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ACTION ITEMS

1. Call to Order

Chair Francesconi called the meeting of the Academic Strategies Committee to order at 3:06 p.m.

2. Approval of June 2012 Minutes

   ACTION: Director Emily Plec made the motion to approve the minutes and David Yaden seconded. Motion carried. Director Eiland was not present for the vote.

3. Academic Program Approvals
   - EOU, MFA in Creative Writing

Chair Francesconi called upon Steve Adkison, Provost & Executive Vice President at Eastern Oregon University to provide background on the proposed program. Discussion centered on the demand for low-residency requirement programs. It was noted that this program employs part-time faculty members that work on other similar programs throughout the state, offering a stable faculty presence for student cohorts.

   ACTION: Directors David Yaden made the motion to approve the BA/BS in Social Science program and Jim Middleton seconded. Motion carried. Director Eiland was not present for the vote.
4. Institutional Core Themes

Chair Francesconi called upon Vice Chancellor Melody Rose to provide an overview of the change in Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) new accreditation standards. It was noted that the standards adopted by NWCCU in 2010, require governing boards approve institutional core themes as an extension of institutional missions. Discussion centered on the role of the board in assuring that core themes are congruent with institutional mission.

**ACTION:** Directors Jim Middleton made the motion to approve institutional core themes for the seven public universities and Emily Plec seconded. Motion carried. Director Eiland was not present for the vote.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

5. ASC Work Plan Review and Board Retreat Discussion

Chair Francesconi opened the discussion on the committee work plan noting that the committee has the opportunity to refine their work. After a lengthy discussion, it was decided that the work plan will serve as a tool to see the committee through the next year, and that the following items need to be linked to specific work plan initiatives.

- Access to be linked with OUS Contributions to 40-40-20
- Critical degrees to be linked with Research Connected to Oregon’s Economy and 2013-15 Strategic Priorities
- Administrative diversity to be included in Diversity discussions.
- Faculty Satisfaction will be added to Ongoing Activities.

**NEXT STEPS:** Chair Francesconi would like to investigate ASC’s role in the context of Board priorities and resources. Melody Rose will work with Emily Plec to bring the Faculty Satisfaction survey to the committee for review.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

6. Reports: Credit for Prior Learning, Teacher Preparation, Eastern Promise and Research Collaboratory.

Chair Francesconi directed Melody Rose to provide a report on Credit for Prior Learning (CPL). Currently, there is a growing dialogue about reducing time to degree and cost for students. In response to this dialogue, the System Office has initiated an ad hoc committee that will engage faculty on the challenges and opportunities surrounding CPL, and develop policy recommendations around the advancement of CPL practices. Provosts will appoint two faculty members to serve on the committee. In addition, two representatives from the Learning Outcomes and Assessment (LO&A) group will also participate. The committee will provide a progress report of initial findings to ASC by January 2013, with a final report by June 15, 2013.
Chair Francesconi pointed out the value of a collaborative approach between campuses, education sectors, and community and industry partners. It was noted that as a result of collaborative approaches, the Teacher Preparation, Eastern Promise and Research “Collaboratory” proposals have advanced with the legislative funding teams.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS (cont.)**

7. **OUS Contributions to 40-40-20**

Chair Francesconi opened the discussion on OUS Contributions to 40-40-20. Discussion centered on the creation of the Board’s Ad Hoc 40-40-20 Strategy Committee, which was developed to advance the discussion and create a framework that will help the state and OUS reach the 40-40-20 goal. The committee will have a one year charge, and will be made up of members from all three board committees. Chair Francesconi called on the Co-Chairs, David Yaden and Jim Middleton to outline the framework for the committee. It was pointed out that committee will focus on the selection of a capacity model, as well as develop clear specifications/definitions for 40-40-20, review and prioritize policies and issues already in place. After a full and frank discussion, it was agreed that the work of the 40-40-20 Strategy Committee will be a valuable tool is assessing how the System will contribute to reaching statewide goals.

**NEXT STEPS:** Melody Rose will meet with the Co-Chairs of the 40-40-20 Strategy Committee and will notify ASC when the work is ready to discuss in committees.

