

Kansas Board of Regents

PERFORMANCE AGREEMENTS TASK FORCE

1000 S.W. Jackson Street, Suite 520, Board Room

Topeka Kansas

Wednesday, January 15, 2003, 1 p.m.

MINUTES

The Performance Agreements Task Force met in the Board Room of the Kansas Board of Regents, 1000 S.W. Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka, Kansas, 1:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 15, 2003.

Members Present: Bill Docking, Chair Janice DeBauge, Vice Chair
 Chuck Engle Jon Wefald
 Tom Burke sub for Vietti Larry Gould
 Roxanne Kelly Ron Keith
 Rick Moehring Daron Jamison
 Amanda Golbeck Soon Merz

Members Absent: Jackie Vietti

Board Staff: Director of Academic Initiatives Kathyrne Mueller
 Director of Curricular Affairs Robert Masters
 Director of Adult Education Dianne Glass

Approval of Minutes of December 18, 2002

Larry Gould moved and Regent DeBauge seconded the motion to approve the December 18, 2002 Minutes for the Performance Agreements Task Force. Motion carried.

Discuss What the Board Can Expect of Task Force Members

Regent Docking asked for open discussion of what the expectations are as Task Force Members.

Discussion followed concerning the focus of task force members on institution/constituency/sector/councils/etc. The question was raised that with broad representation [from Chair of Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee, Member of Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee, Member of Board of Coordinated-But-Not-Governed Institution, CEO of Governed Institution, CEO of Coordinated-But-Not-Governed Institution, CAO of Governed Institution, CAO of Coordinated-But-Not-Governed Institution, Faculty Member of Governed Institution, Faculty Member of Coordinated-But-Not-Governed Institution, Students' Advisory Committee Representative, CAO for Board (ex officio), and IR Representative for Board (ex officio)], should the perspective be limited to that of each individual member, or should it be what is best for the system? The task force determined that individuals should represent what is best for the system while recognizing that each has a role to play given how they were selected to the task force. The task force emphasized that it is very important to allow for input from all of the councils and the Board of Regents on a monthly basis. It was pointed out that the proposed timeline allows for this. Regent Docking advised the Task Force that he would inform the Board of Regents that the Task Force has a strong desire to receive input from the Regents.

Performance Agreements Task Force Minutes - January 15, 2003

Discuss Circulation of Task Force Member Input

In discussing the need for appropriate circulation of task force member input among task force members, Regent Docking indicated the following ground rules: 1) No input should be shared with the task force without permission from the sender. 2) The originator of the e-mail, fax, letter, etc., should indicate in their message whether or not they want it shared with everyone. 3) If Dr. Golbeck determines that a piece of information should be shared for the benefit of the task force, she should contact the sender for permission to send it out to the task force. The Task Force agreed with the above ground rules.

Discuss Initial Use of Rankings

Regent Docking asked Dr. Golbeck to review the initial use of rankings. Dr. Golbeck advised the Task Force that board staff took the background materials reviewed at the first task force meeting and the input received by the January 8th deadline and composed twelve system goals. Vice President Golbeck then explained the Rankings of Goals (columns) by Task Force Members (rows) table below. [This table has since been corrected.]

Rankings of Goals by Task Force Members

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
	1	3	5	6	2	7	11	10	8	12	9	4
	1	6	5	2	3	11	10	9	8	12	4	7
	1	4	9	2	5	9	9	3	9	9	9	9
	3	2	1	5	4	6	7	10	11	12	9	8
	1	3	4	9	9	2	9	9	5	9	9	9
	1	7	12	5	2	9	11	8	6	3	10	4
	1	7	11	5	3	6	10	8	2	9	4	12
	1	2	4	5	7	3	12	6	11	8	9	10
	3	5	6	1	2	10	9	8	11	7	12	4
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	1	5	8	2	3	9	6	4	10	12	7	11
Totals	15	46	60	46	45	78	101	83	90	103	93	90
Rank	1	23.5	5	23.5	4.2	6	11	7	8.5	12	10	8.5

