

**KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE
MEETING AGENDA
November 4, 2025
10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**

The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) will meet virtually via Zoom. An in-person option will be available at the Curtis State Office Building at 1000 SW Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka, Kansas, 66612.

- | | |
|---|---|
| I. Call to Order | Regent Johnston, Chair |
| A. Roll Call and Introductions | |
| B. Approve Minutes from September 17, 2025, Meeting | |
|
II. Board Consent Items | |
| No Items | |
|
III. Board Discussion Agenda Items | |
| Consideration of Revisions to the Board's Policies on Tenure,
Post-Tenure Review, and Workload | Rusty Monhollon, VP
Academic Affairs |
| p.5 | |
|
IV. Other Matters | |
| Academic Affairs Updates | |
|
V. Announcements | |
| Next BAASC Meeting – November 19, 2025 | |
|
VI. Adjournment | |

BOARD ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE

Three Regents serve on the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC), established in 2002. The Regents are appointed annually by the Chair and approved by the Board. BAASC meets virtually approximately two weeks before each Board meeting. The Committee also meets on the morning of the first day of the monthly Board meeting. Membership includes:

Alysia Johnston, Chair

Pamela Ammar

Diana Mendoza

Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee

AY 2025 Meeting Schedule

<i>BAASC Academic Year 2025- 2026 Meeting Dates</i>			
Meeting Dates	Location	Time	Agenda Materials Due
September 3, 2025	Virtual Meeting	10:30 a.m.	August 13, 2025
September 17, 2025	Topeka	10:45 a.m.	August 27, 2025
September 30, 2025	Virtual Meeting	10:30 a.m.	September 9, 2025
November 4, 2025	Virtual Meeting	10:30 a.m.	October 14, 2025
November 19, 2025	Virtual Meeting	10:45 a.m.	October 29, 2025
December 2, 2024	Virtual Meeting	10:30 a.m.	November 11, 2025
December 17, 2025	Topeka	10:45 a.m.	November 26, 2025
January 6, 2026	Virtual Meeting	10:30 a.m.	December 16, 2025
January 14, 2026	Topeka	10:45 a.m.	December 24, 2025
February 3, 2026	Virtual Meeting	10:30 a.m.	January 13, 2026
February 11, 2026	Topeka	10:45 a.m.	January 21, 2026
March 3, 2026	Virtual Meeting	10:30 a.m.	February 10, 2026
March 11, 2026	Topeka	10:45 a.m.	February 18, 2026
March 31, 2026	Virtual Meeting	10:30 a.m.	March 10, 2026
May 5, 2026	Virtual Meeting	10:30 a.m.	April 14, 2026
May 20, 2026	Topeka	10:45 a.m.	April 29, 2026
June 2, 2026	Virtual Meeting	10:30 a.m.	May 12, 2026
June 17, 2026	Topeka	10:45 a.m.	May 27, 2026

Please note that virtual meeting times are 10:30 a.m. and Board Day meetings are 10:45 a.m., unless otherwise noted.

KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE
MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 17, 2025

The September 17, 2025, meeting of the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee was called to order by Chair Alysia Johnston at 10:45 a.m. The meeting was held in the Board Office located in the Curtis State Office Building, 1000 S.W. Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka. *Proper notice was given according to law.*

MEMBERS PRESENT: Regent Alysia Johnston
 Regent Diana Mendoza
 Regent Pamela Ammar

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regent Diana Mendoza moved that the minutes of the September 3, 2025, meeting be approved. Following the second of Regent Pamela Ammar, the motion carried.

Other Matters

Take Action on GED Score for Systemwide Mathematics Placement Measures

Dr. Jennifer Bonds-Raacke, Director of Academic Affairs for KBOR, gave an overview of related policies to the current issue paper, including systemwide placement measures for math and English courses approved in May 2023 and multiple placement measures for gateway math courses approved in September 2024. Today's item expands the multiple placement measures to include a GED score option. The Adult Education division recommends adding the GED score as an additional systemwide measure for entry into gateway courses without corequisite support. The recommended GED scores are included on pg. 6 of the agenda. Regent Mendoza clarified that students with a GED score would not be required to take additional placement assessments. Regent Johnston further clarified that GED scores would permit students' entry into any of the three gateway math courses. Regent Ammar moved to approve the addition of the GED score as a multiple measure for the systemwide mathematics placement. Following the second of Regent Mendoza, the motion carried.

