

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY
BOARD OF GOVERNORS

February 11, 2005

The twenty-ninth meeting of the West Virginia University Board of Governors was held on February 11, 2005, in the Rhododendron Room of the WVU Mountainlair. Board members in attendance were Hank Barnette, Joe Campbell, Betty Chilton, Steve Farmer, Steve Goodwin, Vaughn Kiger, Doug Leech, Joe Lopez, Paul Martinelli, Parry Petroplus, Ralph Sevy, Michael Vetere, Robert Wells, Chris Wilkinson and Jordan Workman. Russ Isaacs and Rod Thorn were absent and excused.

WVU officers, and regional campus officers and representatives present were:

From WVU:

President David C. Hardesty, Jr.;

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research, Gerald Lang;

Vice President for Administration, Finance & Human Resources, Gary Rogers;

Vice President for Health Sciences & Dean, School of Medicine, Bob D'Alessandri

Vice President for Student Affairs, Ken Gray;

Vice President for Institutional Advancement, Christine Martin;

General Counsel, Tom Dorer;

Executive Officer for Social Justice, Jennifer McIntosh;

Interim Associate Vice President for Finance, John Williams;

Associate Provost for Academic Professionals, C. B. Wilson;

Special Assistant to the President/Provost, & Assistant BOG Secretary, Ginny Petersen;

Director of University News Service, Becky Lofstead;

Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs, Brenda Thompson

Special Assistant to the President, External Affairs, Dave Miller

Special Assistant to the Chief of Staff, Jennifer Fisher;

Special Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs, Sheila Powell;

Executive Assistant to the President, Sara Master

President of the Faculty Senate, Larry Hornak;

President-elect of the Faculty Senate, Michael Lastinger;

President of Staff Council, Terry Nebel;

Director, Internal Audit, Bill Quigley;

From WVU at Parkersburg:

Marie Gnage, Campus President and Regional Vice President, WVU

Joe Badgley, Dean of Students

From West Virginia University Institute of Technology:

Lanny Janeksela, Interim Campus President and Regional Vice President, WVU;

From the Community & Technical College of West Virginia University Institute of Technology:

Jo Harris, President, Community and Technical College;

From Potomac State College of West Virginia University:

Kerry Odell, Interim Campus President and Regional Vice President, WVU;

A member of the Press and 3 Journalism students were also present.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Board Chairman, Doug Leech at 8:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Barnette moved that the West Virginia University Board of Governors go into executive session pursuant to West Virginia Code §6-9A-4(2)(A) to discuss personnel and management issues. The motion was seconded and passed, and the Board thereupon met in executive session. Following the discussion, Mr. Wilkinson moved that the Board rise from executive session. The motion was seconded and passed*.

APPOINTMENT OF WVUIT PRESIDENT

Joe Lopez moved that the Board appoint Mr. Charles E. Bayless as President of West Virginia University Institute of Technology. The motion was seconded and passed*.

Mike Garrison, a member of the Higher Education Policy Commission announced that he, as the designee of the HEPC, approved of the appointment of Mr. Bayless.

Mr. Garrison and Mr. Leech both thanked Dr. Lanny Janeksela for serving as interim president of WVUIT. Dr. Janeksela thanked the Board of Governors, President Hardesty and Provost Lang for their faith in him in appointing him interim president, and for their mentorship. He reported that Mr. Bayless's appointment was welcomed by the Tech community, noting that Mr. Bayless is a Tech alumnus.

President Hardesty reported that Mr. Bayless would assume the Presidency on April 4, and thanked the members of the search committee.

RECESS

Chairman Leech declared the meeting in recess to allow committees to meet.

The meeting reconvened at 12:45 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Wilkinson moved that the minutes of the meetings of November 5 and November 17, 2004 be approved as written. The motion was seconded and passed.

PRESIDENT'S COMMENTS

President David Hardesty, in his 10th year as president, provided a mid-year report on progress towards meeting the annual goals and objectives established for him by the Board of Governors. He noted that in a tough, competitive environment, WVU and affiliates are advancing according to plan. Specifically, strategic planning is advancing under the leadership of Provost Lang and Senate Chair Hornak; the financial plan is on target, thanks in large part to the increased enrollment; our Compact was rated "excellent" and retention of first year students is up to 81%; government relations are good, critical searches are underway, and being successful, and enrollment management continues to function well.