8. **Diversity**

Chair Francesconi opened the discussion on system wide diversity. Attention was drawn to the need to advance diversity initiatives. The committee discussed the diversity metric in presidential evaluations, as well as the variables that lead to attrition, barriers to student success, and the creation of campus culture that supports diversity. After a full and frank discussion it was agreed that the concept of diversity may differ from campus to campus, and that there is a need to be more intentional about understanding the numbers and what that means at each institution.

**NEXT STEPS:** Melody Rose will work with OUS institutional research to collect diversity data on undergraduates and faculty, and will facilitate a discussion at the November ASC meeting.

9. **Adjournment**

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.
Oregon State University seeks Board approval to offer an instructional program leading to a M.S./M.Eng./Ph.D. in Environmental Engineering.

1. Describe the purpose and relationship of the proposed program to the institution’s mission and strategic plan.

Environmental Engineering, as a profession, is dedicated to solving a variety of societal needs that are related to social, economic, and environmental challenges. One of Oregon’s greatest 21st Century challenges will be how to provide adequate infrastructure for its population growth and economic development without sacrificing its clean water, air, and land resources. Graduates with an Environmental Engineering graduate degree from Oregon State University (OSU) will be ideally suited to enter Oregon’s workforce and provide the leadership, expertise and innovation required for a rapidly changing environmental setting. As Oregon’s land grant, sea grant, space grant, and sun grant university, OSU has within its mission and goals of education, research, and service, a strong commitment to maintaining environmental quality and sustainability. The proposed Environmental Engineering graduate degrees will support environmental quality and sustainability by providing graduates with an expertise in environmental engineering analysis and design.

The broad nature of the proposed Environmental Engineering degree program will contribute to all of OSU’s strategic priorities, including sustainable earth ecosystems, improving health and wellness, and promotion of economic growth and social progress. The technologies needed to maintain clean water, air, and land resources are essential for all of these strategic planning priorities. To this end, a graduate program in Environmental Engineering will help to provide optimal statewide development through lower costs and reduced environmental impacts.

2. What evidence of need does the institution have for the program?

According to the American Academy of Environmental Engineers “Environmental Engineering provides limitless opportunities as to type of work, for whom you work, and where you work. A career in Environmental Engineering provides a comfortable salary, job security, and considerable personal satisfaction.” The best evidence of need and market demand is the continued demand for students from OSU who have completed an Environmental Engineering area of concentration degree program. Graduates have always found excellent job opportunities in Oregon, the Pacific Northwest, nationally, and internationally with private consulting firms, government agencies, regulated industries, or in academia.
A graduate student with an advanced degree in Environmental Engineering will have a unique professional expertise and greater knowledge base that will allow them to make significant contributions and provide meaningful decisions related to local, statewide, and national environmental quality issues. Some civic issues (i.e., climate change) are becoming increasingly complex and technical. Graduates in Environmental Engineering will be well-suited to make important contributions as society seeks to find optimal solutions to a wide variety of environmental problems along with their associated management.

3. Are there similar programs in the state? If so, how does the proposed program supplement, complement, or collaborate with those programs?

There is a graduate program at Portland State University (PSU) which offers M.S., M.Eng., and Ph.D. degrees in Civil and Environmental Engineering, and there is also a graduate program at the Oregon Health and Science University/Oregon Graduate Institute (OHSU/OGI) which offers M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Environmental Science and Engineering. The proposed graduate degrees in Environmental Engineering complement both the PSU and OHSU/OGI offerings. The PSU program in Environmental Engineering is strongly focused upon water quantity and quality issues, similar to the Water Resources Engineering degrees offered by the OSU Graduate School. The OGI program in Environmental Science and Engineering is strongly focused upon biogeochemical processes and groundwater remediation. Neither of these programs have a strong emphasis upon traditional environmental engineering focus areas in the built environment.

The faculty members within the School of Chemical, Biological, and Environmental Engineering (CBEE) have collaborated in the past with both the PSU and OGI programs. Joint proposals and projects have been conducted with both programs and the OSU Environmental Engineering faculty members have had substantial interaction with PSU faculty around the establishment of Oregon’s Built Environment and Sustainable Technologies (BEST) Signature Research Center. Future collaborations are expected as appropriate.

4. What new resources will be needed initially and on a recurring basis to implement the program? How will the institution provide these resources? What efficiencies or revenue enhancements are achieved with this program, including consolidation or elimination of programs over time, if any?