Take Action on GED Score for Systemwide English Placement Measures

Sam Christy-Dangermond, Director of Academic Affairs for KBOR, thanked Julie Clark, Associate Director of High School Equivalency for KBOR, for her efforts in lining up GED scores with the existing measures. She added that a GED score of 160 would qualify students for English Composition 1 without corequisite support. Students who do not meet any of the placement measures are welcome to take the course with corequisite support. Regent Johnston asked how many students are entering the KBOR system with a GED score. Julie Clark responded that approximately 40 percent of the 900 GED earners from AY 2024-2025 went on to post-secondary education in the state of Kansas. Regent Ammar moved to approve the systemwide English placement measures. Following the second of Regent Mendoza, the motion carried.

Academic Affairs Updates

Sam Christy-Dangermond shared that 2025 performance reports are expected to be presented to the committee in executive summary form in November. These reports stem from the three-year performance agreements from AY 2024-AY 2026, committing the institutions to full implementation of Math Pathways, corequisite developmental support, and systemwide course placement measures for gateway Math and English courses by Fall 2026.

Jennifer Bonds-Raacke shared that the 2025 KCOG conference will take place on October 10th, which will review 7 new courses and 21 review courses.

Regent Johnston asked how many courses transfer through TAAC. JBR responded that after this year, there will be 133 courses in the system.

Announcements

Next BAASC Meeting – September 30, 2025

Adjournment

Regent Johnston adjourned the meeting at 11:03 a.m.

**Consideration of Revisions to the Board's
Policies on Tenure, Post-Tenure Review, and
Workload**

Dr. Rusty Monhollon
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Summary

As one of its goals for the academic year, the Kansas Board of Regents directed the Board's Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) to collaborate with faculty and academic leadership to conduct a comprehensive review of Tenure, Post-Tenure Review, and Instructional Workload policies at the state universities. This initiative aims to ensure these frameworks support academic innovation, faculty development, and student success.

Background

As directed by the Board, BAASC initiated a comprehensive review of the Board's Tenure, Post-Tenure Review, and Workload policies. Academic Affairs' staff took the lead for the reviews.

The Regents discussed these policies at its July retreat. Although no vote was taken, there was a consensus that the Board wanted to "strengthen" its policies to protect and preserve tenure.

Soon after the retreat, Academic Affairs' staff met with the provosts and the faculty senate presidents to discuss the Board's motivation for reviewing these policies, what outcomes it hoped to achieve, and to chart a path forward for completing the review. The participants agreed that KBOR staff would revise the policies and share those drafts with the provosts and faculty senate presidents for their review and comment. The faculty senate presidents said they would solicit feedback from their campus colleagues before responding back with recommendations.

Staff drafted revised versions of each policy, based on research conducted on other states and systems. Staff identified numerous key elements from systems comparable to KBOR, many of which were incorporated into the draft. From this research, staff also identified other elements they believed would help strengthen the Board's policies and achieve its goals.

Staff sent the first revised drafts to the provosts for review and comment, and made revisions based on their feedback. These revised drafts were shared with both the provosts and the faculty senate presidents for comment. The provosts and the faculty senate presidents met virtually to discuss the recommended changes. Staff then revised the drafts based on this discussion and the feedback received from the provosts and the faculty senate presidents. Staff shared this draft one final time with the provosts and the faculty senate presidents before sending it to members of BAASC.

Discussion

The Workload Policy has been revised substantially with the goals of strengthening it and linking to tenure and post-tenure reviews. Revisions to the Tenure and Post-Tenure Review policies were mainly the addition of an annual reporting requirement for both. Language was added to the Post-Tenure Review policy requiring each institution's post-tenure review policy to include provisions for the dismissal of faculty who have been placed on an improvement plan and have not satisfactorily completed the improvement plan. Additionally, a post-tenure review can be triggered if a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory performance rating on an annual evaluation.

