• Data-driven curriculum design
Drexel University

Presenter: Dr. Fran Cornelius

Waypoint Launch: August 2007

Primary Applications:
• Feedback and assessment of online graduate nursing student thinking and writing skills
• Observational assessment of nursing candidates performing procedures
• Nursing accreditation
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS
CONSTELLATION
Choice & Flexibility

Download Audio

Print

Mobile

Online
Engaging Learning Environment
Asset Ownership
Constellation Walkthrough
Diane Thompson
SVP, Secretary and General Counsel

Higher Education – Bridgepoint Education
• December 2008

Apollo Group, Inc.
• Chief Human Resources Officer
• Vice President / Counsel

Pima County Attorney’s Office
• Deputy County Attorney

Education
• University of Arizona College of Law, J.D.
• Antioch University, MA
• St. Cloud University, BA
Legal and Government Affairs Organization

SVP, Secretary & General Counsel
Diane Thompson

VP/Sr. Corp Atty
SEC/Business Transaction Compliance

- Corporate Attorney
- Corporate Attorney

VP/Corporate Attorney
Regulatory Compliance

- Director of Student Grievance Management
- Director of Compliance
- Director of Regulatory Compliance

VP of Government Affairs

- Director of Government Affairs
- Director of Government Affairs
- Manager of Political Affairs (PAC)
- Government Affairs Coordinator
OIG Compliance Audit
Ashford University

Audit of Ashford University’s Administration of Title IV Program Funds

• May 2008 – Audit commenced; covers period from March 2005 – June 2009

• September 2009 – OIG conducted a telephonic exit interview for the audit
  • Completed its field work
  • Anticipated issuing a draft audit report

• Once the draft report is issued, BPI has 30 days to respond

• Final draft is then issued to both BPI and the Department of Education (DOE)

• BPI and the DOE work to resolve any remaining issues
Six potential exceptions remain at this time:

- Compensation policies and practices with respect to enrollment advisors
- Calculation of returns of Title IV program funds
- Timeliness of returns of Title IV program funds
- Student authorizations to retain credit balances
- Disbursements of unearned Title IV program funds
- Maintenance of supporting documentation for students’ leaves of absence
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS
Dan Devine
Chief Financial Officer

Higher Education – Bridgepoint Education
• January 2004

Mitchell International (Thomson)
• Chief Financial Officer
• Vice President of Finance
• Vice President of Strategic Planning

Foster Wheeler Corporation
• Chief Financial Officer (Operating Company)
• Manager of Cost Control (Construction Group)
• Controller of North American Manufacturing
• Auditor

Education
• Drexel University, BA
• Certified Public Accountant , Pennsylvania - Inactive
Finance Organization

Chief Financial Officer
Dan Devine

Vice President of Finance

- AU Financial Aid Director
  - Associate Director of Student Accounts
- Director of Financial Planning & Analysis
  - Planning Staff

University of the Rockies CFO

- Financial Aid Director
- Finance Staff

Vice President / Controller

- Assistant Controller
- Director of Financial Reporting
  - Accounting Staff
Key Highlights of Financial Model

• Highly visible revenue stream
• Track record of enrollment and revenue growth
• Operating leverage drives margin expansion, earnings growth and robust free cash flow
• Capital efficient business model supports attractive return profile
• Limited private loan requirement and favorable bad debt trend
Growth Trajectory Validates Student Value Proposition

Enrollment

- 2007: 12,623
- 2008: 31,558
- 2009: 53,688
- Q1'10: 65,788

Revenue

- 2007: $85.7 million
- 2008: $218.3 million
- 2009: $454.3 million
- Q1'10: $156.1 million

108% CAGR*

130% CAGR**

*CAGR 2007 – Q1 2010
**CAGR 2007 – 2009
Consistent Improvements in Operating Leverage Across Cost Base

Instructional Costs & Services as a % of Revenue (Non-GAAP)

