

DECEMBER 15-16, 2010

Kansas Board of Regents

2010-2011

Gary Sherrer, Chair
Ed McKechnie, Vice Chair

KANSAS BOARD OF REGENT MEMBERS:

Jerry Boettcher

Christine Downey-Schmidt

Mildred Edwards

Tim Emert

Dick Hedges

Dan Lykins

Ed McKechnie

Janie Perkins

Gary Sherrer

FORESIGHT 2020

A Strategic Agenda for the State's Public Higher Education System

1. Align System & Institutional
2. Increase Participation
3. Improve Retention & Graduation Rates
4. Enhance Student Success
5. Align with Kansas Workforce Needs
6. Ensure State University Excellence

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Item		Page
Meeting Information and Schedule	1
Board Agenda	2
Minutes of Previous Meeting	5
Wednesday Consent Agenda	13
Wednesday Discussion Agenda	17
Thursday Consent Agenda	36
Thursday Discussion Agenda	45
Other Agendas		
Board Fiscal Affairs and Audit Standing Committee	119
Council of Presidents	120
System Council of Chief Academic Officers	126
Council of Chief Academic Officers	129
Resources		
Board Meeting Schedule	134
Deadlines for Agenda Item Submission	134
Board of Regents Committee Listing	135

MEETING INFORMATION AND SCHEDULE

Unless noted, all meetings take place at the Curtis State Office Building (CSOB) at 1000 SW Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka, Kansas, 66612 in the meeting room indicated. Addresses for offsite meetings can be obtained by contacting the Kansas Board of Regents office at 785-296-3421.

Wednesday, December 15, 2010

Time	Committee/Activity	Location
9:00 am - 9:30 am	System Council of Chief Academic Officers	Kathy Rupp Room
9:30 am or Adjournment	Council of Chief Academic Officers	Kathy Rupp Room
10:00 am - Noon	Council of Faculty Senate Presidents	CTE Conference Room
11:00 am - Noon	Fiscal Affairs & Audit Standing Committee	Board Room
11:00 am - Noon	Council of Presidents	Suite 530
Noon - 1:15 pm	Lunch <i>Board of Regents & President Tompkins</i>	Conference Room B
Noon - 1:15 pm	Lunch <i>Council of Chief Academic Officers</i>	Kathy Rupp Room
1:30 pm	Board of Regents Meeting	Board Room
4:00 pm	Students' Advisory Committee	Kathy Rupp Room
6:00 pm	Dinner <i>Board of Regents, President Tompkins, State University CEOs and Spouses</i>	Topeka Country Club Garden Room

Thursday, December 16, 2010

Time	Committee/Activity	Location
8:30 am	Board of Regents Meeting	Board Room
11:30 am	Lunch <i>Board of Regents & President Tompkins</i>	Conference Room B

MEETING AGENDA

The Kansas Board of Regents will meet in the Board Room located in the Curtis State Office Building at 1000 SW Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka, Kansas, 66612.

Wednesday, December 15, 2010

- I. Call To Order** Regent Sherrer, Chair
 - A. *Approve Minutes* p. 5
November 17-18, 2010 Meeting

- II. General Reports**
 - A. *Introductions*
 - B. *Report from the Chair* Regent Sherrer, Chair
 - C. *Report from the President & CEO* Andy Tompkins, President & CEO

- III. Standing Committee and Other Reports**
 - A. *Academic Affairs* Regent Hedges
 - B. *Fiscal Affairs & Audit* Regent Boettcher
 - C. *P-20 Council* Regent Downey-Schmidt

- IV. Approval of Consent Agenda**
 - A. *Academic Affairs* Regent Hedges
 - 1. Act on Requests for Additional Degree Granting Authority for Concord Career Colleges p. 13
Gary Alexander, VP, Academic Affairs
 - 2. Approve Request for Degree and Certificate Program Submitted from Wichita Area Technical College p. 15
Blake Flanders, VP, Workforce Development