The list of goals from A - L are as follows: Goal A: Improve Learner Outcomes; Goal B: Improve Economic/Workforce Development; Goal C: Increase Efficiencies/Effectiveness; Goal D: Increase Retention/Completion; Goal E: Increase Participation/Access; Goal F: Increase External Resources; Goal G: Strengthen P-12 Teacher Workforce; Goal H: Increase Job Placement/Advancement; Goal I: Support Community Enrichment; Goal J: Improve Secondary-Postsecondary Transitioning; Goal K: Improve Citizenship; Goal L: Facilitate Transfer. The twelve system goals are ranked 1 to 12 with number one being the highest rank and number twelve being the lowest rank. Dr. Golbeck pointed out that goals B and D tied and goals I and L tied. Discussion followed. The Task Force concluded that all goals finally developed by the task force should be shared with the councils. The question was raised do we expect the agreements to have only system goals. The task force was advised that each institution's Performance

Performance Agreements Task Force Minutes - January 15, 2003

Agreement would have initiatives that are tied to institution specific goals and system goals. Another question raised was shouldn't the five Board coordination goals be the basis for the system goals? Suggestions were made; among them were the following: 1) use coordination goals two, three & four along with learner outcomes and 2) place the twelve goals within the four core competencies (teaching/learning, research/scholarship, service, and administration). Discussion followed concerning what the legislature wants, how do you measure outcomes, and how do you determine the number of goals. It was indicated that the legislature has some dissatisfaction with the piece on the four core competencies and would like more uniformity. It was reiterated that the four areas of teaching/learning, research/scholarship, service, and administration could be used for uniformity. It was clarified that the legislature wants more uniformity in the reporting.

Discussion on the idea of developing a reporting mechanism for "seamless education" followed. Suggestions were as follows: 1) use a proactive reporting tool, 2) develop steps for meaningful improvement, 3) core competencies could be retained and developed so that systemwide goals could be achieved, and 4) look at the Arizona State Report Card as an example. The question was raised who is grading Arizona? The Arizona state board does the grading making the grade a system grade. The task force was reminded that a system grade was suggested in the NORED report.

Discussion continued on how to use goals to move the system forward. Suggestions were as follows: 1) keep the core competencies using the twelve goals within the core competencies, 2) others would grade the institutions on how they are progressing, 3) take the input that we have received and define a smaller number of goals with perhaps combining some of the goals, 4) goals that incorporate participation, access and transfer, 5) establish three or four goals that reconnect education with the public interest, then provide/allow room for institution specific goals, 6) establish initiatives to improve recruitment and retention, 7) do not establish goals that measure what institutions already do, 8) institution specific goals should target what can be done to improve and/or change, 9) take the three coordination goals two, three and four and merge the twelve system goals with them. (i.e., goal #2 - j & l, goal #3 - e, b, h and goal #4 - b, f, i k, 10) identify ways to do things differently and find specific goals to accomplish these, 11) compare Arizona's example which is a more direct way to achieve what we want to achieve, and 12) use the first report to indicate how an institution is doing and the 2nd report to indicate how an institution is moving forward on the system goals.

The task force was advised that the first approach of measuring what an institution is already doing has received negative responses. Perhaps it would be more pertinent for today to move to a new list of goals for measuring. The question was raised are we all on the same page that system goals and institution specific initiatives will be put together to achieve the system goals. The task force was reminded that Chairperson Wempe wants performance agreements to have significant focus on system goals but not exclusively. Each institution would identify three out of five system goals to incorporate within their performance agreements.

The list of twelve system goals was arbitrary and much too large a number. The question is how few goals should we have on our list that would allow us to have a workable number. Discussion followed and the following suggestions were made: 1) five goals with the flexibility to choose three to facilitate system improvement (There needs to be enough uniformity for improvement to show up.), 2) use fewer numbers so that a Report/Score Card can be developed to show significant focus, and 3) each institution should include institution specific indicators - as few as three and no more than five.

Performance Agreements Task Force Minutes - January 15, 2003

Questions were raised about how long these goals will be used, what will be the review process, will this process give incentives or take them away, and should we look at areas of weakness within the state and focus on improving the state in those areas. The following points were made: 1) the goals would be reviewed annually to determine whether or not significant progress has been made and do the goals need to be changed, 2) system goals take more than a year to accomplish, 3) when goals have been met, consider new goals, and 4) the issue of measurement (quantitative data or qualitative data) to demonstrate to the people of Kansas, the Legislature, and the Board of Regents that institutions have improved is crucial.

The ranking process will be repeated on a list of revised goals. Dr. Golbeck proposed that a list of questions be developed and distributed to the task force, requesting their input. Regent DeBauge pointed out that a subcommittee to develop the reporting procedures would be helpful. Regent Docking reiterated that the process is just beginning and that he is looking forward to progressing. He thanked the task force for participating.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.