***Unless otherwise stated, all motions were passed unanimously.**
February 11, 2005

OTHER OFFICER REPORTS

Provost Jerry Lang introduced Dr. Larry Hornak, and noted that the two of them are serving as co-chairs of the strategic planning committee. He gave a progress report on the administrative searches underway on campus. Mr. Barnette requested an outline of subjects to be covered by the strategic plan, and the inclusion of quantitative objectives.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Executive Committee: Doug Leech, Chairman of the Executive Committee, noted that the committee had met on February 10, 2005, had received a legislative update and a report from the General Counsel, and had no action items to report.

Academic Affairs: Stephen Goodwin, Chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee, reported that the Academic Affairs committee had reviewed and approved four action items, and heard a report from Kimberly Colebank on the *Mountaineer Partnership Assisting Academically Challenged Teens in West Virginia* program, and a report on the guidelines for course and program approval from Provost Lang.

Business Affairs: Parry Petroplus, Chairman of the Business Affairs Committee, reported that the committee had considered three action items, which they recommended be approved by the board, and heard reports on the sale of the WVU bonds, the continuing effort to identify and improve on best practices as recommended by the external auditors, and an update on capital projects underway at the university.

Student Affairs: Vaughn Kiger, Chairman of the Student Affairs Committee, noted that he has attended several student government meetings, and commended the excellent student leaders at the University. He had also met with staff in student affairs, and considers them to be excellent as well. He reported that the Student Affairs committee had heard the annual report of the Vice President for Student Affairs, Ken Gray, and had received a report on newly developed maps of alumni, students and donors from Vice President Chris Martin. He noted that the Board would like a report from the “retreat” being held about the maps on February 18th.

Community & Technical Colleges/Regional Campuses: Betty Chilton, Chair of the Community & Technical Colleges/Regional Campuses Committee reported that the committee had heard the Annual Report of the President of West Virginia University at Parkersburg, Marie Gnage, and had been impressed with her report and with the Strategic Plan developed for their campus. They had also learned of a series of new programs being offered as certificate programs on the various campuses. Mrs. Chilton noted that as chairman of the Community & Technical Colleges/Regional Campuses committee, she had visited both WVU-Parkersburg, and West Virginia University Institute of Technology

INFORMATION ITEMS

Finance:

Vice President for Administration, Finance & Human Resources, Gary Rogers gave a presentation on the quarterly financial indicators and quarterly financial statements. He noted that the Governor's budget proposal may call for a further budget reduction, but that it would be several months before the final budget is approved.

Mr. Goodwin noted that the transition between Dr. Kelly and Dr. Rogers as Vice President for Administration, Finance and Human Resources had been impressive.

Legislative Update:

Special Assistant to the President for External Affairs, Dave Miller, noted that the legislative session had just started two days before. He indicated a need to be diligent in watching for topics that might work to the University's disadvantage, and pointed to Virginia as a model to watch regarding increasing flexibilities for Universities. He pledged to keep the Board informed throughout the legislative session.

Faculty Report:

Christopher Wilkinson, Faculty Representative to the Board, presented his annual report of the faculty. His theme was Outcomes Assessment, and his remarks are attached to these minutes.

ACTION ITEMS

Based on discussions of each item at the respective Committee meeting, an explanation of each to the full board, and recommendations for approval by the appropriate committee, Mr. Leech asked for final discussion on any action item.

There being no further questions, upon motion duly made by Mr. Goodwin and seconded, the following items were approved unanimously.

1. Approval of Honorary Degrees

Resolved: That the West Virginia University Board of Governors approves as presented four honorary degree candidates for West Virginia University, one candidate for WVU-P and one candidate for Potomac State College of WVU. The persons to be honored will be announced at a later date.

2. Appointment to the United Health System Board

Resolved: That the West Virginia University Board of Governors approves the appointment of Dr. John Prescott, Dean of the WVU School of Medicine, to the Board of United Health System as the representative of the "Medical Staff of the Corporation."

3. Suspension of the AAS in Paramedic Science At WVU-Parkersburg

Resolved: The West Virginia University Board of Governors approves the suspension of the AAS in Paramedic Science at West Virginia University at Parkersburg effective June 30, 2005.

