

For conference call dial:
866.620.7326 and use
conference code:
1366296630

**KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE
AGENDA**

**Conference Call
Tuesday, November 30, 2010
11:00 a.m.**

	Page
I. Approve Minutes	
a. November 2, 2010 Minutes [Attachment 1]	2
b. November 17, 2010 Performance Agreement Review Minutes [Attachment 2]	6
II. Act on Performance Agreements Reviewed Wednesday, November 17, 2010 [Attachment 3] 13	
III. Agenda Planning	
1. Wednesday, 12/15/2010 Consent Agenda	
a. Act on Requests for Additional Degree Granting Authority for the Following:	
• Concord Career College [Attachment 4]	14
c. Act on Requests for Degree and Certificate Programs Submitted from Community Colleges and Technical Colleges – Wichita Area Technical College [Attachment 5]	16
c. Act on 2011-2013 (Cycle 8) Performance Agreements [Attachment 6]	19
2. Thursday, 12/16/2010 Consent Agenda	
Act on Request to Approval of a Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Computing (CIP 11.0101) –University of Kansas [Attachment 7]	20
3. Thursday, 12/16/2010 Discussion Agenda	
a. Act on Request to Reorganized the Institute of Community and Public Health into a School of Public Health – University of Kansas Medical Center [Attachment 8]	27
b. Act on Requests to Change the Academic Affairs Calendars – WSU and PSU[Attachment 9]	32
c. Act on Revised Academic Program Review Guidelines [Attachment 10]	39
d. Act on Proposed Admission Standards [Attachment 11]	59
IV. Other Business	
a. Act on Highland Community College and Fort Hays State University Request to Revise Performance Agreement [Attachment 12]	65
b. BAASC Update Private Postsecondary Education – December 2010 [Attachment 13]	87

**Tentative Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee Conference Call Schedule
September 2010 to June 2011**

BAASC Conf Call – 11:00 a.m.	Board of Regents Meeting Dates
Tues, August 31, 2010 BAASC Conf Call	September Board – September 15-16, 2010
Tues, October 5, 2010 BAASC Conf Call	October Board – October 20-21, 2010
Tues, November 2, 2010 BAASC Conf Call	November Board – November 17-18, 2010
Tues, November 30, 2010 BAASC Conf Call	December Board – December 15-16, 2010
Tues, January 4, 2011 BAASC Conf Call	January Board – January 19-20, 2011
Tues, February 1, 2011 BAASC Conf Call	February Board – February 16-17, 2011
Tues, March 1, 2011 BAASC Conf Call	March Board – March 16-17, 2011
Tues, April 5, 2011 BAASC Conf Call	April Board – April 20-21, 2011
Tues, May 3, 2011 BAASC Conf Call	May Board – May 18-19, 2011
Tues, May 31, 2011 BAASC Conf Call	June Board – June 15-16, 2011

**Kansas Board of Regents
Academic Affairs Standing Committee**

**Tuesday, November 2, 2010
Conference Call
MINUTES**

The Academic Affairs Standing Committee of the Kansas Board of Regents met by Conference Call in Conference Room B of the Kansas Board of Regents, 1000 S.W. Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka, Kansas, at 11:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 2, 2010. This meeting had been properly noticed pursuant to the Kansas Open Meetings Law on October 28, 2010.

Members present: Regent Dick Hedges, Chair
Regent Janie Perkins
Regent Mildred Edwards

Member absent: Regent Ed McKechnie

Staff present: Gary Alexander, Jean Redeker, Jacqueline Johnson, Joan Warren, Don Richards, Dennis Rittle, and Julene Miller

Present: Gayle Shaw, Kansas Association of Community College Trustees and Scott Rothschild, Lawrence Journal World

**Others present
by phone:** Ann Cudd and Barbara Romzek, University of Kansas; Tes Mehring and Jim Williams, Emporia State University; and Gary Miller, Wichita State University

Meeting opened at 11:00 a.m.

Approve Minutes

October 5, 2010 Minutes

Regent Perkins moved and Regent Hedges seconded the motion to approve the October 5, 2010 Minutes. Motion passed.

Agenda Planning

Wednesday, 11/17/2010 Consent Agenda

Act on Requests for Additional Degree Granting Authority for the Following: Capella University

Jacqueline Johnson presented Capella University's request for additional degree granting authority for the Master of Science in Studies in Human Behavior. Board staff reviewed thoroughly the staff qualifications, record keeping systems, coursework, materials, website platforms and/or campuses and staff recommended approval of this request.

Regent Edwards moved and Regent Perkins seconded the motion to recommend placing agenda item 1.a. Act on Request for Additional Degree Granting Authority for the Following: Capella University on the Consent Agenda of the Wednesday, November 17, 2010 Kansas Board of Regents agenda.

There was no discussion. Motion carried.

Act on Requests for Degree and Certificate Programs Submitted from Community Colleges and Technical Colleges

Don Richards presented Highland Community College's request for approval of the following new program: Medical Coding (51.0713). This program request addressed all criteria and has been subject to the 14 day comment period required by policy. The program was reviewed by the Technical Program and Curriculum Committee and the Postsecondary Technical Education Authority recommends approval.

Regent Perkins moved and Regent Hedges seconded the motion to recommend placing agenda item 1.b., Act on Requests for Degree and Certificate Programs Submitted from Community Colleges and Technical Colleges, on the Consent Agenda of the Wednesday, November 17, 2010 Kansas Board of Regents agenda.

There was no discussion. Motion passed.

Wednesday, 11/17/2010 Discussion Agenda

Act on Request to Approve the Corrections Alignment

Chuck Kater presented the request to approve the Corrections Alignment. Barton, Hutchinson, Kansas City Kansas, Labette, and Seward offer a corrections program. The Kansas Department of Corrections has reviewed the competencies and skills contained within the common courses and endorsed this alignment. During the process it was noted that the state had two distinctively different types of corrections programs – correctional officers who work in prisons and those who work in community-based settings.

Regent Perkins moved and Regent Edwards seconded the motion to recommend placing agenda item 2.a. Act on Request to Approve the Corrections Alignment on the Discussion Agenda Wednesday, November 17, 2010 Kansas Board of Regent agenda.

There was no discussion. Motion passed.

Act on Request to Approve the Welding Alignment

Dennis Rittle presented the request to approve Welding Alignment. A welding program is offered by 19 technical and community colleges: Barton, Butler, Coffeyville, Cowley, Dodge City, Garden City, Highland, Hutchinson, Independence, Johnson, Kansas City Kansas, Manhattan, Neosho, North Central, Northwest Kansas, Salina, Seward, Washburn Institute of Technology, and Wichita. The State Business and Industry Welding Committee support the credentials listed on the alignment map. The TEA recommends approval of the alignment.

Clarification was made concerning the Kansas WorkReady Certificate. While it is not a required credential, individuals are encouraged to attain it.

Regent Edwards moved and Regent Perkins seconded the motion to recommend placing agenda item 2.b. Act on Request to Approve the Welding Alignment on the Discussion Agenda Wednesday, November 17, 2010 Kansas Board of Regents agenda.

There was no further discussion. Motion passed.

Thursday, 11/18/2010 Discussion Agenda

Act on Request for Extension Program in KC Metro Area – Emporia State University

Gary Alexander presented Emporia State University's request for a Bachelor of Science in Education with an elementary education major in the Kansas City metropolitan area. The request is not for a new degree program, but is for a new location of an existing degree program. The program will be offered on the Johnson County Community College campus at the invitation of Johnson County Community College. Emporia State University has similar programs with Kansas City Kansas Community College and Butler Community College. No other state universities offer a similar program in the Kansas City metropolitan area. Clarification was given regarding this proposal and responses were received from the University of Kansas and Pittsburg State University.

In the future, a 14 calendar day comment period will be provided for state universities to provide input on new proposals. The proposing state university will be asked to respond to the feedback. BAASC will receive the feedback and response as an addendum to the proposal to extend programs in the Kansas City metropolitan area.

BAASC expressed appreciation of the clarification.

Regent Perkins moved and Regent Edwards seconded the motion to recommend placing agenda item 3.a. Act on Request for Extension Program in KC Metro Area – Emporia State University on the Discussion Agenda Thursday, November 18, 2010 Kansas Board of Regents agenda.

There was no discussion. Motion carried.

Act on Request Approval for a Master of Art and Ph.D. in Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies (CIP 05.0207) – University of Kansas

Jean Redeker presented the University of Kansas' request for approval of a Master of Arts and Ph.D. in Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (CIP 05.0207). All of the requirements of the program approval process were met. Two state universities have undergraduate degrees utilizing this Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) code, but do not have graduate degrees. No new funds are required for this program. A team of three external reviewers evaluated the proposed Ph.D. The evaluators recommended approval. No other comments on this program proposal were received. The Council of Presidents and Council of Chief Academic Officers recommend approval.

Discussion followed:

- BAASC appreciates the fact that no new funds are needed
- Students applying for the Ph.D. program must pass an oral exam

Regent Edwards moved and Regent Perkins seconded the motion to recommend placing agenda item 3.b. Act on Request Approval for a Master of Art and Ph.D. in Women, Gender and

Sexuality Studies (CIP 05.0207) – University of Kansas on the Discussion Agenda Thursday, November 18, 2010 Kansas Board of Regents agenda.

There was no further discussion. Motion passed.

Other Business

BAASC Update Private Postsecondary Education – November 2010

Jacqueline Johnson presented an update on the activities of the Private Postsecondary Education as follows: New programs received for review – 3; New programs pending further review – 55; Applications requested by and sent to prospective schools – 2; and New School Applications received – 0.

Meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

**Kansas Board of Regents
Academic Affairs Standing Committee**

**Wednesday, November 17, 2010
MINUTES**

The Academic Affairs Standing Committee of the Kansas Board of Regents met in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room of the Kansas Board of Regents, 1000 S.W. Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka, Kansas, at 11:00 a.m. on Wednesday, November 17, 2010.

Members present: Regent Dick Hedges, Chair
Regent Mildred Edwards

Member absent: Regent Ed McKechnie
Regent Janie Perkins

Staff present: Gary Alexander, Jean Redeker, Jacqueline Johnson, and Joan Warren

Present: Alysia Johnston, Coffeyville Community College; Sue Darby, Hutchinson Community College; Martha Robertson, Hutchinson Community College; Ed Berger, Hutchinson Community College; Linda Fund, Kansas Association of Community College Trustees; Eric Burks, North Central Kansas Technical College; Bill Wojciechowski, Pratt Community College; Melodie Christal, Washburn University; Mike Mosier, Washburn University; Nancy Tate, Washburn University; Steve Loewen, Flint Hills Technical College; Lisa Kirmer, Flint Hills Technical College; Dean Hollenbeck, Flint Hills Technical College; Bill Ivy, Pittsburg State University; Lynette Olson, Pittsburg State University; Mike Ahern, Dodge City Community College; Sangki Min, Kansas City Kansas Community College and Tamara Agha-Jaffar, Kansas City Kansas Community College

Meeting opened at 9:00 a.m.

The purpose of this meeting was to review nine Performance Agreements for the period of January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2013, for the purpose of making recommendations to the full Board.

Action on these performance agreements will take place at the regularly scheduled Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee conference call on November 30, 2010 because there was not a quorum present at this meeting.

Jean Redeker presented a brief introduction for each of the performance agreements, and the Standing Committee reviewed nine performance agreements as follows:

1. **Washburn University** – Melodie Christal, Mike Mosier, and Nancy Tate represented Washburn University. Improve Learner Outcomes Goal 1 indicators are in response to concerns regarding graduating students’ ability to communicate in writing and orally, general numerical literacy and to think critically and solve problems; seek to meet the growing health care needs of Kansas residents; and seek to prepare business students to work in a global economy. Goal 2 Improve Workforce Development seeks to meet the need for work force shortages in occupational therapy, nurses and essential leadership skills in organizations. Goal 3 Increase Targeted Participation/Access will increase students in Concurrent/Dual enrollment, technical/community colleges, and GED and at risk high school learners served by Literacy Education Action Project (LEAP) in matriculating into a four-year institution.

Summary of Changes from the Previous Approved Performance Agreement:

The ETS Proficiency Profile and the NCLEX pass rates in Goal A were included in the previous performance agreement. The indicator in Goal A focusing on international business is new to this agreement. Goal C Indicator 2, increasing the number of MSN graduates, was part of the previous agreement. The other indicators in Goal C are new. Goal D is new to this agreement and was not included in the previous agreement.

Discussion followed:

- The focus on international business is appreciated by the Board
- Leadership Studies has been separated from the cut Transformational Experience
- The need for teachers with credentials has expanded with the increase in enrollment of dual credit and concurrent enrollment classes
- Washburn University’s partnership with Highland Community College in the Literacy Education Action Project fits nicely with Washburn University’s new mission

2. **Flint Hills Technical College** – Steve Loewen, Lisa Kirmer, and Dean Hollenbeck represented Flint Hills Technical College. Goal 1 Improve Learner Outcomes focuses on increasing the percentage of students earning a grade of C or better in technical math, college algebra and physical science, as well as decreasing the percentage of students placed on academic probation. Goal 2 Improve Workforce Development focuses on increasing the percentage of student successfully completing the Interactive Digital Systems Program and the Welding Program (two programs with high demand and high wages) as well as accessibility of courses through non-traditional times and/or through non-traditional delivery methods. Goal 3 Increase Targeted Participation/Access focuses on increasing enrollment, retention and completion of students in non-traditional gender programs. Goal 4 Increase External Resources focuses on increasing gifts, the number of donors to the Foundation and scholarship dollars awarded.

Summary of Changes from the Previous Approved Performance Agreement:

This agreement addresses three goals (B, C and E), while the previous agreement addressed four goals (A, B, C, and D). Goal B in the previous agreement focused on improving students’ grades in math, while Goal B in this agreement focuses on improving students’ grades in math, improving students’ grades in science and decreasing the number of students on academic probation. Goal C in the current agreements details indicators for increasing the number of students successfully completing two programs and also increasing the number of credit hours delivered at nontraditional times and methods. Goal C in the previous agreement focused on

increasing the number of students successfully completing three programs. Goal E, which was not included in the previous agreement, details the institution's plans to increase external resources.

Discussion followed:

- Tutoring is available for facilitating success in math
- Intensive advising helps with keeping students off academic probation and increases retention
- More promotion and recruiting will be targeted toward the non-traditional gender programs which are difficult to recruit and retain students
- An alumni association will be developed and targeted as potential donors for the Foundation

3. **Kansas City Kansas Community College** – Sangki Min and Tamara Agha-Jaffar represented Kansas City Kansas Community College. The performance agreement focuses on increasing enrollment, improving learner outcomes, and increasing the enrollment and retention of Hispanic students. It is a balance between goals that are a stretch and yet attainable. One goal is to transition technical education students, GED students and high school graduates to a 2 year degree or credential. Other goals improve learner outcomes for students in developmental courses and increase the number of Hispanic students served.

Summary of Changes from the Previous Approved Performance Agreement:
The institution chose Goals A, B and D for this performance agreement while in the previous agreement Goals B, C and D were addressed. Goal A is new to this agreement. Goal B addresses developmental education and technical education, while in the previous agreement Goal B focused on developmental education, retention and graduation. Goal D in this agreement focuses on increasing enrollment, retention and graduation of Hispanic students while the previous agreement focused on these issues for the general student body.

Discussion followed:

- Increase the number of ABE/GED successful completers to enroll in a certificate of associate program was to offer the first course free
- Send adjuncts to the high schools for dual enrollment courses
- Distance remedial education classes were not as successful as face-to-face
- Entry and Exit tests have helped to shorten students' time in remedial programs
- For Hispanic students, KCKCC has mini workshops to help faculty and staff with Spanish phrases
- BAASC appreciates KCKCC's comment - "These initiatives support Foresight 2020 Strategic Goal 2 and Strategic Goal 3."

4. **Coffeyville Community College** – Alysia Johnston represented Coffeyville Community College. Goal 1 focuses on increasing the number of students transitioning from the ABE center to certificate or associate programs; increasing the number of high school students enrolled in Construction Technology and Precision Machining, as well as increasing the number of secondary articulation agreements. Goal 2 focuses on increasing the success rate of students in developmental courses, in first subsequent college-level math or English course, and in college

algebra. Goal 3 focuses on increasing the number of: students receiving CompTIA A+ certification; students receiving NCCER certification; male students enrolled in allied health programs; and female students enrolled in manufacturing programs.

Summary of Changes from the Previous Approved Performance Agreement

In the previous performance agreement, Goal A focused on increasing articulation agreements with community colleges, technical colleges and universities. In this agreement, Goal A focuses on transitioning ABE students to the postsecondary environment, increasing the number of high school students enrolled in technical programs and increasing the number of articulation agreements with high schools. Goal B indicators are the same as in the previous agreement. In the previous agreement, Goal C focused on developing new business partnerships, increasing scholarship funds and increasing continuing education offerings in the Health Sciences. In the new agreement, Goal C focuses on increasing the number of certifications awarded and increasing the number of students in nontraditional gender programs.

Discussion followed:

- BAASC appreciates Coffeyville Community College's work on aligning with the Regents Goals
- Establish classes specifically for transitioning to postsecondary education
- Emphasize success in College Level Math or English courses

5. **Colby Community College** – Paula Davis represented Colby Community College. The performance agreement focuses on career and technical programs, articulation agreements, core competencies in sciences, and distance education opportunities.

Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement:

Goal A in the previous agreement focused on distance education and Vet Tech graduates, while Goal A in this agreement focuses on articulation agreements and career and technical education program completers. Goal B in this agreement outlines increasing competencies in targeted courses, while Goal B in the previous agreement targeted developmental education and institution-wide outcomes. Goal C in the previous agreement targeted noncredit distance education endeavors and obtaining grants while Goal C in this agreement targets program completers. Goal D is new to this agreement and focuses on expanding distance education offerings.

Discussion followed:

- Transfer of credits will be easier for students achieving the Kansas Core Competencies in Sciences
- Colby Community College is developing online general education courses
- Colby's Vet Tech program had 100% pass rate
- Renewable energy is a new and exciting technical program

The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee congratulates Colby Community College on the strength of its learner outcomes goal.

6. **Hutchinson Community College** – Sue Darby and Martha Robertson represented Hutchinson Community College. Hutchinson Community College focused on three areas: (1) increased participation and access in service area high schools, (2) increased number of students with degree and credentials and (3) increased number of students with academic success.

Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement:
Goals A, B, C, D and an institutional goal were part of the previous agreement. This agreement addresses Goals B, C and D. Though there are fewer goals in this agreement, there is a very strong focus on outcomes. In addition, fewer goals allow the institution to better focus and target its efforts instead of diffusing efforts across too many goals. Goal B in the previous agreement dealt with the success of developmental education students while Goal B in this agreement focuses on outcomes assessment and persistence. Goal C in this agreement seeks to increase the number of students with degrees/credentials, while Goal C in the previous agreement sought to align courses and programs. Goal D in this agreement focuses on increasing student credit hours. Goal D in the previous agreement dealt with transitioning students to four-year institutions.

Discussion followed:

- Online courses have increased dramatically
- Hutchinson has an agreement with Salina Technical College for serving nursing students
- Increasing the numbers of students in courses leading to credentials that are part of stackable credential programs has increased the students' ability to enter the workforce
- Faculty and staff are working with students to identify areas of concern and more students are being retained
- Many of Hutchinson's students transfer to Wichita State University

BAASC commends Hutchinson for its work on student assessment for the last five years.

7. **Pratt Community College** – Bill Wojciechowski represented Pratt Community College. Pratt Community College focused on access, retention, completers and diversity. It has two grants that provide resources the institution would not normally have.

Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement:
The previous performance agreement has six goals, while this agreement has three. By including three goals PCC is better able to target its efforts instead of diffusing them across too many goals. In the previous agreement, Goal B Improve Learner Outcomes, focused on the completion and retention of students in developmental courses, while Goal B in this agreement primarily focuses on student athletes. Goal A Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness focuses on online courses and completers in online programs, while in the previous agreement the institution primarily worked on increasing the number of collaborations with other institutions and students enrolling as a result. Goal D Increase Targeted Participation/Access was included in the previous performance agreement, though the focus has shifted to completions/degrees for this performance agreement.

Discussion followed:

- Pratt's allied health programs align with strategic goals 2 and 5
- Partnerships with Cowley Community College, Barton Community College, Dodge City Community College and Coffeyville Community College for nursing programs
- Pratt has increased math tutoring and re-testing adults to assist in moving students out of remedial courses quicker
- The Student Athletes pilot program is patterned after the Colorado program which has had 80% graduation rate

8. **North Central Kansas Technical College** – Eric Burks represented North Central Kansas Technical College (NCKTC). The performance agreement focused on the skills needed for success, enhance employment skills, improve transition throughout the education process to employment.

Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement:

The institution focused on retention and completion in the previous agreement. It did so again for this agreement, but targeted different programs in (Goal B). Goal C indicators are new for this agreement. Goal A Indicator 1 is new to the agreement while Indicators 2 and 3 were included in the previous agreement.

Discussion followed:

- NCKTC has increased advertising and marketing tools increasing the number of students interested in associate degree options and advanced credentials
- Short-term technical training assists business and industry partners with skilled workers
- Increasing the number of 2+2 articulation agreements will help students earn an associate degree

9. **Pittsburg State University** – Lynette Olson and Bill Ivy represented Pittsburg State University. Pittsburg State University worked to align its agreement with the strategic plan. It has focused on diversity with domestic minority and international students, increased degree completion, and emphasis on meeting the needs of the Kansas workforce/economy.

Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement:

Goal A in this agreement focuses on retention, degree completion, and scholarships for part-time students. Goal A in the previous agreement dealt with the alignment with secondary schools and two-year institutions. Goal D in the previous agreement focused on the recruitment and retention of minority students while Goal D in this agreement focuses on the recruitment of Hispanic students, nonresident students and international students. Goals B and C are significantly different from the previous agreement.

Discussion followed:

- Meet with the families and individually with the students to help increase Hispanic enrollment
- Scholarships for part-time students will require policy change prior to implementing
- Goal 2 aligns with Foresight 2020 (3) freshman retention

- Increase publicity of the GRAD NOW program that will improve graduation rates and increase the number of degreed individuals in Kansas and the region
- Students' e-portfolio will assist in developing skills needed to secure employment and advance in their profession
- New curricular initiatives are in progress that will meet needs in the economy and open up new areas of opportunities for graduates

The Standing Committee commends Pittsburg State University for a quality performance agreement that aligns well with Foresight 2020.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Act on 2011 – 2013 Performance Agreements

Summary and Recommendation

In accordance with K.S.A. 74-3202d and the Board's Performance Agreement Guidelines and Procedures, the following performance agreements are presented to the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee for review. Staff recommends the performance agreements be forwarded to the Board for approval. (11/19/2010)

Background

At the November 17, 2010 BAASC meeting, nine schools presented their proposed performance agreements covering calendar years 2011, 2012 and 2013. (Because of the volume, the proposed agreements were mailed to BAASC members under separate cover during the first week in November.)

BAASC members reviewed the nine proposed agreements at the November 17, 2010 meeting, but due to lack of a quorum the committee was unable to take action. To act on the agreements, BAASC may either recommend revision of an institution's proposed performance agreement or recommend the proposed performance agreement be forwarded to the Board for consideration as submitted.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of performance agreements for the following nine institutions: Flint Hills Technical College, Kansas City Kansas Community College, Coffeyville Community College, Colby Community College, Hutchinson Community College, Pratt Community College, North Central Kansas Technical College, Pittsburg State University and Washburn University.

Act on Requests for Additional Degree Granting Authority for the Following:

- **Concord Career College**

Staff Recommendation

Concord Career College request approval of degree granting authority for an Associate of Applied Science Degree in Occupational Therapy Assistant and in Health Information Technology. After a thorough review of staff qualifications, record keeping systems, coursework, materials, website platforms and/or campuses, staff recommends approval of this request.

11/16/10

Background

The Kansas Private and Out-of-State Postsecondary Educational Institution Act (hereinafter “the Postsecondary Educational Institution Act”) gives the Board of Regents responsibility for authorizing schools to deliver instruction in Kansas. The scope of this responsibility includes most private institutions located in the state of Kansas and extends to qualifying private and public colleges and universities located outside of Kansas.

Institutions that apply for degree and non-degree granting status are reviewed according to a process and set of standards required by the Postsecondary Educational Institution Act. The process may include on-site reviews to ensure proper facilities, equipment, materials, and adequate space are available to meet the needs of the student. Other standards include reviewing items such as:

- Courses, curriculum and instruction to ensure quality, content and length are reasonable and adequately achieve the stated objective(s).
- Proper maintenance of student transcripts, attendance records, and proper use of students’ achievement records and/or entrance tests.

Each institution is required to submit a catalog including descriptions of the programs and courses offered, and may review class syllabi, along with contracts for clinicals, and other documents as needed. The catalog also contains a listing of instructors and their credentials, and a statement of the objectives of the program(s). Staff reviews these materials, along with resumes of administrators and instructors.

Institution Requests:**Concord Career College:**

- Associate of Applied Science Degree in Occupational Therapy Assistant
- Associate of Applied Science Degree in Health Information Technology

Concord attained its first Certificate of Approval to operate in Kansas in March 2010. For more than fifty years Concorde Career College has prepared thousands of students to enter the field of Allied Health. Its principal office is located in Mission, Kansas, and it has fifteen campuses located across the country. It generally enjoys long operating histories in local markets.

The Occupational Therapy Assistant program is dedicated to providing a supportive learning environment. At Concord Career College, students can acquire theoretical knowledge, technical skills, and professional behaviors that provide graduates with the expertise needed to practice in numerous occupational therapy services settings. Concord Career College is in the process of obtaining accreditation from the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE).

The Health Information Technology program is an administrative technology degree for students interested in a non-clinical care profession in the health care industry. The person working in health informatics is responsible for many aspects of preparing, analyzing, managing, and preserving medical records needed by patients, hospitals and insurance companies. Concorde Career College will seek accreditation from the Commission on Accreditation for Health Informatics and Information Management (CAHIIM). CAHIIM accreditation is not required for a graduate to find entry-level employment within the field but is required to become a Registered Health Information Technician (RHIT). CAHIIM accreditation will occur prior to the graduation of the first cohort which will allow graduates to sit for the RHIT National examination.

Concorde Career College is accredited by the Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges (ACCSC). This accreditation, according to K.S.A. 74-32,168 of the Postsecondary Educational Institution Act, may be accepted as evidence of compliance with the statutory standards for approval.

Approve Requests for Degree and Certificate Programs Submitted from Community Colleges and Technical Colleges

Summary and Staff Recommendation

Each month community colleges and technical colleges submit requests for the approval of new certificate and degree programs. The Board office received one program request to be implemented in 2011. The program submitted addressed all criteria requested and has been subject to the 14 day comment period required by policy. The program has been reviewed by the Technical Program and Curriculum Committee and the Postsecondary Technical Education Authority recommends approval.

11/30/10

Background

Community colleges and technical colleges submit requests for new certificate and degree programs each month utilizing forms approved by staff. Criteria addressed during the application process include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Student and employer demand for the program
- Current and projected job openings and anticipated wages
- Level of program duplication across institutions, based on Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) code, and any efforts to collaborate to provide the needed program
- Rationale for why collaboration is not a viable option and/or need for a duplicative program
- Program description and designation of required and elective courses
- Measurable program outcomes and course competencies
- Process and frequency for review of program content, level of program success, and process for addressing any areas of concern
- Any specialized accreditation required and/or available for the proposed program
- Faculty qualifications and proposed student to faculty ratio
- Description of facilities and equipment needed and available
- Projected program costs and designation of adequate resources
- Membership of a steering/advisory committee for the program
- Approval by institutional academic committee and local governing board

Description of Proposed Program

Wichita Area Technical College requests approval for the following new program:

Robotics (CIP 15.0405) at the Associate of Applied Science (61 credits) and Technical Certificate (47 credits) levels.

The proposed program prepares students for entry into the highly technical field of industrial robotics. Students will be prepared to function as robotics technicians and will be capable of: assembly, installation, programming troubleshooting and maintenance of robotic and automated equipment. Interest has been stimulated in this career field by “Project Lead the Way” and “Boosting Engineering Science and Technology (BEST) which are two local programs targeted at high school students. The

Wichita area has 15 of the state's 29 BEST programs, many of which have won state and regional championship events.

WATC conducted several surveys of prospective students and identified 221 prospective candidates who were interested in the proposed program. The college plans to begin the proposed program with 10 students in the initial start-up year and projects an enrollment of 25 students by year three.

The job category of Electro-Mechanical Technician represents the current occupational category within the state that graduates of the program would enter. Kansas Department of Labor data reports the median wage for this occupational category to be \$23.67 per hour.

WATC has partnered with: SpiritAeroSystems, Advatec, and Cessna as well as the National Institute for Aviation Research (NIAR), Wichita State University, Circle High School and Wichita Public Schools in the development of the program. Together these partner entities make up the Midwest Robotics Initiative Council with the stated goal of working together to grow interest and access to educational opportunities in the field of robotics.

The proposed robotics program would augment other program offerings at WATC and would support the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) accreditation requirements. NIAR is providing over \$500,000 worth of robotics equipment in support of the program which includes two robots.

Letters of support from area employers referenced a need for the program and an interest in sending current employees to WATC to participate in selected elements of the coursework. The Advatec organization which serves as an authorized integrator for FANUC robots also suggested that they would be interested in promoting the program to their customer base.

WATC contacted Cowley Community College to discuss the focus and curricular differences between the proposed WATC robotics program and the Cowley Mechatronics program. Upon review by both institutions, the proposed program was not considered to be "duplicative". No letters of objection were received in response to the proposed program.

The institution has identified \$88,431 as an initial funding requirement for program start-up which is primarily in support of faculty needs and will be funded via a re-distribution of existing institutional resources.

The proposed degree and certificate program has been carefully reviewed by staff utilizing the above stated standards and criteria. Copies of the detailed program proposals are available for inspection.

Recommendation

The Technical Program and Curriculum Committee of the Technical Education Authority reviewed and discussed this program during their May 11, 2010 meeting and elected to place it on the "consent" agenda for action by the full authority. Prior to the May 26, 2010 meeting of the Technical Education Authority, the college contacted the board office and requested that the program's progress in the approval process be suspended to allow additional time for the college to discuss the intent of the proposal with other institutions and constituency groups.

The board office was contacted by the college requesting that the program proceed through the approval process on October 11, 2010. The program proposal was approved during the November 10, 2010 meeting of the Postsecondary Technical Education Authority (TEA). The TEA recommends approval of this program.

Act on 2011 – 2013 Performance Agreements

Summary and Recommendations

In accordance with K.S.A. 74-3202d and the Board's Performance Agreement Guidelines and Procedures, the following performance agreements are presented to the Board for action. The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee recommends the Board approve agreements for nine institutions. Staff agrees with BAASC's recommendation to approve agreements for nine institutions.
(11/19/10)

Background

The eighth performance agreement cycle covers performance during the calendar years of 2011, 2012, and 2013. New funding awarded in July 2011 and each July thereafter will be dependent upon the institution's compliance with its performance agreement. (Because of the volume of the performance agreements, the agreements were mailed to Board members under separate cover.)

Nine proposed performance agreements were due to Board staff September 1, 2010. The proposed performance agreements are the result of a review process that included substantial communication between Board staff and the individual schools. Academic Affairs Directors reviewed all performance agreement proposals. In addition, a career and technical education staff member reviewed those proposals having a technical education component. The process also included a conference with each of the institutions.

Proposed performance agreements were then reviewed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President/CEO, and BAASC.

Recommendation

BAASC recommended approval of all nine performance agreements at its November 30, 2010 meeting. Staff agrees and recommends approval of the following nine performance agreements: Washburn University, Flint Hills Technical College, Kansas City Kansas Community College, Coffeyville Community College, Colby Community College, Hutchinson Community College, Pratt Community College, North Central Kansas Technical College and Pittsburg State University.

Request for Approval of a Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Computing (CIP 11.0101) – University of Kansas

Summary and Recommendation

Universities may apply for approval of new academic programs following the guidelines of Appendix G in the Kansas Board of Regents Policies and Procedures Manual. University of Kansas has submitted an application for approval of a Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Computing (CIP 11.0101). The proposing academic unit has responded to all of the requirements of the program approval process. Five universities have programs utilizing this Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) code. The program will be funded through internal reallocation. Board staff concurs with the Council of Presidents and the Council of Chief Academic Officers in recommending approval.

11/22/10

Background

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Program Summary</u>
1. Program Identification	Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Computing CIP - 11.0101
2. Academic Unit	Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (EECS) School of Engineering University of Kansas
3. Program Description	<p>The proposed program transcends traditional academic boundaries, allowing students to study computing within the context of other disciplines. A deep-rooted understanding of biology, geography, arts, or other disciplines, enables future graduates to more efficiently and economically develop new applications and technologies for their field of specialization. By providing a “big picture” view of complex problems, the program will further enhance students’ critical thinking skills and their ability to collaborate with those from different professions. A BS IC degree will better prepare the students to fill an urgent industry need—fluency in Computer Science and another discipline.</p> <p>The proposed degree is in response to a national need for graduates who can effectively integrate computing with other disciplines to address the challenges within those disciplines. The proposed program will utilize the existing faculty, staff, and resources in the EECS Department in order to provide future students with the opportunity to pursue an undergraduate degree in Interdisciplinary Computing. The BS IC program will offer five areas of specialization, namely, Astronomy, Chemistry, Biology, Geography, and Physics. Additional areas can be added, as other disciplines are integrated into the BS IC program.</p>

4. Demand/Need for the Program	<p>Computer science departments are experiencing increased interest in interdisciplinary programs such as computational biology or interactive media. The objective of the proposed program is to meet such demands. The proposed program will enable the EECS Department to recruit bright students who are attracted to the interdisciplinary nature of the program. The BS IC program will address the recruiting and retention of female students and students from underrepresented groups.</p> <p>The graduates of the BS IC program will be able to pursue careers in a wide range of fields in the industry, government, and academics. Science industries, business, government, and military sectors are making it a priority to hire people with expertise in computing; and industry has identified interdisciplinary computing as an important need. It is reported that the careers that combine computing with other fields will be the new jobs of the future. Numerous reports indicate the excellent career prospects for future BS IC graduates.</p>
5. Comparative /Locational Advantage	<p>Currently, none of the Kansas Regents Universities offers a degree in interdisciplinary computing.</p> <p>A search for other universities, which offer undergraduate programs in interdisciplinary computing, identified five universities in the U.S. (Belmont University, Carnegie Mellon University, Temple University, University of California San Diego, and University of Virginia) and one in U.K (University of Bradford).</p>
6. Curriculum	<p>The BS IC degree will initially be offered in conjunction with five areas of specialization: Astronomy, Chemistry, Biology, Geography, and Physics. Additional areas of specialization can be added later, as other disciplines are integrated into the BS IC program.</p> <p>The curriculum, with total hours of 124 to 128, includes 18 hours of Mathematics, 12 hours of English, 15 hours of Humanities/Social Sciences, 47 hours of Computer Science, and 32 to 36 hours from the area of specialization.</p> <p>The curriculum is specified in detail in the proposal.</p>
7. Faculty Profile	<p>The EECS Department has 34 tenure-track and tenured faculty who will be able to meet the teaching needs of the programs. No new faculty positions are required.</p>
8. Student Profile	<p>The characteristics of the students will be similar to those of the incoming students to the EECS Department. The freshmen admitted to the EECS Department in the Fall 2008 were 72.6% in state, 21.1% out of state, and 6.3% international; and had average composite ACT score of 28.72, average math ACT score of 30.32; and had average GPA of 3.66.</p>
9. Academic Support	<p>The current academic support services will meet the needs of the proposed program.</p>
10. Facilities and Equipment	<p>The current facilities and equipment will meet the needs of the proposed program.</p>

<p>11. Program Review, Assessment, Accreditation</p>	<p>The program will be reviewed as part of the EECS Department's ongoing program review cycles. The undergraduate degree programs currently offered by the EECS Department are accredited by ABET, which is the accreditor for university programs in computing and engineering. Computer Science programs are accredited by the Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC) of ABET. We will seek accreditation for the proposed program through the same channels.</p>
<p>12. Costs, Financing</p>	<p>No additional costs/financing is required.</p>

CURRICULUM OUTLINE
Kansas Board of Regents

I. Identify the new degree: Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Computing

II. Provide courses required for each student in the major:

Course Name & Number	Credit Hours
Core Courses	
MATH 121 Calculus I	5
MATH 122 Calculus II	5
MATH 223 Vector Calculus	3
MATH 290 Elementary Linear Algebra	2
MATH 526 Applied Mathematical Statistics I	3
ENGL 101 Composition Composition	3
ENGL 102 Creative Reading and Writing	3
ENGL 362 Foundations of Technical Writing	3
COMS 130 Speaker-Audience Communications	3
PHIL 375 Moral Issues in Computer Technology	3
EECS 140 Introduction to Digital Logic Design	4
EECS 168 Programming I	4
EECS 210 Discrete Structures	4
EECS 268 Programming II	4
EECS 368 Programming Language Paradigms	3
EECS 388 Computer Systems & Assembly Language	4
EECS 448 Software Engineering I	4
EECS 560 Data Structures	4
EECS 678 Introduction to Operating Systems	4
Electives	
2 Courses Humanities	6
2 Courses Social Sciences	6
4 Courses EECS Senior Electives	12
<u>Astronomy Specialization</u>	
MATH 220 Applied Differential Equations	3
PHSX 211 General Physics I	4
PHSX 212 General Physics II	4
PHSX 313 General Physics III	3
PHSX 316 Intermediate Physics Laboratory I	1
ASTR 391 Physical Astronomy	3
ASTR 503 Undergraduate Research	2
ASTR 591 Stellar Astronomy	3

ASTR 592 Galactic and Extragalactic Astronomy	3
ASTR 596 Observational Astrophysics	1
2 Courses:	6
500 level and above ASTR	
MATH 581 Numerical Methods	
MATH 611 Time Series Analysis	
PHSX 615 Numerical and Computations Methods in Physics	

Biology Specialization

CHEM 184 Foundations of Chemistry I	5
CHEM 188 Foundations of Chemistry II	5
BIOL 150 Principles of Molecular and Cellular Biology	4
BIOL 152 Principles of Organismal Biology	4
BIOL 350 Principles of Genetics	3
1 Course:	3
BIOL 400 Fundamentals of Microbiology	
BIOL 600 Introductory Biochemistry	
BIOL 408 Physiology of Organisms	3
BIOL 412 Evolutionary Biology	3
2 Courses:	6
BIOL 413 History and Diversity of Organisms	
BIOL 414 Principles of Ecology	
BIOL 416 Cell Structure and Function	
BIOL 417 Biology of Development	
BIOL 435 Introduction to Neurobiology	
BIOL 550 Introduction to Systematics	

Chemistry Specialization

PHSX 211 General Physics I	4
PHSX 212 General Physics II	4
CHEM 184 Foundations of Chemistry I	5
CHEM 188 Foundations of Chemistry II	5
CHEM 624 Organic Chemistry I	3
CHEM 625 Organic Chemistry I Laboratory	2
CHEM 646 Physical Chemistry I	4
CHEM 647 Physical Chemistry I Laboratory	2
CHEM 648 Physical Chemistry II	3
CHEM 649 Physical Chemistry II Laboratory	2

Geography Specialization

PHSX 211 General Physics I	4
GEOG 311 Map Conception and Development	4
GEOG 358 Principles of Geographic Information Systems	4
GEOG 526 Remote Sensing of Environment I	4
GEOG 558 Intermediate Geographical Information Systems	4
2 Courses: 300 level and above courses in categories defined in the Undergraduate Study in Geography and Atmospheric Science handbook as: Physical Studies, Geographic Information Science, Human Studies, Regional Studies, and Atmospheric Science	6
7 Hours: GEOG 513 Cartographic Design GEOG 517 Data Handling and Map Symbolization GEOG 726 Remote Sensing of Environment II GEOG 758 Geographic Information Science (prerequisite of GEOG 316 Methods of Analyzing Geographical Data should be taken as an elective)	7

Physics Specialization

MATH 220 Applied Differential Equations	3
PHSX 211 General Physics I	4
PHSX 212 General Physics II	4
PHSX 313 General Physics III	3
PHSX 316 Intermediate Physics Laboratory I	1
PHSX 503 Undergraduate Research	2
PHSX 521 Mechanics I	3
PHSX 531 Electricity and Magnetism	3
PHSX 511 Introductory Quantum Mechanics	3
2 Courses: 600 level and above PHSX	6

Research

Not Applicable

Practica

Not Applicable

Total 124-128

Implementation Year FY 2011							
Fiscal Summary for the Proposed Academic Program							
Institution: <u>University of Kansas - Lawrence</u>		Proposed Program: Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Computing					
Part I. Anticipated Enrollment							
		Implementation Year		Year 2		Year 3	
		Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time
A. Headcount		10	0	20	0	30	0
B. Total SCH taken by all students in the program		270		540		810	
Part II. Program Cost Projection							
A. In the <u>implementation</u> year, list all identifiable General Use costs to the academic unit(s) and how they will be funded.							
In subsequent years, please include only the additional amount budgeted.							
		Implementation Year		Year 2		Year 3	
		<u>Base Budget</u>					
		Salaries	0	0	0	0	0
		OOE	0	0	0	0	0
		Total	0	0	0	0	0
Indicate source and amount of funds if other than internal reallocation:							
All funds for the proposed program will be from internal reallocation; no new courses are introduced.							
Approved: _____							

Act on Request to Reorganized the Institute of Community and Public Health into a School of Public Health – University of Kansas Medical Center

Staff Recommendation

The University of Kansas Medical Center submitted a request to reorganize the Institute of community and Public Health into a School of Public Health. Board policy requires that new schools, departments, and those institutions and centers requiring new state funding must be approved by the Board of Regents. Staff concur with the recommendations of the Council of Presidents and Council of Chief Academic officers to approve this request.