- V. Consideration of Discussion Agenda**
 - A. *Academic Affairs* Regent Hedges
 - 1. Act on 2011-2013 (Cycle 8) Performance Agreements p. 17
Gary Alexander, VP, Academic Affairs
 - 2. Discuss Proposed Admission Standards p. 18
 - B. *Other Matters*
 - 1. Receive Report on Operating Procedures for the New Tiered Funding Distribution Model p. 23
Diane Duffy, VP, Finance & Administration
 - 2. Approve Recommended Statutory Changes to Implement the Tiered Funding Distribution Model for Technical Education and the New Non-Tiered Funding Model p. 25
Julene Miller, General Counsel

- 3. Review the Kansas Commitment Components and Finalize Recommendations for KAN-HELP Kip Peterson, *p. 33*
Director, Government
Relations & Communications

VI. Executive Session

Board of Regents – Personnel Matters Related to Non-Elected Personnel

Thursday, December 16, 2010

VII. Reports

- A. *Introductions*
- B. *Report from Council of Presidents* Chancellor Gray-Little
- C. *Report from Council of Faculty Senate Presidents* Barbara Phipps
- D. *Report from Students' Advisory Committee* Michael Smith

VIII. Approval of Consent Agenda

- A. *Academic Affairs* Regent Hedges
 - 1. Act on Request to Approve a Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Computing (CIP 11.0101) – KU Gary Alexander, *p. 36*
VP, Academic Affairs
- A. *Fiscal Affairs & Audit* Regent Boettcher
 - 1. Authorize Acceptance of Property Under the Deferred Maintenance Tax Credit Program and the Sell of Property to the KU Endowment Association – KU Eric King, *p. 43*
Director of Facilities
 - 2. Approve Architectural Program for a New Fine and Performing Arts Center – PSU *p. 43*
 - 3. Amend FY 2011 and FY 2012 Capital Improvement Plans – KSU *p. 43*

IX. Consideration of Discussion Agenda

- A. *Academic Affairs* Regent Hedges
 - 1. Act on Request to Reorganize the Institute of Community and Public Health into a School of Public Health – KUMC Gary Alexander, *p. 45*
VP, Academic Affairs
 - 2. Act on Requests to Change the Academic Calendars – WSU and PSU *p. 52*
 - 3. Act on Revised Academic Program Review Guidelines *p. 57*

B. Fiscal Affairs & Audit

- | | | |
|--|--|---------------|
| 1. Act on FY 2012 Housing and Food Service Rate Adjustments Submitted by State Universities (Final Action) | Regent Boettcher
Diane Duffy,
VP, Finance & Administration | <i>p. 77</i> |
| 2. Approve Allocation of FY 2012 Rehabilitation and Repair Appropriation – Systemwide | Eric King,
Director of Facilities | <i>p. 108</i> |
| 3. Receive Project Status Report for ARRA/SFSF Funds | | <i>p. 111</i> |

X. Adjournment

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

I. Call To Order

Regent Sherrer, Chair

A. Approve Minutes

November 17-18, 2010 Meeting

KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

MINUTES

November 17-18, 2010

The November 17, 2010, meeting of the Kansas Board of Regents was called to order by Chairman Gary Sherrer at 1:30 p.m. The meeting was held in Board offices located in the Curtis State Office Building, 1000 S.W. Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka. Proper notice was given according to law.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gary Sherrer, Chairman
Jerry Boettcher
Christine Downey-Schmidt
Mildred Edwards
Tim Emert
Dick Hedges
Dan Lykins

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Ed McKechnie, Vice Chairman
Janie Perkins

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regent Lykins moved that the minutes of the October 20-21, 2010 meeting be approved. Following the second of Regent Hedges, the motion carried.

GENERAL REPORTS

REPORT FROM CHAIR

Regent Sherrer reported that the CEO visits with the community colleges, technical colleges, and universities have been very valuable and productive for the Regents. Regent Sherrer also reported that he and President Tompkins met with the Legislative Education Planning Committee (LEPC) earlier this month. They presented Foresight 2020 (A Strategic Agenda for the State’s Public Higher Education System), which was well received by the LEPC.

REPORT FROM PRESIDENT AND CEO

President Tompkins reported that minor changes will be made to the office of the Kansas Board of Regents to create more work space. He also stated that the appeal of the Division of Budget’s recommendations is next week.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Affairs

Regent Hedges presented the Academic Affairs Standing Committee report. The Committee reviewed nine performance agreements at its meeting.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Regent Hedges moved, with the second of Regent Lykins, that the Consent Agenda be approved. The motion carried.