Recommendation

Staff recommends BAASC approve the revisions made to the Tenure, Post-Tenure Review, and Workload policies, and forward them to the full Board for its consideration.

KBOR TENURE POLICY

CHAPTER II: GOVERNANCE – STATE UNIVERSITIES . . .

C. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, FACULTY AND STAFF . . .

2. APPOINTMENTS . . .

b. Faculty and Staff . . .

vii. Tenure for Tenure Track Faculty Appointments ([See Details of COVID-19 Exception](#))

(1) This policy applies only to faculty who have been given tenure-track appointments.

Faculty who have been awarded tenure may be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of program or unit discontinuance or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigency.

(2) In the interpretation of the principles contained in paragraph (1) above, the following is applicable:

(a) The terms and conditions of every appointment shall be stated in writing and be made available to the tenure-track faculty member at the time of appointment.

(b) Beginning with the institution's full-time appointment of the tenure-track faculty member, the probationary period shall not exceed seven years. Faculty health care providers whose sole practice is in connection with a KU practice plan, and/or a KU-affiliated VA hospital or pediatric provider, may be considered full-time solely for purposes of appointment to the Tenure Track. Medical school faculty researchers who are employed by the VA or by a pediatric provider to conduct medical research may be considered full-time solely for purposes of appointment to the Tenure Track. Physician faculty whose sole medical practice is in connection with a KU physician practice plan and who are appointed by the chief executive officer of the University of Kansas Hospital Authority ("KUHA") to hold the position of Senior Vice President for Clinical Affairs or Physician in Chief of the KU Cancer Center as part of the Medical Center's clinical integration with KUHA may be considered full-time solely for purposes of appointment to the Tenure Track as determined by the Chancellor to be in the best interest of the Medical Center. The chief executive officer, or the chief executive officer's designee, may at his or her discretion reduce the probationary period at the time of appointment if it has been determined that the faculty member has served a partial probationary period at a comparable institution and such reduction is in the best interests of the institution. In no instance, however, may the probationary period for a tenure-track faculty member be reduced to less than four years, even though thereby the person's total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years. Notices should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the tenure-track faculty member is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period.

(c) If an untenured faculty member becomes a parent through birth, adoptive placement, or adoption of a child under the age of 5 prior to May 1st of the fifth year of the probationary period, that faculty member, upon notification to the

institution's chief academic officer, shall be granted a one-year delay of the tenure review. Notification must occur within 90 days of the birth, adoptive placement, or adoption. Faculty members retain the right to opt out of this interruption policy.

(d) Under unexpected special and extenuating circumstances, prior to the sixth year of service, and at the request of the faculty member and the appropriate dean, the chief academic officer of the university may grant an extension of the tenure clock for a maximum of one year.

(e) No more than two extensions of the tenure clock may be granted to a faculty member for any reason. Nothing in this provision shall be construed to guarantee reappointment of an untenured faculty member.

(f) Tenure is a privilege that must be affirmatively granted by the institution in recognition of meritorious performance. Tenure is not a privilege that can be achieved simply through continuous service at the institution, regardless of a faculty member's length of service. Absent an affirmative action by a state university to award tenure, a faculty member shall not qualify for tenure solely by virtue of completing the probationary period.

(3) Within this general policy, each state university may make such operating regulations as it deems necessary, subject to the approval of the Board.

(4) Any tenure approved by the institution shall be limited to tenure for the recommended individual at the institution consistent with the tenure policies of that institution. (Effective 11/14/2002)

(5) In exceptional cases, the chief executive officer at a state university may hire faculty members with tenure without their having completed a probationary period.

(6) Decisions of the chief executive officer shall be final and are not subject to further administrative review by any officer or committee of the institution or by the Board of Regents.

(7) Each university shall submit an annual tenure review report to the Board's vice president for academic affairs. The report shall include, at a minimum, data on the number of tenured faculty, faculty on a tenure-track, faculty awarded tenure in the past academic year, faculty denied tenure in the same period, and tenure-track faculty who have left the university before applying for tenure.

i. The tenure review report may be combined with the post-tenure review report.

KBOR POST-TENURE POLICY

CHAPTER II: GOVERNANCE – STATE UNIVERSITIES . . .

C. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, FACULTY AND STAFF . . .

8. EVALUATION OF FACULTY AND POST-TENURE REVIEW

It is the policy of the Kansas Board of Regents that merit increases for faculty shall be based on the annual evaluation of their performance as it relates to the mission of the institution, college/school, and department. The Board of Regents holds the state university chief executive officers accountable for the development and implementation of evaluation systems in accordance with the following guidelines:

Faculty evaluation criteria, procedures, and instruments shall be developed through faculty participation in each department, college, or division. **They will be documented in annual work plans so that all will** understand performance expectations. Criteria, procedures, and instruments shall be:

- i. sufficiently flexible to meet the objectives of the unit.
 - ii. sensitive to multi-year faculty activities and outcomes.
 - iii. approved by the chief academic officer of each university.
 - iv. compatible with contemporary research and scholarly literature on faculty evaluation. For example, when evaluating research, where research is part of the job duties, the assessment should typically include, but is not limited to, information on the quality of the research, the quantity of research conducted, the media through which findings were shared, innovation, partnerships, licensure, and the reception and significance of the research. Similarly, when evaluating teaching, where teaching is part of the job duties, the assessment should generally include, but is not limited to, student ratings obtained anonymously under standard conditions on norm-referenced instruments that account for initial student motivation, evaluation of syllabi, and evaluation of instructional materials.
- b. Each state university shall make available to faculty a ratings instrument for securing student ratings of instruction in all courses. The instrument must be norm-referenced and corrected for major sources of bias as demonstrated by research.
 - c. The evaluation of faculty performance and **future expectations, as detailed in each faculty member's annual work plan, [see Workload Policy, 3. Annual Evaluation]** shall be discussed with them. Documentation recording the sense of the discussion shall be provided to the faculty member.
 - i. The faculty member shall be given the opportunity to add comments to the documentation as part of the official record before it is considered at the next higher administrative level.
 - ii. Each state university shall establish a procedure by which faculty who disagree with their evaluation may request a review.
 - d. Each state university shall implement a plan to supplement its annual faculty evaluation system and shall adopt and implement a post-tenure review plan

consistent with this policy. Each plan shall include procedures and strategies for the following.

- i. The training of departmental chairpersons in the administration of faculty evaluation.
 - ii. The linkage of the outcomes of faculty evaluation with assistance for renewal and development and, when necessary, reassignment and other personnel actions.
 - iii. The training and supervision of graduate teaching assistants.
- e. Regular post-tenure review.
 - i. In addition to the annual evaluation required of all full-time and full-time equivalent faculty, tenured faculty members undergo a post-tenure review five years after receiving tenure. Post-tenure reviews will continue at five-year intervals unless a review for promotion is warranted.
 - ii. The main goal of this process is to help faculty identify opportunities that will allow them to reach their full potential for contributing to the university. Post-tenure reviews aim to provide a broader, long-term perspective compared to the annual review.
 - iii. A post-tenure review committee shall conduct the review. The post-tenure review committee must consist of at least five individuals, two of whom must be from outside of the home department of the faculty member under review.
 - iv. Tenured faculty members who receive an unsatisfactory post-tenure review evaluation will be placed on a one-year improvement plan, developed by the chair or direct supervisor and approved by the appropriate dean and provost. Faculty who do not satisfactorily complete the improvement plan are subject to dismissal, reassignment, and other personnel actions.
 - v. The faculty member under review may appeal the post-tenure review committee's decision through an appropriate university governance structure.
- f. Annual Reporting.
 - i. Each university must submit an annual post-tenure review report to the Board's vice president for academic affairs. The report should include, at a minimum, data on the number of faculty subject to a post-tenure review, those placed on an improvement plan, dismissals resulting from post-tenure review, and other faculty departures not directly related to a post-tenure review.

CHAPTER II: GOVERNANCE – STATE UNIVERSITIES

A. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

12. FACULTY WORKLOAD POLICY

Faculty are crucial in developing a higher education system in Kansas that focuses on access, excellence, accountability, research, and service. Their influence on the quality and value of a university education is clear in areas like curriculum design, teaching strategies, program development, and creating a vibrant learning environment. Additionally, faculty shape this experience through their research, scholarship, creative work, service to the university, community, and profession, as well as their engagement with students inside and outside the classroom, including advising. The Kansas Board of Regents' workload policy is designed to cover all these aspects by establishing standards for workload expectations, acknowledging faculty contributions in each area, and ensuring accountability to both the university and the state.