11/22/10

Background

Pursuant to Board policy requiring Board approval of new schools [Chapter II.D.7.(2)(a)], the University of Kansas Medical Center requests authority to establish a new School of Public Health. The school will be created as a result of the reorganization of the university's existing Institute of Community and Public Health, which currently holds more than \$30 million in grant support.

External reviewers have examined the university's plan and recommend creation of the new school. In addition, based on progress already made, the reviewers recommend that the projected timeline for seeking accreditation be shortened.

The University of Kansas will reorganize four existing departments to form the new college: Preventive Medicine and Public Health (Kansas City); Preventive Medicine and Public Health (Wichita); Biostatistics; Health Policy Management. New private funding will be sought to support a dean, selected faculty, and necessary administrative personnel. Otherwise, the school will be supported by internal reallocation of funds under the direction of the chancellor and Executive Vice chancellor.

This reorganization is intended to contribute to development of a stable public health workforce in Kansas, which currently ranks 41st in Centers for Disease Control and Preventing funding, 50th in Health Services and Resources Administration funding, and 16th in Assistant Secretary Preparedness and Response funding. It is expected that the new School of Public Health will, over time, enable the state to compete more effectively for both private and public funding support for public health education, service and research programs.

Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of this request.

August 23, 2010

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Allen Rawitch

FROM: Dr. Barbara F. Atkinson



RE: Reorganization Plan for the Preventive Medicine, Biostatistics and Health Policy and Management Programs at the University of Kansas Medical Center into a School of Public Health

Background

On July 1, 2008 the University of Kansas Medical Center formed the Institute for Community and Public Health (ICPH). The mission of the Institute is *to support and develop leading programs of public health education, service and research in collaboration with the broad public health communities in our state and region for the betterment of the health of Kansas citizens and communities*. The Institute currently includes four KUMC departments: Preventive Medicine and Public Health in Kansas City; Preventive Medicine and Public Health in Wichita; Biostatistics in Kansas City; and Health Policy and Management in Kansas City. It houses over 45 faculty actively engaged in public health education, service and research. Currently, the Institute holds over \$30 million in grant support. We have developed a plan for reconfiguring the activities of the programs in the Institute for Community and Public Health as outlined here for the Board of Regents' review. This plan includes input from: faculty, staff, students and alumni of the core departments; faculty and leaders in related departments and programs throughout the broader University; the public health practice community, as well as from the leaders of a range of state, county and community public health agencies,

National Expertise

The plan for the institute also included extensive feedback from experts in the field. Notably, several national leaders in public health education including Dr. Richard Kurz, Dean, School of Public Health, University of North Texas Health Science Center and Dr. Jim Raczynski, Founding Dean, Fay W. Boozman College of Public Health, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences provided guidance for the plan. These two individuals provided comprehensive assessments of KUMC's public health efforts on two separate occasions in recent years. In 2006, Drs. Kurz and Raczynski, along with Dr. Edward B. Perrin, Emeritus Professor of Health Services at the University of Washington, advised the University to establish an "Institute for Public Health" with the ultimate goal of developing a "school of public health that provides the instructional and research capacity to respond to the health needs of Kansans." In August 2009, Drs. Kurz and Raczynski returned and in their follow-up assessment concluded that KU has the resources to develop a school of public health, and recommended that the timeline to application for accreditation, originally projected as 5-7 years, be significantly reduced.

Proposed Reorganization

We are proposing the Institute of Community and Public Health be reorganized into a School of Public Health. We are confident that this proposed reorganization will strengthen collaboration across major academic units, create opportunities for joint educational and research programs throughout the Regents' system. It will support and strengthen the training and diversity of the public health workforce in both the private and public sectors. Further, it will assure that Kansas is well-prepared to benefit from the economies that can be recognized when public health, with its focus on wellness and prevention at the community level, augments the system of medical care, with its focus on the treatment of individuals.

Three overarching goals guide our planning: (1) providing graduate programs for our students that will prepare them for careers in public health service, teaching and research in either the private or public sectors in our state and region; (2) developing research and education programs that support the delivery of public health services and that facilitate the creation of sound public policies related to health and medical care; (3) creating collaborative research and educational programs with the Schools of Medicine, Nursing, Allied Health in order to further the Medical Center's mission of training and producing the future health care workforce.

Overview of Proposal

The four departments comprising the current Institute of Community and Public Health (ICPH)—the Departments of Preventive Medicine and Public Health (Kansas City), Preventive Medicine and Public Health (Wichita), Biostatistics, and Health Policy and Management—will form the core of a School of Public Health. These four departments are currently part of the School of Medicine. Given the types of education, research and service conducted by these departments, they are an appropriate academic “fit” for a School of Public Health. This reorganization should greatly benefit the educational and research activities of these four departments, allowing them to improve their support of the programs other schools and departments on the medical center campus and elsewhere in the University. The reorganization will be accomplished as follows:

1. The School of Public Health will organize the various faculty and programs in the four departments under the direction of a dean. Existing faculty, along with recruits to positions vacated by attrition, will be organized within the four departments to support the degree programs required by the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) for accreditation. The departments and programs will be:
 - a. The Departments of Preventive Medicine and Public Health in Wichita and Kansas City will collaborate in support of the following programs:
 - **Master of Public Health (MPH).** The existing generalist MPH degree, currently accredited by CEPH, will be revised to develop the various concentrations or “tracks” using existing funding and grants. These tracks will include concentrations in Social and Behavioral Health, Epidemiology, and Occupational and Environmental Health.
 - **Master of Clinical Research (MCR).** This program is in operation on both the Kansas City and Wichita Campuses. No changes will occur to this program as a result of the reorganization.
 - **Doctor (PhD or DrPH) of Public Health.** This program is being developed and will be submitted for approval by the Board of Regents in the near future.
 - b. The Department of Biostatistics:
 - **Master of Science (MS) of Biostatistics.** This program is enrolling students for the first time, beginning Fall 2010.
 - **Master of Public Health with a concentration in Biostatistics.** In collaboration with the Departments of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, Kansas City and Wichita, this concentration is being developed as a part of the revision of the generalist MPH program.
 - **Doctor (PhD) of Biostatistics.** This program is enrolling candidates for the first time, beginning Fall 2010.
 - c. The Department of Health Policy and Management:
 - **Master of Health Services Administration (MHSA).** An existing program and the oldest of the graduate programs operated within the Institute. No changes will occur to this program as a result of the reorganization.
 - **Master of Public Health with a concentration in Health Policy and Management.** In collaboration with the Departments of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, Kansas City and Wichita, this concentration is being developed as a part of the revision of the generalist MPH program.
 - **Doctor (PhD) of Health Policy and Management.** This program began Spring 2009.

These programs encompass approximately 170 students for the Fall 2010 semester. Enrollment in the School's core programs is expected to approach 200 students, as recently implemented programs grow to their expected enrollments and as those programs with approval pending come on-line.

The School will have a strong "practice" focus whereby its education, research and service activities will develop collaborations with the public health practice community across the state and with other Kansas Regents' institutions. The School is expected to become a resource for the practice communities in both the public and private sector. It will function as a provider of technical assistance and support in the delivery of services; conduct locally initiated, community-based research programs; and assist in the maintenance of accreditation of local health departments; and the development of public policy.

3. Over time, other departments, programs, and centers with public health related missions and interests will have the opportunity to collaborate with, or in some cases integrate into, the School. Examples include:
 - a. The doctoral (PhD) program in Nutrition, currently housed in the School of Allied Health in Kansas City.
 - b. The Center for Health Care Informatics, currently housed on the KUMC campus in Kansas City. This Center has received approval to offer an interdisciplinary Master (MS) of Health Informatics. The Center currently collaborates with the Center for Biostatistics and Advanced Informatics and is aligned with the Medical Informatics initiative within the Department of Biostatistics.
 - c. The Center for Environmental Studies, housed on the KU-Lawrence campus.
 - d. The Lifespan Institute, operating on the KU-Lawrence campus.
 - e. The Department of Public Administration, operating on the KU-Lawrence and Edwards campuses.
 - f. The School of Architecture, Design and Planning on the KU-Lawrence campus.
 - g. The School of Social Welfare on the KU-Lawrence campus.
 - h. The School of Law on the KU-Lawrence campus.

Given the scope of the public health related programs and initiatives in these units, and in others across all KU campuses, significant academic benefit for students, faculty and staff, could be derived through such collaborations. Furthermore, they have great potential to enhance the public health practice community and the health of Kansas citizens across the state. In turn, these collaborations would facilitate and advance the creation of an accredited School of Public Health

4. The reorganization will position the University to apply for accreditation of its School of Public Health by CEPH as early as calendar year 2011, with the possibility of accreditation by 2014-2015. Currently there are over 40 accredited schools in North America and Mexico. The accreditation process takes approximately three years to complete once the initial application is forwarded to CEPH. Accreditation is critical in ensuring that the School of Public Health achieves its overarching mission.

Improving the health of the State of Kansas

Reorganization of the University's public health related programs as a School of Public Health should have substantial impact on the academic programs at the University as well as the broader public health needs of our state. Consider that on a per capita basis in 2009, our state ranked 41st in Centers for Disease Control and Prevention funding, 50th in Health Services and Resources Administration funding, and 16th in Assistant Secretary Preparedness and Response funding. A School of Public Health will allow the state to develop a stable public health workforce and, over time, will allow our state to more successfully compete for private and public funding in support of public health education, service and research programs. The public health workforce is similar to other sectors of the health care labor pool in that states with no school of public health tend to have a less than adequate public health workforce and related resources. Consequently, the creation of a school within our state is a step to assuring an adequate supply of public health providers and scientists and ultimately to enhancing the health and well being of our citizens.

Funding

The reorganization of existing programs as a school of public health is cost-effective and can be accomplished with negligible disruption to students, faculty, and staff. New funding from private sources and endowments will be sought to recruit a Dean, a few key faculty, and other required administrative personnel. Otherwise, reorganization, including any necessary realignment of faculty positions, to form the school will be supported through internal budget reallocations under the direction of the Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor. Any relocation of faculty and staff within the Medical Center or between the campuses will occur with no reductions in staff positions. Degree programs will be moved intact within the school to protect the integrity of those programs. All current students will be able to complete their programs of study on schedule and we expect these changes to be of benefit to all future students. With the endorsement of the Board of Regents, this reorganization will take effect at the start of FY 2012 (July 1, 2011).

Summary

I am encouraged by the depth and breadth of the discussions that gave rise to the recommendation to reorganize the programs in public health and health policy to form a school. These discussions were driven by realistic assessments of the potential that exists within the University and of the future needs of our state. The process has resulted in a proposal that serves the needs of faculty and students in health related disciplines at the Medical Center and across all campuses of the University. In addition, the proposal, if implemented, will advance the University's mission to serve the people of Kansas.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information to forward to COCAO for their next meeting.

Act on Requests to Change the Academic Affairs Calendar – WSU and PSU

Summary and Recommendation

Board of Regents policy requires consideration of academic calendars proposed by the Regents universities for any deviation for reasons other than natural disaster or national emergencies. This month the Board is asked to consider Wichita State University and Pittsburg State University requests changes for Fall 2011, Spring/Fall 2012 and Spring 2013. The proposed changes to the academic calendars conform to existing policies and guidelines. Staff recommends approval. 11/19/10

Background

Kansas Board of Regents Policy states the following:

1. ACADEMIC CALENDAR (6-19-70; 1-18-90; 5-20-93; 6-25-2009)

- a. The Academic Calendar of each institution under the jurisdiction of the Board shall provide for an academic year minimally consisting of two sixteen week semesters totaling no fewer than 146 instructional days plus five final exam days each semester.
- b. Each Regents university shall file a three-year Academic Calendar adhering to holidays and breaks approved by the Board. Each institution shall follow the calendar as approved by the Board. Any deviation for reasons other than natural disasters or national emergencies must have prior approval of the Board.

Although current Board policy permits diversity among the universities in the construction of academic calendars, the adoption of common elements by the Board in 1984 and 1990 has forced considerable consistency in the number of instructional days, exam days and vacation days. The remaining variation appears partially rooted in administrative requirements and campus traditions. Some degree of institutional flexibility is important for effective institutional planning in the use of facilities and the management of enrollments and personnel.

Proposed Change to Academic Calendar

Wichita State University requests approval to revise its academic calendars for Fall 2011; Spring/Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 as follows:

Wichita State University		
	Move From	To
Fall 2011		
Fall Classes Begin	Thursday, August 18, 2011	<i>Monday, August 22, 2011</i>
Fall Break	October 13-14, 2011	<i>October 17-18, 2011</i>
Total Instructional Days	75	<i>73</i>
Spring 2012		
Spring Classes End	Monday, May 7, 2012	<i>Thursday, May 3, 2012</i>
Total Instructional Days	75	<i>73</i>
Exams	May 9-15, 2012	<i>May 5-11, 2012</i>

Fall 2012		
Classes Begin	Thursday, August 23, 2012	<i>Monday, August 27, 2012</i>
Fall Break	October 18-19, 2012	<i>October 22-23, 2012</i>
Total Instructional Days	75	<i>73</i>
Spring 2013		
Classes End	Monday, May 13, 2013	<i>Thursday, May 9, 2013</i>
Total Instructional Days	75	<i>73</i>
Exams	May 15-21, 2013	<i>May 11-17, 2013</i>

Pittsburg State University requests moving its start date for the 2012 and 2013 spring semesters and a correction to the Fall 2012 start date from Thursday to Monday as follows:

Pittsburg State University	
Move From	To
Spring 2012	
Thursday, January 12, 2012	<i>Tuesday, January 17, 2012</i>
Spring 2013	
Thursday, January 10, 2013	<i>Monday, January 14, 2013</i>
Fall 2012	
Aug 20 Thurs	<i>Aug 20 Mon</i>

Pittsburg State University's Fall 2012 start date of August 20 is a Monday and not a Thursday as noted on the KBOR calendar listing. This correction will be made.

The following calendars reflect the revisions with strikethrough and italics.