4. Approval of an Intent to Plan

Resolved: That the West Virginia University Board of Governors hereby approves an Intent to Plan regarding the transfer of administrative responsibility for the Regents Bachelors Degree at West Virginia University at Parkersburg to West Virginia University at Parkersburg.

5. Approval of a Policy on Faculty & Administrative Productivity

Resolved: That the West Virginia University Board of Governors adopts Policy 22: Policy on Faculty & Administrative Productivity.

6. Approval of a Policy on Credit for Public School Service

Resolved: That the West Virginia University Board of Governors adopts Policy 23: Policy on Credit for Public School Service.

7. Reaffirmation of BOG Approval of the Health Sciences Center Research Funding Process

Resolved: That the West Virginia University Board of Governors approves the utilization of certain resources recovered for the University's benefit by the West Virginia University Research Corporation from WVU Health Sciences Center sponsored research grants and contract activity as security for the repayment of financing received from three state agencies by the West Virginia University Research Corporation for the benefit of the West Virginia University Health Sciences Center to fund its strategic research plan.

8. Approval of a Revised Budget for the Allen Hall HVAC Upgrade Project

Resolved: That the West Virginia University Board of Governors approves the revised budget of \$10,600,000 for the Allen Hall HVAC Upgrade Project that provides replacement of deteriorated heating pipes and abatement of asbestos. This approval is based upon funding availability from HEPC Bonds and WVU Revenue Bonds

9. Permission to Plan for a Biomedical Sciences Building

Resolved: That the West Virginia University Board of Governors grants permission for the Robert C. Byrd Health Sciences Center to plan for the addition of a Biomedical Sciences building on its campus. Funding for the building has been provided by the Federal Government.

OTHER BUSINESS

In reviewing the agenda for the April 8, 2005 BOG meeting, Mr. Barnette noted that the Audit Committee would also be meeting at that time.

Mr. Leech congratulated the University for its strong financial position, given the economic times..

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Virginia Petersen
Assistant Secretary

The State of the University from a Faculty Perspective
Report to the West Virginia University Board of Governors
February 11, 2005

by Christopher Wilkinson
Past Chair, West Virginia University Faculty Senate
Member, West Virginia University Board of Governors, 2003 - 2005

Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, President Hardesty. For the second, and final time as Faculty Representative to the Board, I stand before you to discuss issues of importance to the University Faculty. As you are all aware, my report to you last year consisted of an analysis of the professional environment in which our faculty works. As those present will recall, I described that environment as highly complex.

Beyond presenting an analysis of the academic profession as conducted by my colleagues at this institution, I also discussed what I regarded as three major adverse consequences of the working environment, consequences that I believe will continue into the future. First, a sense of the loss of control over the course of one's profession due to increased demand to fulfill certain duties at the expense of those representing desirable opportunities for professional development. Related to that is various forms of interference with professional contributions and advancements. Finally, the necessity for many colleagues employed for the nine-month period between August 16 and May 15 to devote their uncompensated summers to activities arising *not* from their personal professional agendas but rather to work that is vital to the fortunes of not only the individual faculty member but also to those of this institution. As I put it last year, "to serve their professions and this institution, [many faculty] must work off the clock."

Since then, of course, there have been a number of important developments so extensively discussed in previous Board meetings that brief references ought to suffice. First, the ten-year re-accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Second, the rapid and highly productive engagement with Strategic Planning by faculty leaders and administrators founded upon what I will refer to as the "2010 Plan" initially set forth last April and June. Third, the first substantial raise in faculty salaries based entirely upon professional achievement, this new performance-based standard a response to a mandate from the Higher Education Policy Commission. Most recently, the Provost's initiative to reward productive senior faculty at regular intervals for their continued contributions in teaching, research, and service. All of these developments are testimony to the distinguished and visionary leadership of this institution. Viewing all of these from the broad perspective that membership on the University's Board of Governors provides, I know that you are all fully cognizant of the extraordinary benefits all of these developments have for the University now and in the future.