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that each campus's workload policies and procedures fairly treat all full-time and full-time equivalent faculty across the institution, reduce conflicts over workload expectations, and promote consistency in performance evaluations. Additionally, the policy aims to improve accountability and transparency, allowing the Board and legislature to understand staffing needs and budget implications better.

The Kansas Board of Regents recognizes that workload types vary widely across campuses, departments, colleges, and disciplines. It also acknowledges that faculty workloads differ among individuals—both across the campus and within departments or divisions—based on the specific needs of each unit. The Board expects faculty workloads to be equitable, fair, and balanced, and aligned with the unique needs of each department and the whole institution.

Faculty includes a diverse group of institutional staff. It encompasses tenured and tenure-track professors, as well as those not on the tenure track. It may also include clinical and research faculty, librarians, extension agents, and others. Faculty members have various responsibilities, which are outlined below.

1. Each institution shall develop and implement a workload standard policy for all full-time and full-time equivalent faculty.
 - a. The institution's chief academic officer, in consultation with the faculty through regular shared governance processes, is responsible for developing and implementing the workload policy.
 - b. The institution's workload policy must establish guidelines that enable each department chair (or head of a comparable academic unit), under the supervision of the dean (or an appropriate supervisor), to manage faculty workload within the department effectively to support student success and align with the missions of both the department and the university.
 - c. Institution-specific faculty workload policies, at a minimum, shall include:

- i. the types of assignments and how effort is allocated for each faculty member across teaching; research, scholarship and creative activity; and service and engagement;
 - ii. clear statements of expectations and accountability that recognize merit and hold faculty responsible when they fall short, and also hold department chairs or division heads accountable for evaluating faculty based on these expectations.
 - iii. a process for assessing faculty performance relative to workload expectations and presenting the outcomes of these evaluations to the faculty member and the appropriate dean;
 - iv. assurances that faculty members meet their workload obligations properly and within acceptable performance standards;
 - v. provisions for equitable workload variations within departments and schools, and among individual faculty.
- d. All faculty should have assigned teaching loads, although exceptions are permitted for clinical and research faculty, librarians, extension agents, workers, and others with non-instructional roles. The table below shows typical workload percentage ranges by institution type, setting fair expectations for teaching, research, and service. Variations in teaching loads among individuals within departments, schools, or colleges are acceptable if approved by the provost. Some programs' accrediting standards might change the usual teaching load, and others may differ due to the program's intensity, such as studio programs in art and music. The Board's expectation is not for uniform workloads across the entire institution but for fair and equitable workload assignments.

Average Faculty Workload across Academic Units				
Percent of Total Effort				
Institution Type	Teaching	Research	Service	Typical Teaching Load Per Semester
Doctoral Universities	40-55%	35-45%	5-20%	6-9 credit hours
Master's Colleges and Universities	60-75%	15-30%	5-20%	12 credit hours

- e. Instruction at the University of Kansas Medical Center and the Kansas State University College of Veterinary Medicine differs significantly from that at other schools and colleges within the system. These institutions are permitted to establish workload standards for their faculty based on criteria that differ from those outlined in this policy.
2. Essential elements of the workload policy
- a. Teaching
 - i. Teaching and instruction are essential components of faculty workload expectations. Faculty teach both undergraduate and graduate courses, but they also have additional instructional duties such as developing new courses and materials, updating existing content, creating courseware or other resources for technology-based teaching, supervising individual courses like directed readings, overseeing undergraduate research, master's theses, and doctoral dissertations. They also mentor students in co-curricular activities like plays, exhibits, and preparing and setting up new laboratories. Furthermore, they manage teaching

assistants, oversee internships, and offer academic advising, mentoring, and other support activities that promote student success.