Academic Calendar Year, 2010 -2011
Kansas Board of Regents State Universities
No revisions occur on this calendar

<u>Fall, 2010</u>	<u>KU</u>	<u>KSU</u>	<u>WSU</u>	<u>ESU</u>	<u>PSU</u>	<u>FHSU</u>
Classes Begin	Aug 19 Thurs	Aug 23 Mon	Aug 19 Thurs	Aug 18 Wed	Aug 23, Mon	Aug 23 Mon
Classes End	Dec 09 Thurs	Dec 10 Fri	Dec 09 Thurs	Dec 10 Fri	Dec 10, Fri	Dec 10 Fri
Total Instructional Days	75	74	75	76	74	74
Exams Begin	Dec 13 Mon	Dec 13 Mon	Dec 11 Sat	Dec 13 Mon	Dec 13, Mon	Dec 11 Sat
Exams End	Dec 17 Fri	Dec 17 Fri	Dec 17 Fri	Dec 17 Fri	Dec 17, Fri	Dec 17 Fri
Total Exam Days	5	5	6	5	5	6
Total Vacation Days	6	6	6	7	6	6
<u>Spring, 2011</u>	<u>KU</u>	<u>KSU</u>	<u>WSU</u>	<u>ESU</u>	<u>PSU</u>	<u>FHSU</u>
Classes Begin	Jan 21 Fri	Jan 18 Tues	Jan 18 Tue	Jan 12 Wed	Jan 18, Tue	Jan 12 Wed
Classes End	May 12 Thurs	May 06 Fri	May 09 Mon	May 06 Fri	May 06, Fri	May 06 Fri
Total Instructional Days	75	74	75	76	74	77
Exams Begin	May 16 Mon	May 09 Mon	May 11 Wed	May 09 Mon	May 09, Mon	May 07 Sat
Exams End	May 20 Fri	May 13 Fri	May 17 Tue	May 13 Fri	May 13, Fri	May 13 Fri
Total Exam Days	5	5	6	5	5	6
Total Vacation Days	6	6	5	7	6 5	6

- Notes: (a) Wichita State University and Fort Hays State University utilize Saturdays as final exam days and, thus, have a slightly longer exam period.
- (b) University of Kansas Fall break October 14 - 17, 2010; Kansas State University Fall break November 22-23, 2010; Wichita State University Fall break October 14 - 15, 2010; Emporia State University Fall break October 14 - 15, 2010; Fort Hays State University Fall break November 22-23, 2010; and Pittsburg State University Fall break October 21 - 22, 2010.
- (c) Thanksgiving break is November 24-28, 2010; Martin Luther King Day is January 17, 2011; and Spring break is March 21-27, 2011.
 [Approved by KBOR June 12, 2008] *Revision Approved 01/20/10; Revisions Approved 06/23/10*

Academic Calendar Year, 2011 -2012
Kansas Board of Regents State Universities
Revisions 11/19/2010

<u>Fall, 2011</u>	<u>KU</u>	<u>KSU</u>	<u>WSU</u>	<u>ESU</u>	<u>PSU</u>	<u>FHSU</u>
Classes Begin	Aug 22 Mon	Aug 22 Mon	Aug 18 Thurs <i>August 22 Mon</i>	Aug 17 Wed	Aug 22, Mon	Aug 22 Mon
Classes End	Dec 08 Thurs	Dec 9 Fri	Dec 08 Thurs	Dec 09 Fri	Dec 09, Fri	Dec 09 Fri
Total Instructional Days	73	74	75 -73	76	74	76
Exams Begin	Dec 12 Mon	Dec 12 Mon	Dec 10 Sat	Dec 12 Mon	Dec 12, Mon	Dec 10 Sat
Exams End	Dec 16 Fri	Dec 16 Fri	Dec 16 Fri	Dec 16 Fri	Dec 16, Fri	Dec 16 Fri
Total Exam Days	5	5	6	5	5	6
Total Vacation Days	6	6	5	7	6	6
<u>Spring, 2012</u>	<u>KU</u>	<u>KSU</u>	<u>WSU</u>	<u>ESU</u>	<u>PSU</u>	<u>FHSU</u>
Classes Begin	Jan 17 Tues	Jan 17 Tues	Jan 16 Mon	Jan 11 Wed	Jan 12, Thurs <i>Jan 17 Tues</i>	Jan 11 Wed
Classes End	May 3 Thurs	May 04 Fri	May 07 Mon <i>May 3 Thurs</i>	May 04 Fri	May 04, Fri	May 04 Fri
Total Instructional Days	73	74	75 73	76	76 74	77
Exams Begin	May 7 Mon	May 07 Mon	May 09 Wed	May 07 Mon	May 07, Mon	May 05 Sat
Exams End	May 11 Fri	May 11 Fri	May 15 Tues	May 12 Fri	May 11, Fri	May 11 Fri
Total Exam Days	5	5	6	5	5	6
Total Vacation Days	5	6	6	7	6	6

- Notes: (a) Wichita State University and Fort Hays State University utilize Saturdays as final exam days and, thus, have a slightly longer exam period.
- (b) University of Kansas Fall break October 8 – 11, 2011; Kansas State University Fall break November 21-22, 2011; Wichita State University Fall break ~~October 13 – 14, 2011~~ *October 17-18, 2011*; Emporia State University Fall break October 20 – 21, 2011; Fort Hays State University Fall break November 21-22, 2011; and Pittsburg State University Fall break October 20 – 21, 2011.
- © Thanksgiving break is November 23-November 27, 2011; Martin Luther King Day is January 16, 2012; and Spring break is March 19-25, 2012. [Approved by KBOR June 12, 2008]*Revision Approved 04/15/10; Revisions Approved 06/23/10*

Academic Calendar Year, 2012 -2013
Kansas Board of Regents State Universities
Revisions 11/19/2010

<u>Fall, 2012</u>	<u>KU</u>	<u>KSU</u>	<u>WSU</u>	<u>ESU</u>	<u>PSU</u>	<u>FHSU</u>
Classes Begin	Aug 20 Mon	Aug 20 Mon	Aug 23 Thurs <i>Aug 27 Mon</i>	Aug 15 Wed	Aug 20, Thurs <i>Mon</i>	Aug 20 Mon
Classes End	Dec 6 Thurs	Dec 07 Fri	Dec 13 Thurs	Dec 07 Fri	Dec 07, Fri	Dec 07 Fri
Total Instructional Days	73	74	75 73	76	74	74
Exams Begin	Dec 10 Mon	Dec 10 Mon	Dec 15 Sat	Dec 10 Mon	Dec 10, Mon	Dec 08 Sat
Exams End	Dec 14 Fri	Dec 14 Fri	Dec 21 Fri	Dec 14 Fri	Dec 14, Fri	Dec 14 Fri
Total Exam Days	5	5	6	5	5	6
Total Vacation Days	6	6	6	7	6	6
<u>Spring, 2013</u>	<u>KU</u>	<u>KSU</u>	<u>WSU</u>	<u>ESU</u>	<u>PSU</u>	<u>FHSU</u>
Classes Begin	Jan 22 Tue	Jan 22 Tues	Jan 22 Tue	Jan 16 Wed	Jan 10, Thurs <i>Jan 14 Mon</i>	Jan 16 Wed
Classes End	May 09 Thurs	May 10 Fri	May 13 Mon <i>May 9 Thurs</i>	May 10 Fri	May 04, Fri	May 10 Fri
Total Instructional Days	73	74	75 73	76	76 74	77
Exams Begin	May 13 Mon	May 13 Mon	May 15 Wed <i>May 11 Fri</i>	May 13 Mon	May 06, Mon	May 11 Sat
Exams End	May 17 Fri	May 17 Fri	May 21 Tue <i>May 17 Thurs</i>	May 17 Fri	May 10, Fri	May 17 Fri
Total Exam Days	5	5	6	5	5	6
Total Vacation Days	5	6	5	7	6	6

- Notes: (a) Wichita State University and Fort Hays State University utilize Saturdays as final exam days and, thus, have a slightly longer exam period.
- (b) University of Kansas Fall break October 6 – 9, 2012; Kansas State University Fall break November 19-20, 2012; Wichita State University Fall break ~~October 18 – 19, 2012~~ *October 22-23, 2012*; Emporia State University Fall break October 11 - 12, 2012; Fort Hays State University Fall break November 19-20, 2012; and Pittsburg State University Fall break October 25 - 26, 2012.
- (c) Thanksgiving break is November 21-November 25, 2012; Martin Luther King Day is January 21, 2013; and Spring break is March 18-24, 2013. [Approved by KBOR June 12, 2008] *Revision Approved 04/15/10; Revisions Approved 06/23/10*

Wichita State University – Proposed Academic Calendar Changes for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013

Our present academic calendar has Fall classes beginning on a Thursday and exams ending on a Friday morning. The two-week Fall Pre-session begins the next business day after the summer session ends. The Spring semester begins the day after the Martin Luther King holiday and exams end on a Tuesday, two business days after Commencement.

Shortening each semester by two days, as permitted by Chapter II, D.1.a of the KBOR Policy and Procedures Manual, would allow Fall classes to begin on the Monday after the current start day of Thursday, and end at the same time in the fall. It would also allow a one-week break between the end of Summer classes and the start of the two-week Fall Pre-session. Shortening the Spring Semester by two days would allow exams to end on Friday – before commencement – instead of the following Tuesday. Dormitory residents would leave several days sooner, reducing some costs in that area. The proposed changes are indicated below.

	Previously approved	Proposed	Previously Approved	Proposed
FALL	2011	2011	2012	2012
Classes begin	August 18 (Thurs)	August 22 (Mon)	August 23 (Thurs)	August 27 (Mon)
Fall break	October 13-14	October 17-18	October 18-19	October 22-23
Classes End	December 8	December 8	December 13	December 13
Total Instructional	75	73	75	73
Exams (6 days)	December 10-16	December 10-16	December 15-21	December 15-21
SPRING	2012	2012	2013	2013
Classes begin	January 17	January 17	January 22	January 22
Spring break	March 19-25	March 19-25	March 18-24	March 18-24
Classes end	May 7 (Mon)	May 3 (Thurs)	May 13 (Mon)	May 9 (Thurs)
Total Instructional	75	73	75	73
Exams (6 days)	May 9-15	May 5-11	May 15-21	May 11-17
Commencement	May 11-12	May 11-12	May 17-18	May 17-18



Pittsburg State University

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

October 26, 2010

Dr. Andy Tompkins
President and CEO
Kansas Board of Regents
1000 SW Jackson Street, Suite 520
Topeka, KS 66612-1368

Dear Dr. Tompkins:

In complying with the KBOR policy and recommendations, Pittsburg State University has presented and received agreement from faculty and administration to adjust our calendar to reflect an academic year of 148 instructional days for all future academic calendars. With our calendars being adjusted to 148 instructional days per academic year (fall and spring semesters) and our Spring 2011 calendar being approved at the January 2010 Board of Regents meeting, we will need to also adjust our start dates for Spring 2012 and Spring 2013.

Currently, the academic calendar provided in the April 2010 KBOR agenda package has our start dates as follows:

Spring 2012 January 12 (Thursday)
Spring 2013 January 10 (Thursday)

We request that the start dates be changed as follows:

Spring 2012 January 17 (Tuesday)
Spring 2013 January 14 (Monday)

This will make the instructional days fall into line with our 74 days per semester for a total of 148 instructional days per academic year. Additionally, the change to our spring calendars will also better facilitate students moving into residence halls over the weekend, rather than mid-week. This has proven to be preferable to staff as well as students and parents.

Additionally, please note that our Fall 2012 start date of August 20 is a Monday and not a Thursday as noted on the KBOR calendar listing. Thank you for your consideration to our calendar changes. If further explanation is needed, please contact my office.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Lynette J. Olson in cursive.

Lynette J. Olson, Ph.D., CFLE
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

tp

cc: Dr. Steven A. Scott
Dr. Bill Ivy

1701 South Broadway • Pittsburg, Kansas 66762-7554 • ☎20/235-4113 fax: 620/235-6192 • www.pittstate.edu/admin/provost

Act on Revised Academic Program Review Guidelines – November 2010

Summary and Staff Recommendation

This item presents a revision of the Board's 1997 Program Review guidelines for Board consideration. Staff recommends approval of these guidelines. November 30, 2010

Background

In fall 2009, the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee was charged to “review and make recommendations for full Board consideration regarding the Board’s ‘program review’ process, as it relates to the state universities.” To fulfill this charge, Board staff, in consultation with the Council of Chief Academic Officers, reviewed the procedures approved September 18, 1997. This analysis led to the conclusion that the 1997 guidelines are fundamentally sound but require updating to more effectively serve contemporary needs.

This item contains two documents, the currently operative 1997 guidelines, *Academic Program Review in the Kansas Regents System*, and a proposed revision of those guidelines, *Guidelines for Academic Program Review*. The latter was developed in consultation with the Council of Chief Academic Officers (COCAO) and the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC). Based on these discussions, staff revised and updated the original 1997 document, deleting portions not directly relevant to the process.

Key components of the 1997 guidelines are:

- Statement of purposes and goals at both the campus and system levels
- Description of the program review process
- Criteria for assessing program quality, effectiveness and viability
- Report and recommendations to the Board of Regents
- Data collection by each campus following a common program review data base that identifies the specific program information to be reported to the Board

This revision retains the key components of the 1997 guidelines. In addition, it:

- Reflects creation of the KSPSD database
- Clarifies the role of this data in supporting program review
- Eliminates of extraneous material

Program Review Process

The attached proposed program review process includes the following core components:

Institutional Activity

- Submit program data to KSPSD
- Review each academic program on an 8-year cycle
- Program Self-study
- Individual Program Reports and recommendations

Board Staff Activity

- Review program data in KSPSD
- Review individuals program reports/recommendations
- Consult with institutions regarding problem areas
- Annually monitor and report to Board on programs flagged for additional review
- Prepare annual report to Board on individual campus results

The program review process outlined above begins with an intensive self-study on the part of the program in question, continues with Board staff analysis of these reviews together with KSPSD data to determine possible problem areas, and concludes with the staff report to the Board on the results of this analysis. Where problems are found, staff consult with institutions regarding steps taken to deal with programs determined to have significant weaknesses. Staff use the information from this process to develop its annual report to the Board on program review.

Use of Data

The Board has established minima for number of majors, graduates, faculty and average ACT score. Emphasis is placed on those programs up for review in a given year, but staff reviews all minima tables to determine those programs that fail to significantly meet minima requirements.

While program review is not primarily data collection, data are crucial to monitoring program performance over time. Staff will analyze the data collected, consult with campuses to identify problem areas, and monitor campus progress over time in dealing with those problem areas.

Recommendation

Staff recommend approval of the proposed *Guidelines for Academic Program Review*.

GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

November 2010

Introduction

Program review is inextricably bound to academic quality and the allocation of resources within the public universities governed by the Kansas Board of Regents. Its primary goal is to ensure program quality by: (1) enabling individual universities to align academic programs with their institutional missions and priorities; (2) fostering improvement in curriculum and instruction; and (3) effectively coordinating the use of faculty time and talent.

The Kansas Board of Regents' program review policy reads as follows:

(1) In cooperation with the universities, the Board will maintain a program review cycle and a review process that will allow the universities to demonstrate that they are delivering quality programs consistent with their mission. (12-19-86; 6-23-88; 9-18-97)

(2) The review of degree programs shall encompass all levels of academic degrees from associate to doctoral. Program reviews are institutionally based and follow the departmental or unit structure of the institution. "Program" means an academic plan that is approved by the appropriate governing board and leads to an award, for example, a degree or a career/technical certificate. (12-17-82; 1-20-84; 6-23-88; 9-18-97; 6-23-05)

On September 18, 1997, the Kansas Board of Regents approved guidelines for the current program review cycle. These guidelines provide goals for program review at two levels, campus and system. At the campus level they include assessment to strengthen the quality and accessibility of academic programs; identifying program needs and campus priorities; and identifying areas for reorganization, including "modification, merger, and discontinuance." Principal goals at the system level include ensuring that programs are consistent with institutional missions and roles; ensuring optimal student access and use of resources; minimizing duplication; and encouraging institutional cooperation.

These levels coincide with the two distinctive types of assessment, namely, assessment for improvement and for accountability. Campus level review of academic programs is primarily aimed at improvement, while system level review focuses primarily on accountability. This is not to say that the two goals are mutually exclusive; only to recognize that they are two different processes that respond to distinct dynamics. It is important that institutions and Board staff remain mindful of the creative tension that exists at each level between these two types of review.

Purpose of Academic Program Review.

The Board and Regents universities conceive program review as integral to the academic planning process that occurs at both the institutional and system levels, with the overarching purpose of maintaining and improving the quality of academic programs offered by the system universities. Program review provides an opportunity for faculty and administrators to reflect on their institution's educational practices and review the role of their programs in the context of the totality of programs offered by Regents universities. This is accomplished by ensuring:

1. the highest possible level of academic program quality;
2. an appropriate differentiation of institutional missions and roles within the Regents system;
3. optimal effectiveness in the use of State and student resources; and
4. maximum responsiveness to the intellectual, cultural and workforce needs of the state.

Although the overarching purposes remain the same, the goals and operation of program review vary at the campus and system levels. A differentiation of goals implies that the campuses and the system have different responsibilities in the program review process.

Program review begins at the campus level, where its goals include but are not limited to:

1. strengthening the quality and accessibility of academic programs by assessing existing program strengths and concerns;
2. augmenting institutional self-management by identifying and articulating academic program needs and campus priorities; and
3. identifying needs to reorganize academic programs, including modification, merger and discontinuance.

Individual universities may specify or add to these campus goals for program review.

At the system level, the primary goals for program review include:

1. ensuring that program quality and priorities are consistent with institutional missions and roles;
2. refining the scope of program offerings to optimize student access and use of resources; and
3. identifying viable opportunities for minimizing unjustifiable program duplication and supporting appropriate institutional cooperation.

In addition, as directed by the Board, staff may undertake different types of system review. Examples of such reviews are the analysis of system-wide program array and the system-wide review of individual academic program categories.

The Program Review Process

Program Review Cycle

Each public university is charged with the review of its academic programs and the implementation of its own process for program review. Each academic program offered by the institution will be reviewed at least once within an eight year cycle determined by the institution.

The current eight year cycle is 2007–2014, meaning that the next cycle will be 2015 – 2022. Institutions will provide Board staff with the schedule of programs to be reviewed in the next cycle no later than December 2014. Subsequently, institutions will provide staff with the schedule of programs to be reviewed in the upcoming cycle no later than December of the year preceding the first year of that cycle.

Program Review Process and Criteria

Program review documents are due in the Board office by February 16 of each year. Board staff will review individual program review reports and program data provided to KSPSD. Based on this review, staff will consult with chief academic officers regarding any questions, issues or problems that should be addressed.

Although program review is ultimately focused on discrete academic programs, the larger context of institutional planning, management and budgeting of the university should be enhanced by the process.

Each program will be examined by the university using the following criteria:

1. centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution;
2. the quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty;
3. the quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;
4. demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program;
5. the service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond; and
6. the program's cost-effectiveness.

Additional criteria consistent with institutional mission may be also be added. These criteria have relevance for all degree programs, regardless of discipline or degree level. However, the conceptualization, measurement, and application of these criteria in the review of academic programs will vary according to a variety of factors, including institutional mission and degree level. Universities may also implement separate review processes for graduate and undergraduate education.

Institutional reviews may include student learning assessment data, evaluations, recommendations from accreditation reports, and various institutional data, e.g., data on student post-collegiate experiences, data gathered from the core and institution-specific performance indicators, and/or information in national or disciplinary rankings of program quality. Specific and/or additional information that relate to these criteria and that are meaningful and appropriate for the institution can be developed by individual universities.

Data and Minima Tables

Data collected on each academic program are critical to the program review process. Based on institutional data housed in the Kansas State Postsecondary Database, Board staff assemble minima tables for review. The Board has established minima for number of majors, graduates, faculty and average ACT score. Emphasis is placed on those programs up for review in a given year, but staff reviews all minima tables to determine those programs that fail to significantly meet minima requirements.

Based on this review of the data, staff consult with institutions to identify problem areas. The annual report to the Board will include updates on campus actions to alleviate those problems.

Data minima are established for the following categories:

Undergraduate programs:

- number of majors;
- number of graduates;
- number of faculty FTE to deliver the program;
- average ACT score.

Master's and Doctoral programs

- number of majors;
- number of graduates;
- number of faculty FTE to deliver the program

Programs Requiring Additional Review or Monitoring for Improvement

The annual program review process includes both review of individual programs on the regular 8-year cycle, and analysis of the program data provided by campuses to KSPSD. Based on these reviews, some programs will be identified for additional review, while others may be recommended for elimination. In each case, Board staff will consult with staff at institutions and report to the Board on the status of such programs.

Programs Selected for Additional Review or Monitoring

Based on review of both qualitative reports and of these data, Board staff and/or institutions will identify areas of possible concern and consult with institutions to determine what, if any, steps should be taken to resolve problem areas. Institutions may find that some programs require additional review, beyond that provided by the regular review cycle. In addition, some programs may require monitoring for a period of time to assess their progress in rectifying problems

identified in the regular program review. Guidelines for prompting additional review or monitoring include minimum data criteria in specific categories. Academic programs which fail to meet any one of these minimum criteria may be targeted for intensive reviews in addition to the regularly scheduled self-study.

Specific data minima that potentially trigger additional review are provided to institutions annually by Board staff. Guidelines are annually reviewed by the Board's Information Research and Academic Affairs staff.

In addition to programs identified by the minima tables, the university may designate any other program for intensive review based on other information in the program review data base or other information sources, such as assessment results, and accreditation reports, pertaining to the program's quality or relationship to institutional mission.

Board staff will monitor campus activities regarding programs identified for further review or monitoring until those issues are resolved. Information about these programs will be included in the annual report to the Board on program review.

Final Report and Recommendations

Upon the conclusion of the reviews each Regents university will provide the Board with an executive summary of its annual review and program by program recommendations. The campus reports to the Board should aim for brevity and include the following:

1. An institutional overview, no more than five pages in length, describing the review process, how data sources were used to shape program recommendations and the most significant program changes or recommendations resulting from the program review.
2. A one- to two-page summary assessment and institutional recommendations for each program reviewed, to include the following information:
 - Name of program reviewed
 - College/Unit in which program is housed
 - Brief program description
 - Degrees conferred
 - Placement of graduates, e.g., types of positions, starting salary
 - Sources of external support
 - Conclusions and recommendations
3. A one-page institutional estimate of the fiscal implications of any recommended program changes.