Of these, it is the first one to which I will draw attention today: the highly favorable evaluation of the University by the Higher Learning Commission. A great many individuals from across the institution played essential roles in preparing reports of, and discussing with members of the Evaluation Team, the array of issues that bear on the quality of higher education at WVU. Members of that team expressed admiration for the accomplishments that occurred since the previous evaluation of 1994. From the construction of a state-of-the-art Downtown Campus Library which, I would argue, has effectively reoriented the focus of campus life for many students away from the Mountainlair and toward the inviting and well-equipped study facilities and collection of

the DCL, to the adoption of a new General Education Curriculum for all undergraduates, to successful fund raising initiatives, to a substantial increase in sponsored research, and increased collaboration with the larger business community, Team members found much to praise and were justified in doing so.

Within the third part of the Report to the Higher Learning Commission, the Advancement Section, we do find one loose end that concerns a subject that has fundamental consequences for the University faculty. The text that appears in the Board Book on page 26 presents that loose end. I will not take the time to read that text as I am certain you have done so already. I do intend to discuss the significance for faculty of the recommendation made, which was subsequently turned into an expectation by the Higher Learning Commission, that by May 1, 2007, the University submit a Progress Report on Assessment.

My discussion will be presented in four parts. First, what the Commission (and I) mean by the term "Assessment." Second, how this activity challenges the assumptions of many colleagues concerning the nature of their work. Third, what we are doing to establish a professional environment that welcomes Assessment as a beneficial activity for faculty. Finally, what I believe to be the Board of Governors' responsibility in this matter as part of its oversight of the University's academic mission.

One final point before I begin, and this concerns the continuity of Faculty representation on this Board. It was thanks to the encouragement of Hank Barnette, and the unanimous consent of the Faculty Senate, that a two-year term was established for this position. While some of my colleagues on the Board are serving for an identical period, others have longer terms, and the possibility of a renewed appointment is available to all. This provides essential continuity and promotes the maintenance of institutional memory at this level which serves the University well.

The value of such continuity has also been the impetus for my continuing consultation on various matters with the Faculty Senate, most consistently with its current leadership. For the Board's information, the subject of this report and, indeed, its content and conclusions reflect not simply my own perspective but as well those of my colleagues, Dr. Larry Hornak, Professor of Electrical Engineering and current Chair of the Faculty Senate, and Dr. Michael Lastinger, Associate Professor of Foreign Languages who is Chair-elect. Upon assuming office next June, he will become my successor as Faculty Representative to this body. All of us have involved with issues of Assessment, are committed to institutionalizing its practice here, and Mike will take responsibility for informing you on appropriate occasions of the progress we are making.

To the matter at hand: what do we mean by "Assessment?" The working definition we have adopted is this: "Assessment is an ongoing process aimed at understanding and improving student learning. It involves making our expectations explicit, systematically collecting, analyzing, and interpreting evidence to determine how well students' performance matches our expectations, and using the results to document, describe, and improve students' performance." This definition characterizes the particular form of Assessment with which we are concerned: Outcomes Assessment. We seek to determine what outcomes undergraduates have achieved through their educational experiences, or to put it another way, what students know and what they can do with that knowledge.

Outcomes Assessment may be said to function in two contexts: the major field or program, wherein we are engaged in "Programmatic Assessment," and the more elusive domain, the General Education Curriculum or GEC, the successor to the Liberal Studies

Program which in turn was preceded by the Core Curriculum. Board members who received their undergraduate degrees from this University are alumni of one of these latter curricula; the GEC replaces the Liberal Studies Program beginning with the Fall Semester, 2005. The issues surrounding Assessment are many and complex. A full presentation on all of them at this time would, I fear, exhaust both your attention and your patience. Therefore, in this report I will focus attention only upon Outcomes Assessment in the context of the GEC.

Some, or all, of the following questions may have occurred to some of you. Aren't faculty already giving tests and grading papers? Don't they give final grades in their courses? Isn't the University already in the business of assessment? The response to all three questions is "yes." However, such assessment is tied to specific courses. In fact, education professionals refer to grades as an "evaluation," not an "assessment. Grades do not reliably tell us what students may take with them after the class is over, after the semester ends, after they graduate, nor what they are able to do with whatever it is they do take away. To put it another way, if, as Albert Einstein observed, "Education is what remains after one has forgotten everything he learned in school," then Outcomes Assessment seeks to determine what does indeed "remain" with our graduates as a result of their studies at this University once they have left the campus over time.