The support of these graduate degrees is part of the College of Engineering’s present budget and future strategic plan. No changes to present plans for financial viability, funding, recruitment of faculty, or library support are expected. This proposal is essentially to elevate an existing program (an area of concentration in the Chemical Engineering program) such that it has its own degree title and recognition; i.e., M.S., M.Eng., and Ph.D. in Environmental Engineering. This proposal will not result in any significant changes to faculty, facilities, or budget. The research programs associated with the proposed degree are located in Merryfield and Owen Halls. The program’s on-going research program will continue to be funded unchanged by CBEE and the College of Engineering. An added cost in future years of approximately $2,000 per year for new brochures and changes to the webpage are expected.

All appropriate University committees and the OUS Provosts’ Council have positively reviewed the proposed program.
RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMITTEE
The OUS Provosts’ Council recommends that the Board’s Academic Strategies Committee authorize Oregon State University to establish an instructional program leading to a M.S., M.Eng., and Ph.D. in Environmental Engineering, effective Winter 2013. With Committee approval, a five-year follow-up review of this program will be conducted in 2018-19.

(Committee action required)
Introduction:
The Oregon University System (OUS) contracted with the American Council on Education (ACE) to assist OUS with two important objectives. The first, internal to the system, was to provide information to support the development of policies on the various campuses to provide existing faculty greater flexibility in order to increase retention in these challenging times for higher education. Second, external to the system, to compare system institutions to similar types of institutions using data derived from similar surveys to address key issues such as salaries and more flexible workloads that are critical to recruiting talented and diverse faculty to Oregon to serve the people with quality academic programs, and the state with cutting edge research important to its future in a complex and rapidly changing environment.

The Process:
Participation in the survey on the part of institutions and their respective faculty was voluntary. All OUS institutions with the exception of the University of Oregon participated. ACE and OUS worked together to develop both an institutional and faculty survey tailored to meet the system’s needs. ACE’s surveys, utilized in gathering data from a wide range of institutions, were customized for OUS but still allowed for comparison between system institutions and ACE’s broader database.

Once agreed upon and taking into account the institutions’ schedules, ACE launched the institutional survey for administrative responses and the faculty survey to all tenured and tenure-track faculty. As agreed, the reminders were sent on a regular schedule to encourage responses from both administrators and faculty.

As responses were received by ACE, they were codified and analyzed. Benchmarking reports were prepared for each institution so that each one could compare itself to all system institutions and also externally to its approximate peers from ACE’s national database. These surveys provided opportunities for both quantitative and qualitative responses. Both types of data were analyzed and compared to similar questions answered by previous “takers of these surveys.”

Findings:
Each institution that participated has been provided with detailed finding from the surveys conducted by their faculty and benchmark data. This report reflects the aggregate finding at the system level for all institutions participating in the survey.
A. Issues Raised by Faculty in Open-Ended Survey Questions

The most common concerns expressed by faculty were low salaries in comparison to the national median and to their peer institutions. 38% of faculty answering this question indicated concern about low salaries. Faculty believe that low salaries affect both recruitment and retention of good faculty. While salaries were a problem for all faculty, some faculty also expressed concerns about teaching loads. These concerns were expressed mostly about institutional mission and the balance of research, teaching, and service. Further comments from faculty indicate that administrative work and institutional service place demands that take away time faculty have to devote to teaching and research. They believe that some current practices act as a barrier to retention of new faculty.

In addition, faculty respondents reported concern for funding for research generally and support for grant writing, start-up funds and support staff. Start-up funds were of greatest concern. Respondents expressed interest in part-time appointments and the importance of policies for dual career couples.

B. Faculty Survey Results:

The demographics of faculty for all six institutions participating in the surveys show a gender balance close to 50/50 (53% male, 47% female system-wide) with 70% tenured, 77% married and 42% with children under 18. Only 19% are 30 or younger while 52% are 50 or older. As to years of service, 64% had 15 years or less service indicating a more active turnover of younger faculty. The faculty from each institution who answered the survey believed that the issues of work/life queried in this survey are important to them and their institutions. 83% indicated to a great extent or to some extent (44%). When asked if these issues had been discussed in departments, the answers reverse with 83% reporting very little or not at all. Another interesting demographic is that 43% of the faculty system-wide are located in the sciences.