Board staff will develop its required annual program review report on information provided by the institutions on each program, analysis of data in the minima tables, and consultation with the institutions.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW IN THE KANSAS REGENTS SYSTEM

I. Academic Program Review and Institutional Mission Development.

From 1982 to 1990, the Kansas Board of Regents and Regents universities reviewed every academic degree program within the Regents system at least once. Born in an era of fiscal constraint, the first cycle of program review resulted in the modification or discontinuance of over 180 degree programs and a documented savings to the State of Kansas of over \$1 million. Equally significant, however, the campus-based program review initiated in 1991 was a critical feature of the study of the missions, roles and aspirations of the Kansas Regents universities. The mission study resulted in the modification, merger or discontinuance of an additional 182 programs or units, and reported reinvestments totaling approximately \$18 million from FY 1994 - FY 1998. The first cycle of program review and the 1991 - 1993 mission study established a place for program review in the culture of Kansas higher education. Program review is critical to the self-knowledge and effective self-management of the six universities governed by the Kansas Board of Regents.

In 1997, the Regents universities face continued fiscal constraints and an array of additional challenges that include a profound need to improve faculty compensation; accommodate changes in the mix, preparation and volume of students enrolling in the universities; integrate new instructional technologies; and respond to increased accountability demands. In preparation for the new realities confronting Kansas higher education, the Board and universities implemented VISION 2020, a rubric for pursuing change in designated areas of university life. VISION 2020 is not a substitute for program review nor is it a vehicle to refine the missions and roles of the Regents universities. However, if properly crafted, program review and VISION 2020 can be complementary and mutually reinforcing.

Program review must support the efforts of the universities and the Board to respond to these new realities by increasing institutional flexibility and supporting campus plans to fulfill assigned institutional missions as well as the initiatives within VISION 2020. Program review most fully enables the universities to develop and refine their mission and roles within Kansas higher education. As such, it is also one of the most important activities to support the ability of the Board and the universities to align academic programs with institutional missions and priorities. Consistent with VISION 2020, program review is concerned with the improvement of curriculum and instruction and the use of faculty time and talent. Program review is inextricably bound to the allocation of resources within the Regents universities. Thus, an administrative review of academic programs occurs each year at the universities. Because of its focus on mission development and refinement, program review is linked to future actions to improve faculty salaries and revenue streams for technology enhancements.

Acknowledging these realities, the Council of Chief Academic Officers and the Council of Presidents reiterated their support for a new cycle of program review at their meetings in Hays, Kansas in September 1996. In response, the following outlines a new cycle of program review in the Kansas Regents system. It was approved by the Board of Regents on September 18, 1997.

II. Purposes and Goals for Academic Program Review.

The Board and Regents universities conceive program review as integral to the academic planning process that occurs at both the institutional and system levels. Therefore, program review contains both institutional and system goals within a set of overarching purposes. Stated generally, program review is intended to improve the quality of the academic programs offered by the Regents universities. Program review also provides an important opportunity for faculty to reflect on educational practices and review the role of their programs in the context of the totality of programs offered by the Regents universities. This is accomplished by ensuring:

1. the highest possible level of academic program quality;
2. an appropriate differentiation of institutional missions and roles within the Regents system;
3. optimal effectiveness in the use of State and student resources; and
4. maximum responsiveness to the intellectual, cultural and workforce needs of the State.

Although the overarching purposes remain the same, the goals and operation of program review vary at the campus and system levels. A differentiation of goals implies that the campuses and the system have different responsibilities in the program review process. Goals for program review at the campus level include but are not limited to:

1. strengthening the quality and accessibility of academic programs by assessing existing program strengths and concerns;
2. augmenting institutional self-management by identifying and articulating academic program needs and campus priorities; and
3. identifying needs to reorganize academic programs, including modification, merger and discontinuance.

The Regents universities may specify or add to these campus goals for program review.

At the system level, the primary goals for program review include:

1. ensuring that program quality and program priorities are consistent with institutional missions and roles;
2. refining the scope of program offerings to optimize student access and use of resources; and
3. identifying viable opportunities for minimizing unjustifiable program duplication and supporting appropriate institutional cooperation.

III. The Program Review Process

A. A Common Program Data Base

Program review begins appropriately at each Regents university with the development and collection of data on each academic degree program. The common program review data base identifies the specific program information the universities will report to the Board. Attachment 6a to this document provides the instructions, operational definitions and reporting format for the elements in the program review data base that will be collected by each institution and reported to the Board. The common program review data base will follow the departmental structure of the Regents universities, as well as provide information about discrete academic programs. For the purposes of this review, programs are identified by their CIP code and degree level. The Regents universities will report the statistical information identified in Attachment 2 to the Board office no later than March 16 of each year

beginning in 1998. Board of Regents staff will work with the Council of Chief Academic Officers to ensure that the database is consistent across universities and is updated annually.

B. The Program Review Schedule

All academic degree programs offered by the Kansas Regents universities will be reviewed at least once within an eight year cycle. Attachment 3 is a sample cycle for the review of academic programs over an eight year period. Programs are grouped by CIP codes assigned in the Board's Degree and Certificate Program Inventory.

C. The Program Review Process and Criteria

Each Regents university is charged with the review of its academic programs and the implementation of its own process and criteria for program review, within a systemwide framework of expectations for the review and a shared timeline for its various phases. Each Regents university is responsible for the design and implementation of its own program review process and schedule consistent with the timelines on Attachment 1. Each Regents university will submit its plan for program review for consideration by the Board at the March 1998 Board Meeting.

Although program review is ultimately focused on discrete academic programs, the larger context of institutional planning, management and budgeting of the university should be enhanced by the process. Thus, the development and implementation of a program review process should integrate the systemwide objectives for program review with the institutional environment for planning, management and budgeting. Each university will use the reviews to establish priorities for its academic programs and allocate resources among programs.

Each program will be examined by the university according to the criteria listed below.

1. Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution;
2. The quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty;
3. The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;
4. Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program;
5. The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and
6. The program's cost-effectiveness.

These criteria have relevance for all degree programs, regardless of discipline or degree level. However, the conceptualization, measurement, and application of these criteria in the review of academic programs will vary according to a variety of factors, including institutional mission and degree level. The Board is particularly concerned that the criteria are interpreted and applied appropriately to programs at different degree levels.

Institutional reviews of programs will not be limited to the statistical information outlined in Attachment 1 but may include student learning assessment data, evaluations and recommendations from accreditation reports, data on student post-collegiate experiences, data gathered from the core and institution-specific performance indicators, and/or information in national or disciplinary rankings of program quality. Specific and/or additional information that relate to these criteria and that are

meaningful and appropriate for the institution can be developed by each Regents university. The universities may consider and implement separate review processes for graduate and undergraduate education. Examples of appropriate indicators for graduate programs might include the value and quality indicators listed in the policy statement on Academic Review of Graduate Programs, adopted by the Council on Graduate Schools.

Recognizing that the need for program review may vary by program, the Board and universities believe that the programs that demonstrate a greater need for review should be prioritized in the review process. Further, campuses may develop multistage review processes that permit more intense reviews of certain programs.

Board of Regents staff will review the database provided by the Regents universities and, by May 1 of each year, alert the chief academic officers to any questions, issues or problems that should be addressed through the institution's review process.

At the conclusion of the annual review each institution will develop and report to the Board of Regents a summary assessment of the program and recommendations for each program's future.

IV. Report and Recommendations to the Kansas Board of Regents

Upon the conclusion of the reviews according to the proposed timeline appearing on Attachment 1, each Regents university will provide the Board with an executive summary of its annual review and program by program recommendations. The campus reports to the Board should aim for brevity and include the following:

- A. A five-page institutional overview describing the review process, how data sources were used to shape program recommendations, and the most significant program changes or recommendations resulting from the program review;
- B. A two-page summary assessment and institutional recommendations for each program reviewed; and
- C. A one-page institutional estimate of the fiscal implications of the recommended program changes for each fiscal year from FY 2000 - FY 2005.

Institutional reports and recommendations for the 1998 reviews are due in the Board office on January 15, 1999. Campus reports will be summarized by Board of Regents staff, in consultation with institutional leadership, and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board's Academic Affairs Committee prior to consideration by the entire Board on February 18, 1999.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW - APPROVED TIMELINE - 1997 -2000

<u>Activity for 1998 Cycle</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>
1. Board of Regents Consideration of Proposal	September 18, 1997
2. Campus Collection of Statistical Overview Data Identified on Academic Affairs Pages 31 to 33.	September 1997 - March 16, 1998 March 16, 1998
3. Campus Report of Statistical Overview Data to the Board Office	September 1997 - March 1998
4. Development of Campus Plans for Program Review	March 1998
5. Board consideration of Campus Plans and Schedules for Program Review	March 1998 - December 1998
6. Campus Reviews of Programs Identified for 1998 Reviews	May 1, 1998
7. Board staff will notify chief academic officers of questions, issues or problems	January 1, 1999
8. Submission of Campus Reports and Recommendations to the Board of Regents	February 18, 1999
9. Consideration of Campus Reports and Recommendations by the Board of Regents	
	<u>Completion Date</u>
	March 16, 1999
1. Campus Report of Statistical Overview Data to Board Office	March 1999 - December 1999
2. Campus Reviews of Programs Identified for 1999 Reviews	January 1, 2000
3. Submission of Campus Reports and Recommendations to the Board of Regents	February 17, 2000
4. Consideration of Campus Reports and Recommendations by the Board of Regents	

**PROGRAM REVIEW - STATISTICAL OVERVIEW
INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITIONS¹**

1998 PROGRAM REVIEW

Institution: Self Explanatory.

Department: List the Department Name.

Discipline: In many instances, the discipline is the same as the department name. However, there are departments that have several disciplines within them. For instance, a Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work Department has three disciplines that should be listed under the discipline section.

Section I: Departmental Data: The data in this section is provided for each department unless requested by the Board of Regents to disaggregate the data into disciplines within a department.

Part A: Departmental Instructional Expenditures. Part A is completed to capture the total **General Use Instructional** expenditures for the department for FY 1993 to FY 1997. The General Use definition is the same as that used for the Kansas Cost Study which includes Sponsored Research Overhead funding. The expenditures are separated by Salaries/Benefits and Other Operating Expenditures (OOE). The third line is the total of Salaries/Benefits and OOE. The five year growth trend should be expressed in a percent of the present growth or decline in dollars for the five year period reported. The growth trend is calculated by subtracting FY 1993 Total Expenditures from FY 1997 Total Expenditures and dividing it by FY 1993 Total Expenditures. The Department General Use Instructional Expenditures as a percent of the Institution's General Use Instructional is calculated by dividing line three by the Institution's General Use Instructional Expenditures. The five year growth trend is the difference between the percent in FY 1997 and FY 1993 divided by FY 1993 percent.

Part B: Student Credit Hour Production. Part B should reflect the total student credit hours (SCH) generated by department for FY 1993 to FY 1997. Show the total number of SCH taught for the Summer, Fall and Spring semesters of each fiscal year requested. The student credit hour production should be reported by level and a total of all the levels. Line 6 is the percent of Undergraduate SCH produced by the department in relation to the Institution's Undergraduate SCH produced for FY 1993 to FY 1997. Line 7 is the percent of Graduate SCH produced by the department in relation to the Institution's Total Graduate SCH produced for FY 1993 to FY 1997. All percents should be reported to the nearest 100th (e.g. 2.05%).

¹developed by CIRO December 13, 1993; updated by Board Staff February 18, 1997.

Part C: Cost per Credit Hour. The general principles and definitions utilized in the Kansas Cost Study govern the departmental costs per credit hour identified in this item. For each fiscal year, report the cost per credit hour for each level from the HEGIS discipline in which the department is located.

Part D: Percent of Departmental SCH taken by the Department's Undergraduates, Graduates, and Non-Departmental majors. Part D will show what percent of the SCH generated by the department is concentrated within the department or outside the department for Fall 1994 and Fall 1997. In other words, Part D is a means to identify those departments which provide a service to other departments and to the University. Report the percent of department SCH generated by Undergraduates majoring in the department and Graduates majoring in the department. The percent of SCH that have not been accounted for by the majors within the department should be reported under non-majors.

Part E: Department Faculty. Part E will show the size and demographics of the department from the faculty side based on actual appointees rather than budgeted. (1) Report the department total number (headcount) of instructional/research/public service personnel who are tenured or on tenure track which includes full-time and part-time personnel for Fall 1997 with 50% or more of their primary assignment in instruction. This is similar to the instructions used for the Board of Regents DBTF Report. (2) From the number reported in line 1, report the number and percent of faculty with terminal degrees. Also, define what is meant by terminal degree (if it is different than a PhD.) since some program areas have different standards for terminal degrees. (3) From the number reported in line 1, report the percent and number who have tenure. (4) Report the number and percent of full-time faculty within the department who are budgeted 100% in the Institution. (5) Calculate the five year growth trend (percent) in headcount using the number reported in line 1 and subtract from the total department headcount (full-time and part-time) in FY 1994 and divide by the FY 1994 total headcount. (6) report the full-time equivalent (FTE) of instructional faculty in the department.

Part F: Actual Instructional FTE. Part F is reflecting Faculty teaching loads for Fall 1994 and Fall 1997 reflecting actual appointments rather than budgeted. (1) Report the Department Instructional FTE of tenure/tenure track faculty. This would include all faculty who have 50 percent or more of their assignment in instruction. (2) Report the graduate teaching assistants (GTA) FTE who are assigned to each department. Designate the GTA FTE which are instructor of record and which are not instructor of record. Instructor of record is defined as those GTA's who assign the grades for the class or who have total responsibility for the class from writing class notes, writing tests, evaluating classwork and assigning final grades. (3) Report all other instructional FTE within the department that does not fall in either line one or two and are contributing to the department. Adjunct faculty who are contributing would be counted as having 0.25 FTE in the department. (4) This is the sum of FTE (line 1 through 3). (5) Report the student credit hours (SCH) generated by the department tenure/tenure track faculty. (6) Report the SCH generated by GTA's who are instructor of record. (7) Report the SCH generated by other instructional faculty. (8) This is the sum of SCH (line 5 through 7). Line 9 through 12 is the average SCH per FTE for each of the designated areas. For line 9, divide the SCH generated by Faculty by the Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty FTE. For line 10, divide SCH generated by GTA's by the GTA instructor of record FTE. For line 11, divide SCH generated by Others by the Other FTE. Finally, line 12, divide total SCH generated by the department by the total FTE in the department including GTA's who are not instructor of record (line 8 divided by line 4).

Section II: Major Data: The data in this section is provided for each major. If a department has several majors, this section must be completed for each major.

Department: Type the name of the department which "houses" the specific major.

Discipline: Type the name of the major for which the following data is provided.

CIP Code: Type the Classification of Instructional Program Code to denote the discipline. This code is the same code used for IPEDS Completions Report.

Part A: Actual Instructional FTE Disaggregated by Discipline. Part A reflects actual faculty appointments by discipline rather than budgeted. (1) Report the instructional FTE to tenure/tenure track faculty who provide instruction in the discipline. This includes all faculty who have 50 percent or more of their assignment in instruction. (2) Report the graduate teaching assistants (GTA) FTE who are assigned to each discipline. Designate the GTA FTE that are instructor of record and those that are not instructor of record. Instructor of record is defined as those GTAs who assign the grades for the class or who have total responsibility for the class from writing class notes, writing tests, evaluating class work and assigning final grades. (3) Report all other instructional FTE with the department that does not fall in either line one or two and contribute to instruction in the discipline. Adjunct faculty who contribute should be counted as having 0.25 FTE in the discipline.

Part B: Majors in the Discipline. List the declared majors in this department as of the Fall term 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997. Separate listings will be provided of undergraduates - (1) Freshmen and Sophomores are optional, and (2) Juniors, Seniors, and 5th Year Seniors; Masters; First Professional/Specialist; and Doctoral level students. Include only those undergraduates who have achieved at least a junior status. Count all declarations of the individual (i.e. all individuals working toward a major, including double major, can be counted more than once).

Part C: ACT Score. List the Average ACT Composite score, the lowest ACT score, the highest ACT score, the number reporting an ACT score, and the percent who have an ACT score for Jrs, Srs, and 5th year majors during the Fall 1995, Fall 1996, and Fall 1997 semester.

Part D: Degrees Conferred. List the degrees conferred for this discipline during Fiscal Years 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, and 1997 by type of degree. Degrees earned but not yet conferred should not be reported. If a student received two degrees at different levels, report each degree in its appropriate classification. If a student graduates with a major in two program specialties, report the degree in the field in which the degree was awarded. If a student actually receives two degrees based on two independent courses of study, report each degree under the appropriate program category. Exclude honorary degrees and awards. List the concentrations by degree level if a degree program confers a degree with several different concentrations/options.

**PROGRAM REVIEW - FY 1998
STATISTICAL OVERVIEW**

Institution: _____ **Department:** _____

Discipline(s) included within Department: _____

DEPARTMENTAL DATA: (1)

	FY 93	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97
Part A: Departmental Instructional Expenditures					
1. Salaries/Benefits	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Other Operating Expenditures	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Total	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
a. Five Year Growth Trend					_____
4. General Use Expenditures as Percent of the INSTITUTION'S General Use Instructional Expenditures					
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
a. Five Year Growth Trend					_____
	FY 93	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97

Part B: Student Credit Hour Production:					
1. Lower Division	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Upper Division	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Graduate 1	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Graduate 2	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Total	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Undergraduate SCH Produced as a Percent of INSTITUTION'S Total Undergraduate SCH Production					
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. Graduate SCH Produced as a Percent of INSTITUTION'S Total Graduate SCH Production					
	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	FY 93	FY 94	FY 95	FY 96	FY 97
Part C: Cost per Credit Hour:					
1. Lower Division	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

2. Upper Division	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Graduate 1	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Graduate 2	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

(1) Data will be provided at department level. Upon request from the Board, data will be disaggregated into disciplines.

	Fall 1994	Fall 1997
Part D: Percent of Departmental SCH taken by:		
1. Their Undergraduate Majors	_____	_____
2. Their Graduate Majors	_____	_____
3. Non-Majors (Reported every three years)	_____	_____

	Fall 1997 N	%
Part E: Department Faculty:		
1. Total Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty (Headcount)	_____	_____
2. Total with Terminal Degree a) Terminal Degree defined as (If different from Ph.D.)	_____	_____
3. Total Tenured	_____	_____
4. Total Full-Time (Budgeted 100% in Institution)	_____	_____
5. Five-year Growth Trend in Headcount		_____
6. Total Instructional Faculty FTE in Department (Definitions and Accounting Period as was used in the DBTF Report)	_____	

	Fall 1994	Fall 1997
Part F: Actual Instructional FTE:		
FTE:		
1. Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty	_____	_____
2. Graduate Teaching Assistants		
a. Instructor of Record	_____	_____
b. Not Instructor of Record	_____	_____
3. Other	_____	_____
4. Total FTE (1 to 3)	_____	_____
SCH:		
5. SCH Generated by Faculty	_____	_____

6. SCH Generated by GTA's	_____	_____
7. SCH Generated by Others	_____	_____
8. Total	_____	_____
RATE (SCH per FTE):		
9. Ave. SCH per Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty	_____	_____
10. Ave. SCH per GTA (I of R only)	_____	_____
11. Ave. SCH per Other Faculty	_____	_____
12. Ave. SCH per FTE	_____	_____

(Line 8/Line 4)

(Calculated every three years using approach developed for Fall 1990 Study)

(I) Data will be provided at department level. Upon request from the Board, data will be disaggregated into disciplines.