Since discussions of Outcomes Assessment were initiated several years ago, some faculty have been asking those same questions. Others have *not* asked these questions but rather have asserted that they do assess their students in the belief that grades should be sufficient indicators of students' potential and that they have no interest in any additional forms of evaluation. Still others do not believe it is possible to measure what we might refer to as "the rest and residue" of a college education—that term is for the benefit of any Board members who may be attorneys. All of which leads me to my second subject: the challenges Outcomes Assessment poses to my colleagues' assumptions of what their instructional activities require of them.

Briefly put, many of the highly dedicated and highly effective instructors at this University have in the past and will continue in the future to provide the kind of educational experiences that intellectually empower their students and thus prepare them for highly productive lives. Evidence of this is all around us: from graduates' success in the job market and in gaining admission to graduate programs in a variety of fields, to the accomplishments of alumni, and to the extraordinary loyalty those alumni have shown to their alma mater in the form of contributions to the Capital Campaign: \$135,802,925.00 were contributed by 25,494 graduates of this institution.

However, that is no longer enough. In the current climate of accountability in American higher education, more precise measures are required. Understandably, some faculty are angry at what they regard as an unnecessary intrusion into their work. Others are fearful that whatever Outcomes Assessment may reveal will become the basis of punitive action directed at them for alleged inadequacies. Still others are resentful of what they regard as a further claim on precious time that will only result in reports that will go on some shelf somewhere to gather dust. While it may be tempting to deride all of these attitudes, I would be less than candid if I did not tell you that as someone who currently has many more professional ambitions than time in which to accomplish them, any add-on had better demonstrate its benefits to me before I will happily embrace it. And there can be no mistake that Outcomes Assessment represents an additional responsibility within the academic mission of this institution.

That said, I will state unequivocally that I believe that this initiative will be as beneficial for the faculty as it will for the students and for the reputation of the University. Quite frankly (and perhaps with less modesty than might seem appropriate), I see Outcomes Assessment as another means by which to validate my belief that I and many of my colleagues are doing an exceptional job in the classrooms, laboratories, and studios in which both teaching and learning take place at WVU. If at any point such measures reveal unanticipated deficiencies, I am equally confident that the University's faculty both collectively and individually will be able to respond effectively: modifying teaching strategies, rearranging the sequence in which information is presented, taking advantage of new instructional technologies, posing different questions to our students, and by other means working to enhance their education further.

My third subject concerns what we are doing to establish a professional environment that welcomes Assessment as a beneficial activity for faculty. Before beginning this discussion, I will ask Board members to look once again at the text of the Recommendation by the Evaluation Team on behalf of the Higher Learning Commission concerning Assessment, which calls for a Progress Report on assessment by May 1, 2007. You will note that in two instances I italicized statements, and I direct your attention to those passages. The first appears under that part of the Recommendation concerning "Department-level program assessment." The first characteristic is that this type of assessment "Shows *clear ownership* by the faculty." The second highlighted text comes in the final paragraph of the Recommendation in which the team expresses confidence in the University's approach to assessment and also the belief "that its implementation will develop *strong faculty support* and will be successful in improving the University's educational programs." I have drawn your attention to these two passages because in different language they express the same expectation: that the University's faculty will embrace Outcomes Assessment, and, as a result, further and continuous improvement in undergraduate education at WVU can be anticipated.

This is our challenge: to develop strong faculty support for an initiative that is for many a new and, to a greater or lesser extent, an unknown quantity, and to do so to such an extent that the faculty take ownership of the process. "Ownership" is a somewhat trendy term, and, like many such terms, its popularity may be due to its ambiguity: anyone can claim to understand what it means because anyone can define it however she or he chooses or change the definition if expedience suggests doing so. I believe that we should understand the term as meaning the same thing in connection with a protocol for determining what our students know and what they can do with that knowledge as it does in connection with a house, a car, or any other material item. As consumers, we take ownership of these and other commodities when we believe to do so will be to our advantage.

Academics are trained to be skeptical. As scholars, their research is bound by rigorous protocols. They require the best evidence, devise elegantly-reasoned explanations of its significance, test their conclusions by the most objective means available, and then send those conclusions out into the larger world for their peers to review and evaluate. To cultivate a sense of ownership of Outcomes Assessment, we must honor those standards by engaging in continuing dialogue with our colleagues, challenging erroneous and/or self-serving conclusions about Outcomes Assessment—some based upon ignorance, others on fear, still others on apathy. We must be responsive to expressions of legitimate concern about its use and value. If we do these things, I believe over time we will forge the kind of favorable consensus that constitutes the "strong faculty support" called for by the Evaluation Team of the Higher Learning Commission.