When asked about support to take advantage of the career flexibility policies available, most faculty (81%) agreed that their chairs were supportive as were their colleagues (87%). However, 46% of the faculty answered that if they asked for a special schedule, they would be less likely to get ahead in their career. They also believe their colleagues would help them (80%) and 69% of the faculty said they had not devoted as much time to family and friends as they would like. However, at a few institutions there were a considerable number of faculty (35%) who did not know about policies or practices in existence at their institutions. 56% of faculty system-wide expressed being overworked and unable to achieve balance between work and family needs. Faculty, in general, believe that administrators are supportive of work/life flexibility, but 25% do not know such policies or practices exist. Faculty also believe that their colleagues have been supportive or would be (61%). Their department chair would be supportive (62%) and 39% believe the Deans would be supportive of use of policies. 53% of the faculty put their careers before their personal/family needs very often or often; if sometimes is included, the percentage rises to 90%. If the question is reversed—personal/ family before career—the percentage is only 17% would put family before professional needs.

When the survey questions become more specific—such as does the campus have policies for partial relief from duties or tenure clock stoppage—there are a majority of faculty who are unaware of the policies in place—38% of tenured faculty and 43% of the tenure track faculty—do not know about whether or not the tenure clock can be stopped under certain circumstances; for childbirth/adoption 64% of the tenured faculty and 67% of tenure-track faculty do not know. 50% of requests for tenure
clock stoppage are for childbirth, 25% for personal disability and 15% for elder care. The other 10% is for a broad variety of purposes.

Faculty members who used this policy believed that the impact on his/her career was very positive, positive, or had no impact (69%). But 40% believed they would have to demonstrate greater academic productivity than others to achieve tenure. 12% of the faculty wanted to but did not stop the clock because they believed it would be an undue burden on colleagues (35%); they would appear less committed (58%); would jeopardize their chances for tenure (49%) and for promotion (36%). Only 17% of new moms took advantage of stop clock; 17% took leave; 42% of this group received full pay from a variety of sources—faculty line, short term disability insurance, sick leave and vacation time; 17% received partial pay and 42% received no pay. 45% said they did not take as much time at they needed. When asked why, they gave reasons similar to those for stop clock—undue burden on colleagues, would appear less committed, would jeopardize tenure and promotion and could not stop grant-funded research. 75% of leave takers felt leave had a very positive, positive, or no impact on tenure and promotion but also 89% said they couldn’t afford it; 28% replied they were not allowed to take it.

Similar questions were asked of adoptive mothers (3%)—but because of such small numbers the results are suppressed to provide confidentiality to the faculty. Leaves for new fathers also questioned both biological fathers and adoptive fathers. Only 3% of biological fathers have taken leave and only 1% of adoptive fathers have taken leave. Because the numbers are so small, all results have been suppressed to maintain confidentiality of the fathers. 6% of faculty throughout the system have taken leave for personal disability for more than three weeks but less than six months. They utilized 3 different types of leave—FMLA (52%), sick leave (55%), and short-term disability leave (17%). 83% of these faculty members received full pay, 7% partial pay and 10% no pay. 24% said they had not taken as much leave as needed. About half (43%) of faculty using this policy used sick leave they accrue each year and can carry forward unused days with no limit to support their leave fully or partially.

When queried about part-time appointments 34% indicated they were allowed but 49% of faculty did not know it was possible to ask for them; 70% of faculty responding did not know they could be used for dependent care. Only 17% of faculty have made use of such policies and only on one half of the campuses can part-time faculty return to full-time work. While on part-time status, 80% of faculty receive full health benefits, while 20% of them do not. 15% of system faculty were also able to stop or slow the tenure clock; 35% were not allowed to do so; and for 50% of the respondents this question was not applicable because they already had tenure. The impact of the part-time appointment was very positive, positive or neutral for 57% of those faculty electing this option to create more flexibility to manage careers and family. 70% of faculty wanted to request part-time appointments for a period of time to care for family members, for personal illness, or to have more time for research or writing, etc. but did not because they believed they would appear less committed, that it might hurt their chances for tenure or promotion or because they could not stop work on grants.