DISCIPLINE/MAJOR DATA:

Department: _____
 Discipline: _____
 CIP Code: _____

	Fall 93	Fall 94	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 97
Part A: Actual Instructional FTE Disaggregated by Discipline					
1. Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Graduate Teaching Assistants					
a. Instructor of Record	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Not Instructor of Record	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Other	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Total FTE (1 to 3)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Fall 93	Fall 94	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 97
Part B: Majors in the Discipline:					
1. Freshmen/Sophomores (Optional)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Jrs., Srs., 5th Year	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Masters	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. First/Prof Specialist	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Doctoral	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Fall 93	Fall 94	Fall 95	Fall 96	Fall 97
Part C: ACT Score of Undergraduate:					

Jrs., Srs., 5th Year Majors

1. Avg. ACT Composite	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Low ACT	_____	_____			
3. High ACT	_____	_____			
4. Number Reporting an ACT Score	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Percent Reporting ACT Score	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

FY 93 FY 94 FY 95 FY 96 FY 97

Part D: Degrees Conferred: (2)

1. Associate	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Baccalaureate	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Masters	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. First Prof/Specialist	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Doctorate	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

List of concentrations within the degrees:

(2) All degrees conferred including second majors.

SAMPLE PROGRAM REVIEW SCHEDULE

<u>Year</u>	<u>CIP Codes</u>	<u>Programs Scheduled for Review</u>
1998	1400	Engineering
	1500	Engineering and Engineering-Related Technologies
	4700	Mechanics and Repairers
	4900	Transportation and Material Moving
1999	1300	Education
	4206	Counseling Psychology
	170407	Rehabilitation Counseling
	3100	Parks, Recreation, Leisure and Fitness Studies
2000	2500	Library and Archival Sciences
	4000	Physical Sciences
	4200	Psychology
	170801	Art Therapy
	4400	Public Affairs
	4500	Social Sciences and History
2001	0100	Agribusiness and Agricultural Production
	0200	Agricultural Sciences
	0300	Conservation and Renewable Natural Resources
	0900	Communications
	1900	Home Economics
2002	5100	Health Professions and Related Sciences
	2600	Biological Sciences/Life Sciences
	4005	Chemistry
2003	0500	Area and Ethnic Studies
	1600	Foreign Languages
	2200	Law and Legal Studies
	2300	English Language and Literature/Letters
	2400	Liberal/General Studies
	3000	Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies
	3800	Philosophy and Religion
	4300	Protective Services
2004	0400	Architecture and Environmental Design
	2700	Mathematics
	5000	Visual and Performing Arts
	062001	Printing Management
	131302	Art Education
	131312	Music Education
	170806	Music Therapy
2005	5200	Business Management and Administrative Services
	0800	Marketing Operations/Marketing and Distribution
	1100	Computer and Information Sciences

Act on Proposed Admissions Standards

Summary and Recommendations

In its 2009 Legislation session, the Kansas Legislature gave the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) authority to establish admission standards for the state's public universities. The Board's Admissions Task Force subsequently developed undergraduate admissions standards that are now presented to the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee for consideration. Staff recommends approval of the proposed standards.

(11/21/10)

Background

Based on the proposals of an Admissions Task Force convened by the Kansas Board of Regents, the Kansas Legislature, during its 2009 Legislative session, gave the Board of Regents authority to establish admission standards for the state's public universities. The Board's Admissions Task Force subsequently reconvened to assist in developing undergraduate admissions standards for public universities.

To develop its recommendations, the Admissions Task Force consulted with a variety of stakeholders, including: provosts and admissions officers at state universities, the Kansas State Department of Education, the Kansas School Counselors Association, the Kansas Association of School Administrators, the Kansas Association of Secondary School Principals, the Kansas Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, the Kansas National Education Association, the Kansas Association of School Boards, USA|Kansas and representatives of the home school community.

Based on its consultations with stakeholders and review of admissions standards in comparable states and university systems, the Task Force recommends that the attached set of undergraduate admissions standards be adopted for Kansas public universities.

Recommendation

Staff recommends approval.

**Kansas Board of Regents
Qualified Admissions Task Force
Proposed Admissions Standards***

In order to be admitted to a Kansas public university, applicants must meet the following standards. Kansas residents meeting these standards are guaranteed acceptance. State universities may set higher standards for nonresidents.

All freshman applicants must achieve a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.0 on all transferable credit hours.

Explanation: This is a new requirement for all freshman applicants.

Graduates of Accredited High Schools

Applicants who graduated from an accredited high school, are under the age of 21 and have less than 24 transferable college credit hours, must meet the following criteria:

1. Complete the precollege or Kansas Scholars curriculum with at least a 2.0 cumulative GPA for Kansas residents and at least a 2.5 cumulative GPA for nonresidents, **AND**
2. Achieve one of the following:
 - a. ACT composite score of 21 or higher, **OR**
 - b. Combined SAT score of 980 or higher on math and critical reading, **OR**
 - c. Rank in the top one-third of their graduating high school class.

Explanation: Current standards include the precollege curriculum as one option among three criteria (test score, class rank, precollege curriculum) applicants may meet for admission. The proposed change removes the precollege curriculum as an option and instead requires students take the precollege curriculum and achieve a minimum GPA as a condition for admission. The proposed change also allows the Kansas Scholars curriculum to be substituted for the precollege curriculum.

Graduates of Unaccredited High Schools (includes students who are home schooled)

Applicants who graduated from an unaccredited high school or home school, are under the age of 21, and have less than 24 transferable college credit hours, must meet the following criteria:

1. Demonstrate completion of coursework equivalent to the precollege or Kansas Scholars curriculum, **AND**

2. Achieve one of the following:
 - a. ACT composite score of 21 or higher, **OR**
 - b. Combined SAT score of 980 or higher on the math and critical reading sections.

Explanation: The proposed change requires students demonstrate they have completed the equivalent of the precollege or Kansas Scholars curriculum as a condition for admission. There is currently no such requirement.

GED students

Applicants who have completed the GED, are under the age of 21, and have less than 24 transferable college credit hours, must meet the following criteria:

1. Achieve an overall score of 2550 on the GED with minimum scores of 510 on each subtest. If the GED was taken before 2002, the overall score must be 250 with minimum scores of 50 on each subtest, **AND**
2. Achieve one of the following:
 - a. ACT composite score of 21 or higher, **OR**
 - b. Combined SAT score of 980 or higher on math and critical reading.

Explanation: The proposed change requires applicants to meet minimum ACT/SAT scores. There is currently no such requirement.

21 or older

Applicants who are 21 or older and have fewer than 24 transferable college credit hours must meet one of the following criteria:

1. Graduate from an accredited high school, **OR**
2. Achieve an overall score of 2550 on the GED with minimum scores of 510 on each subtest. If the GED was taken before 2002, the overall score must be 250 with minimum scores of 50 on each subtest.

Explanation: These standards are the current requirements. No change is requested.

International students

Institutions will verify international applicants have equivalent preparation as U.S. applicants.

Explanation: This is an adaptation of current practice.

Non Freshman Transfer Applicants

Students with 24 or more transferable college credit hours must have a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.0 on all transfer course work to be eligible for admission.

Explanation: No changes are proposed for this category.

Exception Windows

Exception windows are established for the following categories of applicant: resident freshmen, nonresident freshmen, resident transfer, and nonresident transfer. These windows are intended for applicants who do not meet standard admission criteria. A maximum of 15% of resident freshmen applicants, 15% of nonresident freshmen applicants (or 75, whichever is higher), 10% of resident transfer applicants, and 10% of nonresident transfer applicants may be admitted through an exception window.

Explanation: The resident freshmen exception window is increased from 10% to 15%. The conditional admit category is renamed the nonresident freshmen exception window and is increased from 10% or 50 students, whichever is higher, to 15% or 75 students, whichever is greater.

Curriculum

Precollege curriculum. The precollege curriculum is a 16-17 unit curriculum designed to prepare high school students for university-level work.

- | | |
|------------------------|--|
| 4 units, English | Selected From: English/Language arts, Composition, Literature/Reading, AP courses, Speech (limited to ½ unit, which is optional) |
| 3-4 units, Mathematics | 3 units of math with the requirement that students meet ACT college readiness math benchmark OR
4 units of math and one unit must be taken in the year the student graduates

(Courses are selected from Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, Probability & statistics, Trigonometry, Calculus, Precalculus, AP math courses, International Baccalaureate Higher Level math courses, any math course with Algebra II as a prerequisite, and other courses prescribed by the local school district that are designed to prepare students for college. Dual enrollment, concurrent enrollment and online courses may be used to fulfill the math requirement.) |

3 Units, Natural Science	Selected from: Advanced biology, Biology, Earth/space science, Chemistry, Physics (At least one unit must be Chemistry or Physics)
3 Units, Social Science	One unit of U.S. history One-half unit of U.S. government One unit selected from: Psychology, Economics, Civics, History, Current social issues, Sociology, Anthropology, Race and ethnic group relations One-half unit selected from: World history, World geography, International relations
3 Units, Electives	Selected from: English, Math, Natural science, Social science, Foreign languages, Personal finance, Speech/Debate/Forensics, Journalism, Computer/Information systems, Fine arts, Career and technical education

Explanation: The proposed changes to the precollege curriculum add an option to the English requirement, revise the Mathematics requirement, and add electives.

1. The proposed curriculum permits Speech as an option to fulfill a ½ unit of English, which is not an option with the current curriculum.
2. The current math requirement is three units selected from Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, Probability & statistics, Trigonometry, Calculus, Precalculus, AP math courses, International Baccalaureate Higher Level math courses, and any math course with Algebra II as a prerequisite. The proposed change requires students to take three units of math AND meet the ACT college readiness math benchmark OR take four units of math, with one unit taken in the year the student graduates. The three-four units may be chosen from the list above and/or prescribed by the local school district if courses are designed to prepare students for college. Dual enrollment, concurrent enrollment and online courses may be used to fulfill the math requirement.
3. A new category, electives, is added to the precollege curriculum and three elective units are required.

Kansas Scholars Curriculum: The Kansas Scholars Curriculum is one of the requirements Kansas residents must meet in order to receive State Scholar designation during the Senior year of high school. It may be used to fulfill the precollege curriculum requirement for admission.

4 units, English	Same as the precollege curriculum
4 Units, Mathematics	Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II and one unit selected from: Analytic geometry, Advanced algebra, Probability & statistics, Trigonometry, Calculus and functions (Algebra I in the 8 th grade is acceptable.)

3 Units, Natural Science	Biology, Chemistry and Physics
3 Units, Social Science	Same as the precollege curriculum
2 Units, Foreign Language	Two years of one foreign language

Explanation: The proposed change allows the Kansas Scholars curriculum to substitute for the precollege curriculum.

**Individual state universities may petition the Board for approval to implement more stringent admission standards than those contained in this document.*

Act on Request for Revision of Performance Agreements

Summary and Recommendations

In accordance with K.S.A. 74-3202d, and the Board-approved Performance Agreement Guidelines and Procedures, Fort Hays State University and Highland Community College are requesting revisions to their current performance agreements. Staff recommends approval. (11/17/10)

Background

In June 2009, the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) authorized institutions to submit requests for revisions to existing performance agreements any time during the year. Institutions consult with staff on revisions. Once finalized, the revisions are sent to BAASC for action on behalf of the Board.

Request

Fort Hays State University and Highland Community College have submitted requests for revisions. The performance agreements begin on page 66 and the requested changes are highlighted in yellow.

- Fort Hays State University (FHSU) requests deleting Indicators 1 and 3 under Goal 2. The changes are requested for calendar years 2010 and 2011.
 - Indicators 1 and 3 deal with the enrollment and placement of students in the alternative certification Transition to Teaching program. The program primarily attracts students seeking certification in social studies and history. Demand for teachers in these areas has been impacted by cuts to K-12 funding and by the increased number of alternative certification programs in the state.
- FHSU requests moving the second indicator in Goal 2 to Goal 3.
 - As a consequence of deleting Indicators 1 and 3 under Goal 2, only one indicator supports Goal 2. One indicator is typically not strong enough on its own to support an entire goal.
- Highland Community College (HCC) requests revisions to Institutional Goals 1 and 3 for calendar year 2011.
 - HCC requests replacing the four indicators under Goal 1 with three indicators that target increasing the number of students and graduates in the Associate Degree of Nursing program. The current indicators in Goal 1 are overly dependent on others and require too much lead time to be measured in a three-year agreement.
 - HCC requests revising Indicators 1 through 3 under Goal 3 and deleting indicators 4 and 5 under Goal 3. The current indicators focus on the success of students in low-level math courses. The proposed indicators outline a new approach for working with these students -- an approach HCC feels will be more successful and will also positively impact other students.

Recommendation

Staff has reviewed the requests from Fort Hays State University and Highland Community College and recommends approval.

Performance Agreement

Fort Hays State University	Chris Crawford and Larry Gould	Contact phone & e-mail: (785) 628-4531; ccrawfor@fhsu.edu and lgould@fhsu.edu	November 12, 2010
Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access			
Institutional Goal 1: Increase access and retention for Hispanic students			
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome
1.1 Number of Kansas-resident Hispanic students enrolled	2005 - 171 2006 - 187 2007 - 239	2009 - 252 2010 - 266 2011 - 279	
1.2 Retention rate of Kansas-resident Hispanic students	2005 - 54.5% 2006 - 57.9% 2007 - 53.8%	2009 - 55.7% 2010 - 57.5% 2011 - 59.3%	
1.3 Graduation rate of Kansas-resident Hispanic students	2005 - 28.6% 2006 - 36.3% 2007 - 20.0%	2009 - 29.0% 2010 - 30.0% 2011 - 31.0%	

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1: Increase access and retention for Hispanic students

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of Kansas-resident Hispanic students enrolled

Data Collection: Number of Kansas-resident Hispanic students enrolled annually

3-Year Performance History: It is difficult to determine prior performance relative to other institutions or demographic groups given the uniqueness of the target population. Clearly performance has increased over the past three years, but determining the market saturation point for this target demographic is impossible to gauge. To gain on this important goal, FHSU revised three primary institutional strategies. First, FHSU hired a full-time recruiter to focus on this population demographic. Second, FHSU built a scholarship model specific to Hispanic students graduating from Kansas high schools. Finally, FHSU opened an ancillary store-front in Garden City charged jointly with assisting new FR students as well as enrolling new Virtual College students.

Targets: The target presented represents an increase of 20% over the three-year average baseline (199). FHSU is likely to have continued state-wide appeal to this target population due to our strategy of "Affordable Success" and workforce development programs. Building a successful strategy for the Hispanic population has taken years, but FHSU continues to make progress on serving this student demographic that is concentrated in our geographic service area. An increase of 20% requires a significant institutional commitment of personnel, scholarships, and operating expenses.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Retention rate of Kansas-resident Hispanic students

Data Collection: Percent of FT/FT FR Kansas-resident Hispanic-coded students retained fall-to-fall

3-Year Performance History: Performance on this indicator has not been consistent for the three prior years which clearly attests to the difficulty of moving retention-focused measurements. In a quick review of IPEDS data of peer institutions, it is common to have lower retention of targeted demographic groups. Across the last three years, the spread of difference has been between 10 and 20%. The difference at FHSU has been consistently around 10% lower than retention of traditional demographic students (67% retention for all FT/FT FR students, 55.4% retention for FT/FT FR Hispanic students).

Targets: The target presented represents an increase of 10% over the average of the last three years. Impacting retention rates is difficult, and a change of 10% may well take years to accomplish. Institutionally, FHSU retains about 70% of all FT/FT FR students. Bringing the retention rate up for the Hispanic segment is important to increasing the overall institutional retention benchmark. While enrollment is impacted most by input considerations (recruitment, enrollment, and financial aid processes), increased retention comes from personalized advising and success in the classroom. These factors are much more difficult to effectively coordinate.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Graduation rate of Kansas-resident Hispanic students

Data Collection: Percent of Kansas-resident Hispanic-coded students graduating within five years

3-Year Performance History: The three year performance record shows wide variation with a low of 20% and peaking at 36%. Swings in performance history occur when relatively small numbers of students are partitioned off for analysis. As larger numbers of students are included in the cohort group, the graduation rate should stabilize. Across the three years, the average graduation rate for this demographic is 28%. Assumably, this average should be realized as more students are included in the cohort.

Targets: The target presented represents an increase of 10% over the average of the last three years. Impacting graduation rates is even more difficult than impacting retention rates. As an institution, FHSU graduates about 32% of the FT/FT FR cohort within five years. However, graduation rates for our Hispanic student segment is lower. In order to have a long-term impact on that population demographic, FHSU must have a strategic effort to increase graduation rates.

Comments:

Regents System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 2: Increase the quantity and quality of K-12 teachers educated				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
2.1 2009: Number of candidates enrolled in the Transition to Teaching alternative certification program 2010 & 2011: DELETE INDICATOR	2005 - 0 2006 - 57 2007 - 108	2009 - 140 2010 - 170 2011 - 200		
2.2 2009: Percent of seniors scoring at 88 or above on the FHSU Performance Assessment (FPA) 2010 & 2011: Move to Goal B	2006 - 77.8% 2007 - 87.4%	2009 - 88.6% 2010 - 90.1% 2011 - 91.5%		
2.3 2009: Number of districts benefitting from the Transition to Teaching alternative certification program 2010 & 2011: DELETE INDICATOR	2005 - 0 2006 - 14 2007 - 49	2009 - 60 2010 - 70 2011 - 80		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Increase the quantity and quality of K-12 teachers educated

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of candidates enrolled in the Transition to Teaching alternative certification program

Data Collection: Annual count of undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in the Transition to Teaching alternative certification program

3-Year Performance History: The Transition to Teaching program is relatively new. Having just been implemented in 2004-2005, the program has grown to over 100 students in two years. No data is available prior to 2004 due to the non-existence of the program and students meeting the criteria of the current program would have been redirected back into the traditional BS in Education program.

Target: The target represents near estimated full program capacity given demand for this sector. The current enrollment of 108 stretches the limits of existing personnel. In order to achieve the target of 200, additional staff and infrastructure will be required. Given the popularity of the program, the balance between serving the needs of adult learners and program optimization will be challenging to effectively moderate.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Percent of seniors scoring at 88 or above on the FHSU Performance Assessment (FPA)

Data Collection: Percent of seniors scoring at 88 or above on the FHSU Performance Assessment (FPA). The FPA is an assessment given to all seniors graduating with teaching credentials. The FPA is a 113-point rubric-based assessment evaluated by education unit members. The assessment is given at the end of every semester and has been given in its current form since 2005-2006.

3-Year Performance History: Percentage of students passing the FPA at a 88 has averaged 82.6% over the last two year reporting period. Recent performance indicates that 87% of students pass the FPA at a cut-rate of 88 points or higher. Prior data is not available on this indicator since assessment data prior to 2005 was based on a 100 point FPA scaling rather than the current 113 point assessment instrument.

Targets: The cut-point of 88 for the FPA was chosen for consistency with the KSDE requirement. The final target of 91.5% was based on a 5% improvement strategy for student performance. An increase of this level is consistent with NCATE and KSDE expectations for continued accreditation.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of districts benefitting from the Transition to Teaching alternative certification program

Data Collection: Annual count of the number of school districts placing graduates from the Transition to Teaching alternative certification program

3-Year Performance History: Performance history on this indicator is based on the two most recent years data. In just two years, FHSU was able to place graduates of the Transition to Teaching program in 49 school districts. These numbers do not tell the whole story, however. A number of these school districts place graduates that have an interest in staying in western Kansas in high priority areas (STEM, for example).

