THE BOARD AND EDUCATIONAL QUALITY: FINDING THE RIGHT BALANCE
Why a Focus Now on Student Learning?

- Tremendous Investments
- The Questioning of Value and Worth of Degrees
- Increased Focus on Accountability
Overseeing Educational Quality

The Role of the Board
Board Duties: Deliver and Sustain the Mission

- **DELIVER**: Are we delivering on our promise?
- **SUSTAIN**: Will we exist and succeed “forever?”

Fulfill the mission

Ensure long-term viability
The Board’s Role in the Oversight of Educational Quality (2011)

1. Develop board capacity for ensuring educational quality
2. Ensure policies and practices promote educational quality
3. Ensure learning is assessed, data are used, and improvements tracked
4. Approve and monitor necessary financial resources
5. Develop understanding of academic programs
6. Focus on total educational experience
7. Understand accreditation
Board (In)Sufficient Time on Student Learning

- Yes: 38%
- Not enough time: 62%
- Too much: 0%

2010
Time Spent: Money vs. Mission

Relative balance of time on academic and financial issues.

- **57%** Much more on finance/budgets
- **22%** Slightly more on finance/budgets
- **3%** Slightly more on academic issues
- **2%** Much more on academic issues
How has the board’s attention changed in the last five years?

- More attention now: 53%
- About the same: 31%
- Less attention now: 1%
- Don’t know: 15%
Impediments, if any, to the board’s understanding of student learning outcomes

- Lack of interest: 13%
- No impediments: 16%
- Not the Board's role: 22%
- Not enough time: 45%
- Other priorities: 64%
The Curriculum is the Faculty’s Responsibility…

The Board’s Role is to Remind Them of This Responsibility

- Ensure that the institution has an appropriate set of learning outcomes statements
- Ensure that efforts to determine the effectiveness of teaching and learning are in place and ongoing
- Ensure that institutions use the data they collect for improvement

Peter Ewell. Making the Grade. AGB
Key Board Questions: Our “Product”

• How good is our product?
• How good are we at producing our product?
• Are our customers satisfied?
• Do we have the right mix of products?
• Do we make the grade?

Source: Making the Grade: How Boards Can Ensure Academic Quality, Peter Ewell (AGB, 2012)
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Project Cornerstones

1. Metrics regarding student learning and educational quality

2. Institutional processes for educational quality and student learning

3. Board processes, practices, habits

4. Effective strategies for productive faculty and trustee relations
Early Returns

- Mission matters for metrics
- Definitions vary
- To standardize or not to standardize
- Start with what you have; determine what you need
  - Drake University (16 different assessment tools)
- It’s difficult and time-consuming work that requires intentional attention
  - Unfamiliar conversations
  - No foundation upon which to build
  - Challenge of rolling up
Early Returns

- Know where the board thinks it is (and know where it really is)
- Engage meaningfully: Risky showing “pounds of data”
- Challenge to align elements:
  - Faculty work
  - Board meeting schedules
  - Accreditation reviews
Questions for Boards: True or False?

☐ My institution/system has a well-defined set of student learning outcomes.

☐ My college/university/system gathers sound and useful evidence of those student learning outcomes.

☐ The board receives regular information about the achievement of student learning outcomes.

☐ I would be able to explain what “educational quality” means for this institution to a new board member.

☐ I view the oversight of educational quality as an important element of the board’s fiduciary role.
Questions for Boards: True or False?

☐ The responsibility for “doing” educational quality is with the faculty. The board ensures it’s being done.

☐ Compared to other board agenda items, the board gives sufficient time and attention to the institution’s evidence of student learning outcomes.

☐ The board has appropriate processes in place to effectively oversee student learning outcomes.

☐ The board receives regular updates on decisions that the institution makes based on student learning outcomes assessment.
Low vs. High Performing Boards

**Low Performance**
- Over/Under-Engaged
- Not truly independent
- CEO “Owns” Agenda
- Avoids difficult discussions
- Meetings dominated by reports
- Never evaluates CEO
- Confuses philanthropy with good governance
- Never evaluates board performance
- Focuses on oversight
- Limited monitoring of board performance by board

**High Performance**
- Engaged and informed
- Forward/critical thinking
- Opportunity for meaningful deliberation (and appropriately skeptical)
- Creative and inquiring
- Applies risk assessment
- Collaborative partnership with CEO
- Focuses on strategy
Questions and Thoughts
Thank You!

Please visit agb.org for resources on governance.
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