All things considered, 34% of the faculty system-wide are very satisfied with their career at their university; 44% are somewhat satisfied. Adding these two—78% of the faculty are satisfied where they are. However 39% of faculty have taken steps to leave their universities; 75% of this group did so for higher salaries; 39% for better balance; 29% for higher ranks or desire to work at a more prestigious institution. Faculty stay within their universities because of “location, good colleagues, research they can conduct here, position, rank and responsibility, and the students they have.”
C. **Institutional Survey Results:**

Each institution within the system, with the exception of the University of Oregon, completed the institutional survey. Institutions vary in the number of written policies they have in place that provide support for tenured and tenure-track faculty to better balance professional and personal needs. Few of the campuses are tracking usage and the impact of usage of policies in place.

Another issue of importance gleaned from the survey results indicate that the administration of the various universities need to improve communication with faculty about policies available to them to create better integration of professional and life/family needs to achieve career flexibility. When asked about knowledge of existing policies, it was not uncommon to see “don’t know” percentages of 40-70%. Most colleges and universities have found that using multiple means to increase faculty awareness of such policies works best.

**Conclusions:**

The Oregon University System should be proud of the progress that its institutions have made in developing a welcoming environment for new faculty and a satisfying one for all faculty that attempts to recognize their needs throughout their careers, even in these difficult economic times. All of the institutions should be commended for their efforts and encouraged to continue finding additional ways to increase faculty support to allow for balance in their professional and personal lives and recognition of their quality teaching and research.

Based upon the responses of faculty when asked what attracted them to or what makes them stay at their universities, they point to OUS’s strengths. They list these as location, the ability to do the kind of professional work they want, and having great colleagues and good students. They are concerned about support for dual career couples and a fairly significant number (39%) have taken steps to leave. OUS needs to track departures and the reasons for them. The number one reason the survey identified is inadequate salary, and the number two reason is to achieve better balance between work and personal/family life and three to obtain a position of higher rank or responsibility. High turnover rates are extremely costly to the institutions. More effort should be made to address concerns to be able to retain faculty with the knowledge and experience needed at institutions within the System to provide quality education for students and research geared to Oregon’s needs.

OUS is fortunate to have within its system examples of best practices. These could be used to begin system-wide conversations to share information and develop policies that could be modified to fit each campus so that the same assurance is given to all faculty: that faculty are being treated equitably. OUS could also play a significant role in assisting campuses with communication vehicles to disseminate best policies and practices and to provide training for department chairs and other academic administrators as well as for search committees and tenure and promotion committees. Developing such System-wide programs would save considerable funds especially for training programs for administrators and key campus committees.

In summary, ACE believes that the Oregon System has advanced in its ability to support faculty throughout their careers but needs to continue to improve system-wide to remain competitive. Their university peers continue to refine and add policies and program to maintain and improve their position in the pecking order. Standing still means falling behind.
BOARD DIVERSITY POLICY

(Approved by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education at Meeting #822, on March 6, 2009)

POLICY/PURPOSE:

The purpose of this policy is to enhance opportunities within the Oregon University System (OUS) through the application of guiding principles and actions relating to diversity. This policy outlines a framework for leadership reflection and action, the identification of key evidence, and Board-conducted annual performance reviews to assess diversity efforts of the Board, the Chancellor, and campus presidents.

PRINCIPLES/GUIDELINES/PROCEDURES:

Guiding Principle #1: Overall Commitment to Diversity

The Board values the perspectives, educational benefits, and robust exchanges of ideas that are encouraged by the effective facilitation of diversity within OUS and seeks to promote and support initiatives that sustain best practices in diversity efforts.

Actions – The Board, the Chancellor, and campus presidents will identify opportunities and promote expectations for diverse representation, inclusion, and engagement throughout OUS programs and activities.

Guiding Principle #2: Commitment to Workforce Enhancements

The Board values workforce diversity and encourages opportunities for the employment and advancement of diverse faculty and staff within OUS.

Actions – In periodic reports to the Board, the Chancellor and campus presidents will identify strategies and progress toward the enhancement of workforce diversity.

Guiding Principle #3: Commitment to Equity in Student Success

The Board is committed to providing equitable opportunities for students to succeed and to efforts to close achievement gaps among underserved populations.

Actions – In periodic reports to the Board, campus presidents and representatives of OUS student-related committees will identify strategies and progress relating to student success among diverse populations.