Marketing & Promotional Costs as a % of Revenue (Non-GAAP)

General & Administrative Costs as a % of Revenue (Non-GAAP)

*Excludes $11.1 million charge to settle a stockholder claim
† Excludes portion of $30.4 million charge related to the acceleration of exit options
Strong Results Produce Strong Operating Income, EPS & Cash Flows

Operating Income
- Operating Margin: 8.5% (Q1'09) to 32.1% (Q1'10)

Fully-Diluted Earnings Per Common Share
- $0.03 (Q1'09) to $0.49 (Q1'10)

Net Cash Provided by Operating Activities
- $32.3 (Q1'09) to $54.6 (Q1'10)
## Balance Sheet – March 31, 2010

### ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$177,026</td>
<td>$125,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted cash</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketable securities</td>
<td>$45,007</td>
<td>$44,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable, net</td>
<td>$59,503</td>
<td>$43,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred income taxes</td>
<td>$3,545</td>
<td>$4,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses and other current assets</td>
<td>$9,587</td>
<td>$9,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current assets</strong></td>
<td>$294,693</td>
<td>$227,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and equipment, net</td>
<td>$49,809</td>
<td>$47,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill and intangibles</td>
<td>$3,132</td>
<td>$3,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred income taxes</td>
<td>$13,708</td>
<td>$13,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other long term assets</td>
<td>$4,659</td>
<td>$3,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>$366,001</td>
<td>$295,231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LIABILITIES AND STOCKHOLDERS’ EQUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current liabilities:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>$2,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued liabilities</td>
<td>$25,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued income taxes payable</td>
<td>$18,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue and student deposits</td>
<td>$139,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other current liabilities</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current liabilities</strong></td>
<td>$185,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other long term liabilities</td>
<td>$4,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent liability</td>
<td>$8,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td>$198,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitments and contingencies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total stockholders’ equity</strong></td>
<td>$167,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities and stockholders’ equity</strong></td>
<td>$366,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Q1 2010 Cash Flow Statement

## Cash flows from operating activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net income</td>
<td>$29,823</td>
<td>$3,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments to reconcile net income to net cash provided by operating activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for bad debts</td>
<td>7,896</td>
<td>4,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and amortization</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>1,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of premium/discount</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred income taxes</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>(68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock-based compensation</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess tax benefit of option exercises</td>
<td>(249)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholder settlement (non-cash portion)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in operating assets and liabilities, net of effects of acquisitions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>(24,167)</td>
<td>(14,082)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses and other current assets</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(726)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other long-term assets</td>
<td>(897)</td>
<td>(104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>18,499</td>
<td>(1,382)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue and student deposits</td>
<td>17,365</td>
<td>27,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other liabilities</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>1,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash provided by operating activities</strong></td>
<td>$54,557</td>
<td>32,306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cash flows from investing activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital expenditures</td>
<td>(3,579)</td>
<td>(7,223)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted cash</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash used in investing activities</strong></td>
<td>(3,579)</td>
<td>(7,248)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cash flows from financing activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from the issuance of common stock</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs incurred in connection with the IPO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,352)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from exercise of stock options</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess tax benefit of option exercises</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from exercise of warrants</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments of notes payable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments on conversion of preferred stock</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments of capital lease obligations</td>
<td>(634)</td>
<td>(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net cash provided by (used in) financing activities</strong></td>
<td>486</td>
<td>(2,416)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Financial Summary

- **Net increase in cash and cash equivalents**: $51,464 in 2010, $22,642 in 2009
- **Cash and cash equivalents at beginning of period**: $125,562 in 2010, $56,483 in 2009
- **Cash and cash equivalents at end of period**: $177,026 in 2010, $79,125 in 2009
SOX Update

• Program is moving to the testing phase
• Coordinated effort by experienced internal audit team
• All items identified in first round of testing are in the process of remediation
BILL WALTON