Targets: In three years, FHSU seeks to place Transition to Teaching graduates in 80 districts across the state. Again, many of the districts served by this program are located in areas not likely to attract traditional new teachers given geographic remoteness. Serving these high need areas will continue to challenge the Transition to Teaching program, but overall impact of the program is largely measured by FHSU's ability to address needs in underserved areas.

Comments:

2010 & 2011: FSHU requests deleting indicators 2.1 and 2.3 since it is no longer possible to meet the targets negotiated. It is expected that key performance indicators 2.1 and 2.3 will be down substantially and will remain well below the 2009 performance level during 2011 and beyond.

Two critical changes have occurred over the last year that have affected our ability to meet these indicators. Due to the changing budget situation at the K-12 level, the number of positions available for alternative certification applicants has dropped by 70%. Many students seeking alternative certification were hired by school districts to fill open history and social studies positions. Demand for these areas has been met by our success and the efforts of other Regents schools which have also launched alternative certification programs. In short, we expect that current budget climate coupled with our success has exhausted the demand for alternative certification. Based on discussions with the KSDE, we expect the softened demand will continue for several years. In fact, the KSDE has formally advised several Regents schools of the changing environment in hiring opportunities for alternative certification applicants.

If BAASC approves deleting indicators 2.1 and 2.3, indicator 2.2 should be moved to Goal B since it is not possible to adequately support a goal with only one indicator.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes				
Institutional Goal 3: Improve undergraduate students' foundational skills				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
3.1 Performance Task index score from the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) (Direct measure)	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - 1171	2009 - 1183 2010 - 1195 2011 - 1206		
3.2 Analytic Writing Task index score from the CLA (Direct measure)	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - 1211	2009 - 1223 2010 - 1235 2011 - 1247		
3.3 Percent of students passing Introduction to Computing post-test on computer concepts and word processing at 70% or greater (Direct measure)	2005 - NA 2006 - 55% 2007 - 52%	2009 - 55% 2010 - 58% 2011 - 60%		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Improve undergraduate students' foundational skills

Key Performance Indicator 1: Performance Task index score from the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) (Direct measure)

Data Collection: Critical Thinking index score of SR students reported from the immediate prior administration of the CLA

3-Year Performance History: FHSU first participated in the Collegiate Learning Assessment in the 2006-2007 cycle. Results of this administration supported the conclusion that our graduates are average writers. The CLA is a national assessment of FR and SR students writing, critical thinking, and analysis skills. Our performance is norm-referenced against other institutions and factors out performance relative measures like retention and abilities at college entrance to validate the actual value added of an institution's instruction. Approximate range for this scale is from a low estimate of 1016 (25th percentile) to a high scale estimate of 1320 (75th percentile).

Targets: The three year target represents a 3% improvement over 2007 performance. Improvement against national norm-referenced indicators requires significant institutional effort. FHSU continues to commit substantial resources to the "Writing Across the Curriculum" initiative and Writing Center. In addition, FHSU faculty continue to integrate writing intensive assignments into general education and program-level curriculum in order to improve the writing effectiveness of our graduates.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Analytic Writing Task index score from the CLA (Direct measure)

Data Collection: Analytic Writing index score of SR students reported from the immediate prior administration of the CLA

3-Year Performance History: See comments on prior KPI performance history. Approximate range for this scale is from a low estimate of 1097 (25th percentile) to a high scale estimate of 1327 (75th percentile).

Targets: See comments on prior KPI target.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Percent of students passing Introduction to Computing post-test on computer concepts and word processing at 70% or greater (Direct measure)

Data Collection: Percent of students passing post-tests on computer concepts and word processing in the Introduction to Computing class at the 70% cut score or higher

3-Year Performance History: In 2005 faculty teaching the Introduction to Computing class completely refocused the course on learning outcomes that were determined to be critical to the success of our graduates. At this time the assessment models were also completely reviewed and adapted to the new learning outcomes. Since that time student performance has been tracked on the basis of pre-test and post-test scoring to determine course efficacy. Performance history over the past 2 years has shown that about 54% of students pass the post-test on concepts and word processing at a score of 70% or greater.

Targets: As the new curriculum is implemented and adjustments are made to the pedagogy, performance improvement should occur. FHSU made a major commitment of resources to the project during the refocusing effort. The three year target established is for students to have a 15% increase in the number of students passing the post-test at a 70% cut score or greater. Performance gains at 5% annual improvement are attainable in the short-term. However, gains at this rate for the long-term are not possible or desirable given ever-present concerns of grade inflation and course rigor. Additionally, FHSU students already perform above peer as is noted through our participation in the ETS iSkills assessment where students perform at 103% of national peers.

Comments:

Regents System Goal Institutional Goal				
Institutional Goal 4: Enhance physical wellness of students, faculty and staff				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
4.1 Number of users of the Wellness Center	2005 - 21434 2006 - 23305 2007 - 26382	2009 - 40000 2010 - 50000 2011 - 60000		
4.2 Percent of respondents satisfied with health screening and educational programming	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - NA	2009 - 80% 2010 - 85% 2011 - 90%		
4.3 Percent of seniors that often or very often exercised or participated in physical fitness activities (NSSE, Item 6b)	2005 - 52% 2006 - 52% 2007 - 51%	2009 - 53% 2010 - 55% 2011 - 57%		
4.4 Percent improvement of a faculty/staff group on five fitness-related measures	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - NA	2009 - 10% 2010 - 20% 2011 - 25%		
4.5 Percent improvement of a student group on five fitness-related measures	2005 - NA 2006 - NA 2007 - NA	2009 - 10% 2010 - 20% 2011 - 25%		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Enhance physical wellness of students, faculty and staff

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of users of the Wellness Center

Data Collection: Annual count of FHSU faculty, staff, students, and cardholders using the Wellness Center.

3-Year Performance History: Utilization of the Wellness Center has been tracked since it opened in the 1990s. Annual usage has averaged 23707 users over the last three years. In 2007 the Wellness Center was completely renovated in an effort to update equipment and expand the square footage of the facility.

Targets: Last year FHSU conducted a complete renovation of the Wellness Center to update equipment and expand the facility. It is expected that utilization of the facility will double over the short-term, then stabilize based on hours available and amount of machines accessible. The university invested nearly \$500,000 in equipment and expansion, and further improvements are expected (enhanced "card" tracking system, additional machines, staffing).

Key Performance Indicator 2: Percent of respondents satisfied with health screening and educational programming

Data Collection: Annual survey of campus stakeholders (faculty, staff, students, cardholders) with percentage responding satisfaction or strong satisfaction with health screening and educational programming.

3-Year Performance History: Establishment of the survey supports this new goal and has not yet been implemented. No history is available for this KPI.

Targets: FHSU has estimated that 90% of stakeholders will be satisfied with health screening and educational programming related to physical wellness on campus within the three year time parameter.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Percent of seniors that often or very often exercised or participated in physical fitness activities (NSSE, Item 6b)

Data Collection: Percent of SR students completing NSSE Item 6b (Exercised or participated in physical fitness activities) with a response of "often" or "very often".

3-Year Performance History: FHSU has participated in the National Survey of Student Engagement since 2001. Performance history on this indicator suggests that about 52% (based on a three year average) of SR students engage in physical fitness activities at least "often". This level of performance is comparable to the larger NSSE population (53% in 2007).

Targets: Expansion of the Wellness Center and an institutional focus on physical wellness is expected to have residual impact on student participation in wellness activities. Moving performance on this indicator will require information sharing and marketing and will likely have a more immediate effect on FR students rather than SR students.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Percent improvement of a faculty/staff group on five fitness-related measures

Data Collection: Annual documentation of five vital signs (blood pressure, resting heartrate, HDL/LDL, etc) for all members of a faculty/staff group.

3-Year Performance History: No performance history exists for this KPI.

Targets: The three year goal for this indicator is to show improvement of 25% on these five vital signs. Experts suggest that change of this order is realistic and significant. Given the volunteer nature of this KPI, any improvement on these five vital signs is impressive. Numerous studies document the impact of fitness improvement for overall productivity of an organization.

Key Performance Indicator 5: Percent improvement of a student group on five fitness-related measures

Data Collection: Annual documentation of five vital signs (blood pressure, resting heartrate, HDL/LDL, etc) for all members of a student group.

3-Year Performance History: No performance history exists for this KPI.

Targets: The three year goal for this indicator is to show improvement of 25% on these five vital signs. Experts suggest that change of this order is realistic and significant. Given the volunteer nature of this KPI, any improvement on these five vital signs is impressive. Numerous studies document the impact of fitness improvement in students. Students improve their ability to learn and be successful in the collegiate environment if a fitness component is implemented.

Regents System Goal Institutional Goal				
Institutional Goal 5: Internationalize the campus and curriculum				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
5.1 Number of faculty engaged in international collaboration with FHSU partnerships	2006 - 23 2007 - 40	2009 - 44 2010 - 48 2011 - 53		
5.2 Number of international faculty development grants awarded	2005 - 0 2006 - 0 2007 - 0	2009 - 3 2010 - 7 2011 - 10		
5.3 Number of international students enrolled on-campus	2006 - 128 2007 - 231	2009 - 300 2010 - 360 2011 - 411		
5.4 Number of students successfully completing a study abroad experience	2006 - 54 2007 - 76	2009 - 87 2010 - 98 2011 - 109		
5.5 Number of international students successfully completing classes through the Virtual College	2006 - 2349 2007 - 2290	2009 - 2358 2010 - 2397 2011 - 2436		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 5: Internationalize the campus and curriculum

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of faculty engaged in international collaboration with FHSU partnerships

Data Collection: Total number of faculty members coming to FHSU or traveling to partner campuses with expressed purpose of providing education.

3-Year Performance History: Since FHSU began tracking this KPI in 2006, the average baseline performance is 31.5 faculty engaged in international collaboration.

Targets: Target of 40% increase over the average baseline represents a significant advance in faculty exchange and increase in requisite fiscal commitment. Considering that each faculty member traveling abroad for FHSU represents at least a \$2500 investment (not accounting for time), the resources required to mount a large improvement in this area increases quickly. It has long been our experience that faculty must be comfortable with other cultures to successfully teach international students, and the final target represents nearly 20% annual participation of FHSU faculty. Furthermore, given the current state budget constraints maintaining programs like faculty development become more difficult to commit to given the strain on OOE.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of international faculty development grants awarded

Data Collection: Total number of faculty successfully applying for and receiving the international faculty development grant.

3-Year Performance History: No performance history exists for this KPI.

Targets: In 2007-2008 FHSU made a strategic commitment to better fund faculty international travel. Our strategic planning process generated the possibility of a faculty grant process that provides an opportunity for faculty to submit application for significant funding based on project merit. Preliminary feedback suggests that there is widespread interest in this type of approach rather than allocating monies by department or college, or by just considering faculty travel on an ad hoc basis.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Number of international students enrolled on-campus

Data Collection: Total number of non-US residents enrolled on-campus annually.

3-Year Performance History: FHSU has seen a strategic increase in this KPI. Recent performance history shows that over 200 international students are attending campus. Across the performance tracking segment, FHSU has averaged 179.5 international students attending campus, which we've established as our baseline for this performance agreement.

Targets: The 2011 target represents more than 100% improvement over the average baseline of international students participating in campus-based education. Goal 1 of our performance agreement illustrates our commitment to enrollment growth over the next 3-5 years, and the international student sector has been identified as a target for potential growth. Currently, additional resources will need to be committed and deployed quickly and continuously to make this goal a reality.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Number of students successfully completing a study abroad experience

Data Collection: Number of students successfully completing requirements for international exchange or study abroad activities.

3-Year Performance History: Since FHSU began tracking this KPI we have seen an average of 65 students participating in study abroad activities. Data prior to 2006 is not available, but anecdotal information suggests that more students than ever are participating in international study opportunities.

Targets: The three year target of 50% growth (actual increase of 33 students over 2007 baseline of 76) over the average baseline represents a substantial increase in international/study abroad activity. Improving performance on this KPI requires additional scholarships and planning to get more student commitment earlier in their academic program of study. In addition, additional incentives and opportunity for faculty mentoring must be established to be successful.

Key Performance Indicator 5: Number of international students successfully completing classes through the Virtual College

Data Collection: Total number of non-US resident students enrolling and successfully completing Virtual College classes.

3-Year Performance History: FHSU saw a spike in the number of international students enrolling through the Virtual College in 2006. Average performance on this KPI suggests that 2320 non-US resident students enroll and complete classes through the Virtual College.

Targets: The 2011 target represents 5% growth over the current baseline of 2320 students. Success on this target is entirely subject to political processes, but FHSU has demonstrated consistency in our performance in terms of international distance education. Maintaining this level of performance is only possible through our extensive partnership building infrastructure realized through our Office of Strategic Partnerships. While FHSU has relied on 3 Chinese institutions to provide the international enrollments in the past, we have been very aggressive to expand collaborative partnerships by as many as 4-5 new institutions annually. While most of the agreements will not produce large numbers of international enrollments, a larger number of partners represents stability of the international operation and subjects FHSU to less risk over the long-term.

KBOR use only: Fort Hays State University

Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement

Major changes have been made throughout the agreement.

Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement

The previous agreement was approved with the following comments:

Staff is concerned about the weakness of the links between an enrollment goal (goal 4) and underserved populations. It is a contradiction in terms to assert that all on-campus students represent an underserved population. No data are provided to support the claim that turnpike corridor residents or out-of-state residents are underserved.

Staff is also concerned about the weakness of the link between mobile learning environment (goal 2) and workforce development. Regents System Goal C reads, "Institutions will improve career preparation, job placement, and life-long learning activities to better reflect the current and emerging needs of the state." Staff does not see a direct and convincing link to the goal of developing a mobile learning environment.

In light of the absence of baseline data, goal 5 is premature.

Recommend approval for a one-year performance agreement, with the understanding that the next agreement will address the above comments.

These comments do not apply to the current performance agreement.

Recommendation and Comments

Staff recommends approval of requested changes: deleting indicators 2.1 and 2.3. Staff also recommends approval of moving indicator 2.2 to Goal B.

561.09

2009-2011 Highland Community College Performance Agreement

Highland Community College	Harold Arnett	785-442-6125 harnett@highlandcc.edu	Date: August 22, 2010	
Regents System Goal 2009 & 2010:A: Efficiency/Effectiveness/Seamlessness 2011:Regent System Goal C: Improve Workforce Development				
Institutional Goal 1: 2009 & 2010: Reduce the number/proportion of area high school students placing in Fundamentals level courses on entry as freshmen at HCC by providing free placement testing to students while they are still in high school.				
2011: Increase the number of registered nurses in Northeast Kansas through a bridge program for LPNs.				
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. 2009 & 2010: Number of service area high schools participating in early placement testing. 2011: Increase number of students enrolled in LPN to Assoc. Degree in Nursing (ADN) bridge program.	None: New Initiative None: New initiative	YR-09 5 YR-10 8 YR-11 10 CY2011: 12		
2. 2009 & 2010: Number of area high school students participating in early placement testing. 2011: Of enrolled students, increase percent of completers of the ADN program.	None: New Initiative None: New initiative	YR-09 25 YR-10 35 YR-11 50 CY2011: 60%		
3. 2009 & 2010: Number of Doniphan/ Brown County high school students placing in fundamentals level classes on entry. 2011: Increase the pass rate for NCLEX-RN on the first try for program completers.	% students placing in fundamentals-local Year # %Fund YR-04 35 15.1% YR-05 36 17.2% YR-06 34 15.5% Avg 35 15.9% None: New initiative	% students placing in fundamentals-local Year %Fund YR-09 15% YR-10 12% YR-11 10% CY2011: 65%		

4. 2009 & 2010: Number of area high school students placing in fundamentals level classes on entry.	# students placing in fundamentals-area		% students placing in fundamentals-area				
	Year	#	%Dev	Year			Fund Total
	YR-04	193	12.0%	YR-09			9%
	YR-05	142	9.1%	YR-10			8%
	YR-06	157	10.0%	YR-11			6%
2011: DELETE INDICATOR							

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 1:

Key Performance Indicator 1: High School Academic Placement Testing

Data Collection: The number of area high schools covenanting with HCC to allow free academic placement testing of high school students.

3-Year Performance History: None: new initiative.

Targets: This new program seeks to gain the cooperation of four local high schools in the first year and more than doubles that number by the third year of the agreement.

Key Performance Indicator 2: High School Students participating in early academic placement.

Data Collection: Number of area high school students taking free early academic placement test before their graduation semester.

3-Year Performance History: None: new initiative.

Targets: This new program targets 25 participants the first year and doubles that number by its third year. These numbers are based on the number of students placing in fundamentals courses from the schools in previous years.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Local high school students placing in fundamentals level classes.

Data Collection: The number of students from Doniphan and Brown County high schools enrolled in fundamentals level courses in HCC as a proportion of the number of students graduating from those high schools in the same year.

3-Year Performance History: Over the past three years, an average of 15.9% of graduating students from these two counties have enrolled in the lowest level of academic course work currently offered at HCC.

Targets: While eventually expanding this effort to the broader region, we want to focus on the local schools in the first year of this initiative. The first year goal is to reduce the proportion to below the three-year average; by the third year, we seek to reduce the proportion by one-third.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Area high school students placing in fundamentals level classes.

Data Collection: The number of students from high schools in the nine-county service area enrolled in fundamentals level courses in HCC as a proportion of the number of students graduating from that high school in the same year.

3-Year Performance History: There has been tremendous variance in the number of placements over the past three years, swinging from a high of 100 in 2005 to 67 in 2006 and back to 82 in 2007. The three year average is 83 students.

Targets: There will be very little opportunity to make much impact in the first year due to the time constraint and the focus on Brown and Doniphan counties alone in 2009. The third year goal is 15% below the three-year average.

Comments: Students who enter HCC with low academic skills are required to complete remedial course work to help them become better prepared and able to perform at a college level. We have found these courses to be very worthwhile. For example, students who pass the Fundamentals of Math course on their first attempt are seven times more likely to pass the next level math course than are those who fail the class. This benefit helps offset the disappointment lower ability students may experience when they realize that these fundamentals level courses do not count toward graduation. If students enter college fully prepared for college work, they can bypass this remedial step. By offering to conduct free on-site academic placement testing with high school students, we hope to provide them with a realistic assessment of their current level of college readiness while they still have time to take additional courses in high school that will help them achieve a higher level of academic preparation. For example, if a student discovers as a sophomore that he is deficient in math skills, he still has four semesters available to take additional courses in mathematics that should help him place at a higher level on entry to college. This will save students (and/or their financial sponsors!) time and money.

It should be noted that this goal, if realized, will actually reduce the amount of money HCC would be receiving in tuition and fees! However, we believe the benefit to our students and community will more than offset that loss.

CHANGES FOR 2011: As recommended by BAASC at its May 2010 meeting, HCC is proposing dropping the current Goal A and replacing it with the Associate Degree in Nursing goal because: 1) Indicators 1 & 2 are overly dependent on decisions made at high school, which makes its achievement almost entirely out of the control of HCC. HCC can offer the testing to the high schools for no charge, but the extent to which they use the test scores to remediate low-scoring students is completely up to the students and the high schools; and 2) HCC failed to consider the amount of lead-time needed to achieve Indicators 3 & 4. They will not be measurable for two to three more years.