Guiding Principle #4: Commitment to Welcoming Campus Environments

The Board values the importance of campus environments in the attraction, recruitment, and retention of diverse students, faculty, and staff.
Actions – In periodic reports to the Board, campus presidents will a) identify campus climate challenges and successes, b) discuss measures taken to promote welcoming campus environments, and c) describe the possible impact of these measures on student success.

Guiding Principle #5: Commitment to Vendor and Contracting Enhancements

The Board is committed to vendor and contracting practices that encourage and promote participation by minority, women-owned, and emerging small businesses (MWESB).

Actions – In periodic reports to the Board, Chancellor’s Office and campus representatives will provide updates on progress in vendor and contracting initiatives and practices. OUS representatives will identify and incorporate into project proposals opportunities for outreach to promote engagement and seek bids from MWESB contractors.

Guiding Principle #6: Commitment to Continuous Feedback

The Board values the feedback and insights of numerous stakeholders in advancing diversity efforts.

Actions – The Board will include attention to diversity issues within its strategic planning efforts and will solicit ideas, innovations, and standards from the Chancellor and campus presidents that best align with institutional and state priorities. Further, the Board will seek input periodically from representatives of Oregon’s diverse communities.

Guiding Principle #7: Commitment to Key Goals

The Board values both quantitative and qualitative diversity-related evidence to inform decisions and planning.

Actions – The Board directs the Chancellor and campus presidents to provide reports and updates pertaining to diversity achievements and challenges not less than once every biennium. To assist and inform the Board, each OUS institution will identify key diversity considerations relating to students, faculty, and staff each biennium. Campus leaders will identify and prioritize key goals that take into account fiscal resources, enrollment management considerations, curricular planning, workforce diversity efforts, and specific institutional data and environments. The Chancellor’s Office will identify and prioritize key goals pertaining to diversity issues for its units as well. The Board will evaluate annually the Chancellor and campus presidents on elements relating to the identification of, and progress toward, key goals and actions in all areas of this policy and will utilize the guiding principles in Board self-assessments.

Document History

- Promulgated March 6, 2009, by majority vote of the Board.
**EVALUATION CATEGORIES**

The following categories are used to evaluate the performance of OUS presidents and the Chancellor:

1. Leadership
2. Financial management
3. Enrollment
4. Degrees awarded
5. Degrees in Workforce Shortage Areas
6. Research, Scholarship, and Knowledge Creation
7. Representing the University and System/Advocacy/Collaboration.

Within these categories, diversity is evaluated in the leadership, enrollment, degrees and degrees in shortage areas categories. Affordability is addressed within the financial management, enrollment and degrees categories. The matrix below highlights the various areas of emphasis derived from Board goals and the performance compact with the state. Employer satisfaction and graduate satisfaction data are not available for the 2011-12 evaluation cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Emphasis</th>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees/Shortage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal/Mission Alignment</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity (Geog/Demog)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient Operations</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with Faculty</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presidents, the Chancellor, and the Board may discuss and develop goals for the institutions and the System that may lead to different categories for each president in addition to the seven standard areas. Further, an overall assessment by the Chancellor of each president will be provided to the Board, as is currently the case.

**EVALUATION PROCESS**

During its September 2011 retreat, the Board amended the performance review for OUS presidents to include two parts: a “state of the campus” discussion with the full Board and a traditional “performance evaluation” to be conducted one-on-one with the Chancellor. The full Board discussions will take place in conjunction with the June and August 2012 Board meetings. One-on-one evaluations will be coordinated by the Chancellor’s and presidents’ executive assistants with a target completion date of August 2012.

The performance evaluation process still includes a written presidential self-assessment due to the Chancellor no later than June 1, 2012. As in the past, the Chancellor will use the self-assessments in drafting a final presidential evaluation and both written assessments will be provided to the Board upon completion of the two-part evaluation process.

Although some faculty leaders have raised the possibility of an institution’s faculty being involved in presidential evaluations, “360° reviews” are time and resource intensive and should be considered as a compliment to annual reviews rather than as a replacement. The Governance and Policy Committee may consider this comprehensive review process at some point in the future.

**EVALUATION SCHEDULES**

The first part of the evaluation process – discussion with the full Board in executive session – will be held in conjunction with the June 1, June 7, and August 2-3, 2012 Board meetings. One-on-one evaluations with the Chancellor will be scheduled at a separate time with a target completion date of August 2012.