- b. Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity
 - i. Institutional policies should clearly define how research, scholarship, and creative activities contribute to a faculty member's total workload and specify the extent of their impact. These expectations may be higher at institutions where research is a primary mission.
 - ii. Research productivity measures vary by discipline and subdiscipline within the same academic units and across colleges and schools. Therefore, institutional workload policies must clearly specify the research activities expected of faculty within the context and expectations of their specific discipline, such as writing and securing grants; applying for and receiving fellowships; innovation, partnerships, and licensure; the impact and importance of the research; supervising graduate students or postdoctoral associates, or both; and sharing scholarship through peer-reviewed journal articles, book reviews, monographs, book chapters, textbooks, conference papers and presentations, and producing other educational materials.
 - c. Service and Engagement
 - i. Faculty members engage in service that advances the institution's goals and supports its role in serving Kansas and beyond.
 - ii. Faculty service activities may include efforts that strengthen the university or discipline's scholarly community, enhance the quality of life or society, or support the overall well-being of the institution, professional and academic societies, the community, the state, the nation, or the international community.
 - d. Faculty members may also have administrative duties, such as serving as department chair or head, program director, or center director, that impact their workload. Institutional policies should specify how and to what extent these responsibilities are included in a faculty member's total workload.
 - e. Institutions may assign different weights to each of these activities and to other activities it considers essential parts of faculty workloads based on department, discipline or subdiscipline, and other considerations.
 - f. Institutions must create a process for reviewing and evaluating workload assignments.
3. Annual Evaluation
- a. Each full-time and full-time equivalent faculty member is required to have an annual work plan and undergo an annual evaluation by the department chair or division head.
 - b. During the annual review, the department chair or head shall evaluate the faculty member's work against their approved work plan and decide whether the faculty member has met or not met the expectations outlined in the plan.
 - c. The work plan should clearly delineate the expected outcomes and efforts a faculty member needs to achieve in the upcoming academic year, noting that these items may be part of longer-term or multi-year projects. Its objectives should support and align with the criteria for an upcoming summative or comprehensive review, such as reappointment, promotion, tenure, or post-tenure review. The plan must specify expectations for teaching, research, scholarship, and creative activities, as well as service

and engagement, including percentage time allocations that correspond to the faculty member's FTE status.

- i. A faculty member who does not satisfactorily meet their workload expectations for the review period will be placed on an improvement plan.
 - ii. The improvement plan must include specific steps aimed at addressing deficiencies, a timeline for expected progress, and a statement of consequences if improvement does not happen within that period.
 - iii. Faculty members who receive two consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations will be dismissed.
- d. Institutions are responsible for making sure supervisors have training and the necessary skills to perform their responsibilities effectively.

4. Annual Reporting

- a. Beginning with the 2025-2026 Academic year and continuing every other year thereafter, each campus provost will submit a faculty workload report to the Board's vice president for academic affairs. The report shall cover the two prior academic years. The annual report has two primary purposes:
 - i. To illustrate the breadth and variety of faculty activities and how these activities contribute to students, the university's mission, the state, and society at large.
 - ii. To establish a systemwide level of transparency and accountability for how faculty allocate their work time.
- a. The Board's vice president for academic affairs, in consultation with the provosts, will create the report format.
 - i. The annual report should include a narrative that highlights faculty responsibilities, the quality of their work, and how their efforts benefit students, the university, the state, and the broader community. It should also explain the institution's workload policy and how it ensures faculty perform at a high level.
 - iii. Annual reporting metrics will include, at a minimum, the following data:
 - 1. Total credit hours produced, disaggregated by level of the courses taught (lower- and upper-division, undergraduate and graduate).
 - 2. Percentage of all credit hours produced by full-time tenured/tenure track and full-time, non-tenure track instructional faculty, disaggregated by level of courses.
 - 3. Number of sections taught per semester by full-time tenured/tenure track and full-time, non-tenure track instructional faculty, disaggregated by level of courses.
 - 4. Average student credit hour production for core instructional faculty
 - 5. The number of bachelor's degrees awarded
 - 6. Four-year undergraduate graduation rates
 - 7. Student retention rates
 - 8. Faculty publication and scholarship
 - 9. Amount of research funding secured by faculty
 - iv. This report shall be presented to the Board and shared widely with legislators and other constituents.