This proposed goal fits well with the strategic plan, adopted in 2009: "Goal Six: Contribute to strengthening the local economies and enhancing quality of life in our service area." Objective 6.1 "Increase Tech Center activity in the region" clearly connects with this goal, which also addresses the identified statewide need regarding the shortage of trained nurses. This program will be housed at the HCC Technical Center in Atchison. It will help people in HCC's service area, both generally and individually, as it allows participants to improve their earning power while filling a key need in the health services sector. The bridge program will accommodate 20 people in each class. HCC reviewed ADN pass rates for the first year at other schools in KS and found pass rates as low as 52% and as high as 67% for these schools for the first test year. HCC's target is a 65% pass rate for the graduates in the first year of our program who take the NCLEX-RN exam. This exam is required to enter the profession. HCC will be refining the curriculum during the first three years, so HCC hopes that the rate will improve as changes are made in content or approach.

Regents System Goal D: Increase Targeted Participation/Access					
Institutional Goal 2: Increase the participation rate of Native Americans in the service area.					
Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History		Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. Number of Native American students enrolled full-time at HCC.	#NatAm HS Grads	#Enr HCC	# of NatAm Std Enr YR-2009 12 YR-2010 14 YR-2011 16		
2. Proportion of Native American students persisting as full time students from fall to spring semester.	Return from Fall to Spring as full time Year # %		Return from Fall to Spring as full time YR-2009 65% YR-2010 75% YR-2011 80%		
3. Number of Native American students graduating.	Fr. Year # Grad		# of NatAm Grads YR-2009 2 YR-2010 3 YR-2011 5		
4. Number of Native Americans of working age who participate in at least one on-site workshops conducted by Highland Community College.	None		# of Participants 2009 10 2010 15 2011 25		
5. Number of Native American high school students taking free academic placement test provided on-site.	None		# of Students Taking Tests 2009 10 2010 20 2011 30		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 2: Increase the participation rate of Native Americans in the service area.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Enrollment.

Data Collection: Number of self-identified Native American students enrolled in at least twelve hours at HCC.

3-Year Performance History: HCC has averaged eight full time Native American students enrolled on main campus over the previous three years while an average of 32 have graduated each year from service area high schools.

Target: First year target is fifty percent higher than the average enrollment for the three previous years; second year is nearly double the average enrollment from the baseline and the third year target represents a thirty-three percent increase above the first year target.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Persistence.

Data Collection: Proportion of self-identified Native American students persisting as full-time students from fall to spring semester.

3-Year Performance History: Over the past three years, Native American persistence has averaged 64.1% compared to about 70% for Caucasian students, with only six Native American students continuing from one semester to the next as full time students.

Targets: The record for the previous two years shows a dramatic drop from the third year previous. The first year goal seeks a reversal gain of ten percent with an additional ten percent gain over each of the next two years.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Graduation.

Data Collection: Number of Native American students graduating from HCC.

3-Year Performance History: Only three Native American students entering from 2003-2005 graduated from HCC, for a average rate of 13%. That is less than half the graduation rate of Caucasian students.

Targets: While the goal numbers are low, the first year target is double the annual average, increasing to five times the average for 2011.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Workshops

Data Collection: Number of Native Americans of working age participating in on-site workshops; each person per workshop counts as one.

3-Year Performance History: None; new initiative.

Targets: HCC has not offered any on-site workshops in the Indian Nations areas during the previous three years. These workshops may include but not be limited to teacher training, parenting and risk management (a new program at HCC).Numbers are believed to be optimistic but reasonable.

Key Performance Indicator 5: Academic Placement Testing

Data Collection: Number of Native American high school students taking free on-site academic placement test as a sophomore, junior or senior.

3-Year Performance History: None, new initiative.

Targets: The goal is doubled for the second year and tripled for the third year. By the third year, the project seeks a number of participants equal to the average number of Native American graduating from service area schools each year.

Comments: HCC has had very high proportional minority enrollment in regard to blacks. Our average enrollment percentage of on campus students has been ten times the proportion of blacks graduating from service area high schools (17.8% vs. 1.8%). In regard to Native Americans, however, we have not had the same degree of success.

To this point, we must admit a lack of deliberate service in regard to this population. Traditional challenges of the culture and the availability of a free college education at Haskell invite excuses and rationalization. However, the plain truth is that we have not focused our efforts on potential Native American students. We believe that although the numbers are relatively low, there are compelling reasons for us to devote resources to recruiting, retaining and graduating Native American students.

To the best of our knowledge, there are four Indian Nation reservations located in the state of Kansas; all four of them are within our service area. Of 21 Native American students enrolled full time during the 2003-2005 period, only three graduated. Ninety-five Native American students graduated from service area high schools from 2004-2006; HCC enrolled 26 Native Americans during those same years.

This project includes both traditional college students and non-student members of the Native American population. We believe that through on site course offerings and workshops and by providing free college level academic placement testing on location to Native American high school students, we can begin to cultivate a relationship of trust with the nations and provide helpful academic guidance and awareness. The workshops and course offerings will provide the means for working age Native Americans to enhance job skills and the placement testing will give high school students a realistic assessment of their college readiness in time for them to make any needed additional preparations. This should help in regard to increasing the number of applications and enrollments. HCC maintains a fully staffed academic support center to provide free tutoring and study assistance in all subject areas, including basic skills.

HCC, by virtue of its geographic location, is uniquely able to provide the opportunity for Native American students to establish a solid basis of college coursework and earn a two-year degree while continuing to live at home or in close proximity to their home community. We also believe that this initiative helps us continue an anchoring tradition; HCC was founded by a man who traveled from Pennsylvania to eastern Kansas for the purpose of establishing an Indian mission school, one hundred-and-fifty years ago.

Regents System Goal B: Improve Learner Outcomes

Institutional Goal 3: 2009 & 2010: Improve the success rate of students in the Developmental Math program.

2011: Improve academic success and persistence for first-year full-time on-campus students entering in the fall semester who have been placed on academic probation for the spring semester.

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
<p>1. 2009 & 2010: 3-year avg percentage of students passing Fundamentals of Math on first attempt.</p> <p>2011: Increase proportion of students successfully completing a mandatory Career Planning and Placement (COL 160) class during the Spring semester.</p>	<p>Pass Rate (3 Yr Avg)</p> <p>YR-2005 65.8%</p> <p>YR-2006 63.0%</p> <p>YR-2007 58.0%</p> <p>CY 2007: 71.3%</p> <p>CY 2008: 63.6%</p> <p>CY 2009: 60.0%</p>	<p>Pass Rate (3 Yr Avg)</p> <p>2009 61%</p> <p>2010 63%</p> <p>2011 65%</p> <p>CY 2011: 62%</p>		
<p>2. 2009 & 2010: 3-year average proportion of Fundamentals of Math students who enroll in the next course in the math preparation sequence, Beginning Algebra.</p> <p>2011: Increase proportion of probationary students performing above the probationary level during the Spring semester.</p>	<p>Enrollment Rate (3 Yr Avg)</p> <p>2005 50.9%</p> <p>2006 50.5%</p> <p>2007 47.6%</p> <p>CY 2007: 33.3%</p> <p>CY 2008: 25.5%</p> <p>CY 2009: 20.0%</p>	<p>Enrollment Rate (3 Yr Avg)</p> <p>2009 50%</p> <p>2010 52%</p> <p>2011 55%</p> <p>CY 2011: 22%</p>		
<p>3. 2009 & 2010: 3-year average proportion of Fundamentals students who pass the Beginning Algebra course on their first attempt.</p> <p>2011: Increase proportion of first-year probationary students enrolling in a third consecutive semester.</p>	<p>Pass Rate (3 Yr Avg)</p> <p>2005 58.7%</p> <p>2006 55.6%</p> <p>2007 43.0%</p> <p>CY 2007: 21.6%</p> <p>CY 2008: 9.6%</p> <p>CY 2009: 13.8%</p>	<p>Pass Rate (3-Yr Avg)</p> <p>2009 50%</p> <p>2010 53%</p> <p>2011 56%</p> <p>CY 2011: 15%</p>		

4. 2008 & 2009: 3-year average proportion of students completing at least two semesters of at least 12 hours with a minimum GPA of 2.0. 2011: DELETE INDICATOR	Proportion Completing Two Semesters (3 Yr Avg) Yr-2005 31.0% Yr-2006 28.5% Yr-2007 24.7%	Proportion Completing Two Semesters (3-Yr Avg) 2009 28% 2010 30% 2011 32%		
5. 2008 & 2009: 3-year average proportion of Fundamentals students who graduate from HCC (based on yr/semester enrolled in Fundamentals of Math) 2011: DELETE INDICATOR	% Graduating (3 Yr Avg) YR-2005 12.6% YR-2006 12.3% YR-2007 13.2%	Grad Rate Targets (3 Yr Avg) YR-2009 14.0% YR-2010 15.0% YR-2011 17.0%		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 3: Improve the success rate of students in the Developmental Math program.

Key Performance Indicator 1: Passing rate for initial Fundamentals of Math attempt.

Data Collection: Passing rate is defined as the proportion of students receiving final grades who receive a "CR" for Fundamentals of math.

3-Year Performance History: From 2003-2007, 2068 students enrolled full time at the main campus of Highland Community College. Of these, nearly one-fourth (454) placed and enrolled in the Fundamentals of Math course. Students who place in the Fundamentals class enter college with a moderate to severe handicap in mathematical preparation/competency. Some score in the single digits on the ACT math sub-test. Ability measures dip as low as elementary school levels. Success in this first and lowest level developmental math course is critical. For students who passed this course, 75.8% returned as full-time enrollees in the subsequent semester. For those who did not pass the course, only 40% returned as full-time students. Clearly, without inferring a causal relationship, students who do not pass this threshold course are far less likely to continue as full-time students. There is a dramatic drop in the passing rate for 2007 that may be partially explained by the use of computer homework software that virtually eliminated any cheating on homework. (Students cannot copy homework because the program generates a unique set of problems for each student; the only way to cheat on homework is to have another person physically sit at the computer and complete each problem.)

Targets: Results from the national community college Benchmarking project based on Fall 2005 data shows Highland Community College at the 89th percentile nationally in regard to success rates for developmental math courses. [The NCCBP excludes "W" grades from the analysis, significantly increasing the proportion of "successful" students. This effect applies to all participating colleges.] Based on the NCCBP results, attempting to increase success rates for developmental math involves a tremendous challenge as this would most likely move us up into the top ten percent nationally. As additional evidence of the importance of this course, only 16.4% of those who fail on their initial effort in Fundamentals will ever enroll in the next math course, Beginning Algebra, which is the lowest level college credit math class offered at Highland; only 5.0% of the original failing group will earn credit in this subsequent course. By increasing the success rate in the initial attempt, we hope to increase the likelihood of subsequent success. The past several years have seen a declining trend in the passing rate for this course. Meeting the first year goal will require a passing rate of 62% in order to raise the three-year average to the target. Meeting the third year target will yield an increase of 12% over the base rate from 2007.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Enrollment in Beginning Algebra.

Data Collection: Enrollment rate is defined as the proportion of students receiving a final grade (CR, NC or W) in Fundamentals of Math and subsequently receiving a final grade (A, B, C, D, F, W) in Beginning Algebra. ["Drops" are not included in the calculation.] All calculations will be based on grade of record in the college database.

3-Year Performance History: On average, just fewer than 48% of these students have subsequently enrolled in Beginning Algebra.

Targets: The previous years have seen a decline in next-level math course enrollment that parallels the decline in first attempt passing rate. The target moves the rolling average up nearly fifteen percent over the most recent three-year average.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Pass rate for Beginning Algebra on first attempt.

Data Collection: Passing rate is defined as the proportion of students receiving a final grade of "D" or higher in Beginning Algebra. ["Drops" are not included in the calculation.] All calculations will be based on grade of record in the college database.

3-Year Performance History: A dramatic decline has occurred in first attempt passing rate for fundamentals students taking the Beginning Algebra class. The three year average for 2005 was nearly 35% higher than the one for 2007.

Targets: The target rate of 56% should prove quite a stretch given that the Fall 2005 rate is already near the 90th percentile as reflected in the National Community College Benchmarking Project study.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Retention Rate

Data Collection: Proportion of students who enroll in Fundamentals of Math and complete at least two semesters with at least twelve hours enrolled and a semester GPA of at least 2.00.

3-Year Performance History: The rolling three-year average has declined steadily over the past few years, currently ending at 24.7%.

Targets: The first year would require an increase of at least six points (25%) over the previous year to meet the goal. The third year goal sets the target at 32% higher than the most recent average.

Key Performance Indicator 5: Graduation Rate

Data Collection: The proportion of students enrolling in Fundamentals of Math at least four semesters earlier who graduate from HCC.

3-Year Performance History: The rolling average graduation rate for students enrolled in Fundamentals of Math has been relatively stable over the past few years with an increase in the last calculation.

Targets: The Fundamentals level students are at the highest risk for dropping out of college and/or failing to earn a two-year degree. Considering the downward trends in passing rate, subsequent enrollment in the next level course and persistence, maintaining the most recent graduation rate will be a challenge. The first year target is set at the most recent three-year average but is nearly three points higher than the most recent year (2005-10.3%). By the third year, the goal is raised to 17%, requiring a forty percent increase from the most recent three year average.

Comments: This goal seeks to increase the success of students in Fundamentals of Math, primarily by requiring students to attend two hours of math workshop each week in addition to the three hours of course lecture required. The workshops will be conducted by the regular course instructors, who will be paid for five hours of instruction for each course. In addition to this, teachers will be trained to address different learning styles, engage students in active learning and require in-class demonstrations of learning by such means as board work and individual writing boards for guided practice. Students who place in Fundamentals of Math will also be required to enroll in a special orientation class (On Course) that combines life success traits and math study skills training.

CHANGES FOR 2011:

As HCC indicated in the 2009 Performance Report, we feel like we may be close to topping out on our pass rates in Fundamentals of Math. We were at the 89th percentile at last measure for Indicator 1 and it's pushing it to think that we can get much better than that relative to national data. Also, our data show that success or failure in the first math class for students at this level is an important determinant for retention and success in subsequent math classes and in college. For this reason, this Fall, we are trying something new in that we're not offering Fundamentals of Math, placing low-math-placement-score students either in Beginning Algebra (for those on the upper end of test scores) and suggesting to those on the lower end to not take a math course their first semester. We are experimenting with this change based on the hypothesis that if the lowest-math-testing students first have a semester of college in which they experience success in other classes - and not a failure in math - that they will be more likely to return for a second semester. Our new Goal that involves the second orientation class for students on probation is related to this same general assumption that the least prepared students might need a second semester of intense support in order for them to persist in college. Highland Community College's strategic plan, adopted in 2009, identifies as Goal Four: "Provide services that maximize success for all students." More specifically, Objectives 4.3 "Increase the persistence rate for semester: semester and year: year for first-time full-time students" and 4.4 "Increase the persistence rate and graduation rate for developmental and probationary students" show this proposed Performance Agreement goal to be well-aligned with our strategic plan. There has been a marked decline in the academic record of students in their first probationary semester over the previous three years, which is reflected in the declining rate of these students earning a "C" or higher in the mandatory Freshmen Orientation (COL 103) class during their first semester at HCC. The proportion of 2009 students earning their way off probation in their second semester was barely half the rate from 2007. As would be expected, the proportion persisting for a third semester also fell dramatically. Recognition of this trend is one of the key reasons for proposing this replacement goal in the area of Improve Learner Outcomes. Clearly, a significant number of students are not making the desired turnaround in their academic pursuits that would lead to successful completion and improved opportunities for them.

A key part of our strategy is to require probationary students to enroll in a Career Planning and Placement (COL 160) course during their first semester on probation. The course would incorporate principles of success contained in Dr. Skip Downing's On Course program which has demonstrated success with at risk and probationary students in a variety of college settings. The class would include career interest inventories and/or aptitude testing, a field trip to HCC's technical center and the development of individual career plans. Course section enrollment would be limited to no more than fifteen students with instructor/mentors chosen based on interest and aptitude for working with at risk students with a deliberate focus on relationship building.

Regents System Goal F: Improve Community/Civic Engagement

Institutional Goal 4: Increase participation of service area principals and teachers (K-12) in workshops conducted by HCC faculty/staff.

Key Performance Indicator (Data)	3-Year Performance History	Targets	Performance Outcome	Evaluation
1. Number of non-affiliated (with HCC) service area K-12 teachers participating in regional HCC workshops.	# of Teachers Participating YR-2007 18	# of Teachers Participating YR-2009 25 YR-2010 35 YR-2011 50		
2. Number of principals participating in workshops.	# of Principals Participating YR-2007 3	# of Principals Participating YR-2009 5 YR-2010 7 YR-2011 9		
3. Proportion of teachers rating workshops as useful and relevant.	Participant Ratings YR-07 Relevant 73.8% Practical 83.0%	Target Participant Ratings Year Rel Prac YR-09 75.0 85.0 YR-10 78.0 87.0 YR-11 80.0 89.0		
4. Proportion of teachers indicating actual use of ideas from workshop.	None Available	Follow-Up Survey Year % Using YR-09 60.0 YR-10 70.0 YR-11 75.0		

NARRATIVE — INSTITUTIONAL GOAL 4: Teacher Workshops

Key Performance Indicator 1: Number of Teachers Participating in Workshops

Data Collection: Each teacher enrolled/attending each workshop will count as one participant.

3-Year Performance History: Eighteen teachers (in addition to those affiliated with HCC as adjuncts and/or concurrent credit course teachers) participated in the previous and only year of this effort.

Targets: By the third year, the participation goal is nearly tripled over the baseline year.

Key Performance Indicator 2: Number of principals participating in workshops.

Data Collection: Each principal enrolled/attending each workshop will count as one participant.

3-Year Performance History: In the first and only year, three principals participated in workshops.

Targets: The target looks to triple the number of participating principals by the third year.

Key Performance Indicator 3: Participant Ratings

Data Collection: Proportion of participants rating the workshop as useful and relevant (separate survey items) on survey administered at the end of each workshop.

3-Year Performance History: Almost three-fourths of participants in last year's workshops indicated they thought the workshop was relevant with over eighty percent indicating they found the material to be practical.

Targets: Based on long experience (over twenty years) with teacher training, it is rare to find a workshop that results in three-fourths of the attendees indicating that they find the session to be both relevant and practical. It will be very challenging to increase these proportions over the base year.

Key Performance Indicator 4: Follow Up Application Survey

Data Collection: Proportion of teachers indicating actual application of workshop ideas in a follow-up survey sent within six weeks of the workshop.

3-Year Performance History: None available.

Targets: This KPI addresses one of the most critical and yet most often over-looked issues in teacher training: whether or not the training actually affects classroom practice. By the end of the three-year period, we are hoping to find that three-fourths of the workshop participants are able to cite actual examples of using the training in their classrooms.

Comments: Workshops will address learning styles, effective teaching skills, experiential learning activities and other topics per teacher interest/results of survey. At least one workshop will focus on ideas for teaching mathematics.

KBOR use only: Highland Community College
Summary of changes from the previous approved performance agreement HCC requests revisions to Institutional Goals 1 and 3 for calendar year 2011. HCC would like to replace the four Goal 1 indicators with 3 indicators that target increasing the number of students and graduates in the Associate Degree of Nursing program. The current indicators are overly dependent on others and require too much lead time to be measured in a three-year agreement. HCC also requests revising Goal 3 Indicators 1 through 3 and deleting indicators 4 and 5. The current indicators focus on the success of students in low-level math courses. The proposed indicators outline a new approach for working with these students -- an approach HCC feels will be more successful and will also positively impact other students.
Response to any Board comments on the previous approved performance agreement N/A
Recommendation and Comments Staff recommends approval of the revised performance agreement.
561.09

BAASC Update Private Postsecondary Education

Summary of Activity October 26 – November 19, 2010

- New programs received for review – 3
- New programs pending further review – 55

- Applications requested by and sent to prospective schools – 6
- New School Applications received - 1

- Renewal applications received – 3
- Renewal files expected by December 20, 2010 – 18