Since early last summer, a Task Force of Faculty and Administrators has been working on the myriad issues associated with implementing the new General Education Curriculum or GEC. We have done so in order to make the transition to this new curriculum as smooth as possible for students, advisors, faculty, student records officers, the Office of Admissions and Records, and all other University constituencies that may be affected by this change. A subgroup of that Task Force, chaired by my colleague, Dr. Elizabeth Jones, Associate Professor of Advanced Educational Studies in the College of Human Resources and Education, whose specialization is Assessment, has focused its attention on the matter of Outcomes Assessment of the GEC. Thanks to Beth's expertise and guidance, we have developed the draft of a comprehensive Assessment Plan for this curriculum, one that reflects the best practices currently available, one that is longitudinal in design, one that we regard as flexible so as to allow for modifications as findings warrant, and one that we believe to be highly cost-effective. We know how easy it is to spend other people's money; we are being very careful to achieve the most reliable results for the least cost.

During the course of recent meetings of the Task Force to consider this Plan, we concluded that it is essential to build that sense of ownership so critical to the success of Outcomes Assessment in stages. First, all questions and doubts expressed by Task Force members must be answered to *their* satisfaction, with revisions to the Plan if necessary. The same holds true for the concerns of the Provost and other members of the Office of Academic Affairs, for the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, and for the Faculty Senate itself. Concurrent with these discussions, we will identify colleagues known to be either skeptical of or hostile to this initiative in order to address their concerns to the greatest extent possible. It is my expectation that with a strong endorsement by the Faculty Senate we will have a firm foundation of support upon which to argue for this Assessment Plan across the University.

In talking about Ownership previously, I gave my definition of the term in the context of this initiative. But what does Ownership look like? How will we know when we have it? Again, I refer you to the Board book, page 26. Reproduced there is a document in which I take enormous pleasure. It is the tally of the vote taken by the Faculty Senate last March 8 to approve the General Education Curriculum and its implementation as of this coming Fall Semester. I will explain why I think this is what Ownership looks like.

If we look behind the raw figures of the vote on whether to adopt the GEC and abandon a curricular design that in certain key respects had been in place for forty years, the concept of genuine ownership by the Faculty Senate of this innovative curriculum is demonstrated. Of 81 senators voting, 60, or 74%, supported the new curriculum, whereas 21, or 26% did not. I submit that, beyond the obvious conclusion that the motion passed with overwhelming support, those 60 senators represent two of the three cohorts of individuals to be found in any organization who are confronted with a proposal for change.

It is just as true in academia as elsewhere that a call for innovation is greeted immediately and enthusiastically by approximately 20-25% of a group and just as vigorously opposed by a number of similar proportions. In the middle, are those who need to be persuaded of the merits of the proposed change and also persuaded that those who oppose it are wrong. I submit that those 60 senators combine the initially enthusiastic and that far larger middle group who came to see the merits of the proposal as a result of through extensive discussions, constructive modifications to the curriculum, and effective responses to their initial expressions of doubt. I also submit that this is what ownership looks like.

February 11, 2005

None of those closely involved with the implementation of Outcomes Assessment has any illusions that we can persuade *all* faculty of its virtues. All of us are agreed that time and energy must be devoted to the careful development of an ever-widening consensus of faculty in favor of this fundamental change in practice. Because of the attention that we will continue to pay to the legitimate interests of our colleagues, I have every confidence that we can meet our goal of designing a plan that, in the language of the Evaluation Team's Recommendation, "shows clear ownership by the faculty," that will enjoy "strong faculty support," and, most importantly, "will be successful in improving the university's educational programs."

Finally, what do I believe the Board of Governors' role to be in this initiative? It is to ask the following questions of the Faculty Representative as well as of the Provost at least once a year on the occasion of their reports to this body.

1. What Outcomes Assessments have been implemented?
2. To what extent are faculty members embracing this new initiative, that is, to what extent are they taking ownership, and how do we know?
3. Finally, and most importantly, what are the major results from the assessments and what changes have been made based upon this evidence?

Thank you very much. I will be happy to answer questions at this time.