Academic Affairs

ADDITIONAL DEGREE GRANTING AUTHORITY FOR CAPELLA UNIVERSITY

Capella University received approval to offer a Master of Science in Studies in Human Behavior.

CERTIFICATE PROGRAM SUBMITTED BY HIGHLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Highland Community College received approval to offer a Certificate B, with an Associate of Applied Science option, in Medical Coding (51.0713). The program will be conducted in an on-line format and existing facilities and equipment at Highland Community College will be utilized. The Carl D. Perkins program improvement grant will be used to implement the program. The on-going costs will be funded by tuition and other college resources.

CONSIDERATION OF DISCUSSION AGENDA

Academic Affairs

CORRECTIONS ALIGNMENT

Blake Flanders, Vice President for Workforce Development, presented the proposed Corrections Program Alignment. Five community colleges offer a corrections program, which prepares individuals to serve as correctional officers. The Secretary of the Kansas Department of Corrections (KDOC), Roger Werholtz, stated that the KDOC has reviewed the curriculum and supports the alignment. Following discussion, Regent Hedges moved to approve the Corrections Program Alignment. Regent Downey-Schmidt seconded and the motion carried.

(Corrections Alignment Map filed with Official Minutes)

WELDING ALIGNMENT

Vice President Flanders presented the proposed Welding Program Alignment. Nineteen technical and community colleges offer a welding program. Following discussion, Regent Emert moved to approve the Welding Program Alignment. Regent Edwards seconded and the motion carried.

(Welding Alignment Map filed with Official Minutes)

Fiscal Affairs and Audit Report

Regent Downey-Schmidt presented the Fiscal Affairs and Audit Standing Committee report. The State Universities Campus Safety and Security Status Reports had been reviewed by members prior to the meeting and there was no discussion about the information contained in those reports. The Committee discussed format and whether additional information needs to be covered in the reports. This topic will be sent to the Council of Business Officers for more discussion and recommendations will be sent back to the Committee. Additionally, the Committee discussed the requested legislative changes to the scholarship programs and the Federal US Department of Education Desk Audit on ARRA/SFSF.

Fiscal Affairs and Audit

REFUNDING BOND RESOLUTION – IF SAVINGS OF AT LEAST 3%, ADVANTAGEOUS RESTRUCTURING OF DEBT SERVICE REQUIREMENTS, OR ELIMINATION OF BURDENSOME COVENANTS CAN BE ACHIEVED – STATE UNIVERSITIES

Rebecca Floyd, Executive Vice President/General Counsel of the Kansas Development Finance Authority (K DFA), presented a proposed Refunding Bond Resolution. The Resolution will authorize K DFA to issue refunding revenue bonds for any of the state universities when the economic conditions are right (savings of at least 3% or more, advantageous restructuring of debt service requirements, or elimination of burdensome covenants can be achieved). Following discussion, the Board amended the Resolution to include the language that each series of proposed Refunding Bonds shall be presented to and approved by any two of the following Board Officers: the Chair, the Vice-Chair or the President and CEO prior to issuance. Additionally, the Board removed the language “and instructs” in Section 2 of the Resolution. Regent Emert moved to adopt the Resolution as amended. Following the second of Regent Boettcher, the motion carried.

(Amended Resolution filed with Official Minutes)

REFUNDING BOND RESOLUTION – STUDENT UNION AND ACKERT HALL – KSU

General Counsel Julene Miller introduced a Refunding Bond Resolution for Kansas State University. In 1998, the Kansas Development Finance Authority issued revenue bonds to pay a portion of the Student Union Renovation and Expansion Project and again in 2000 for the Ackert Hall Addition Project. Due to current economic conditions, an opportunity exists to achieve present value interest savings by refunding all or a portion of the bonds. Regent Boettcher moved to adopt the Resolution and authorize the Chair and the President and CEO to execute the Resolution and related bond documents. Following the second of Regent Lykins, the motion carried.

(Resolution filed with Official Minutes)

BREAK

The Chairman called for a short break at 2:30 p.m. and resumed the meeting at 2:41 p.m.

Other Matters

TIERED FUNDING DISTRIBUTION MODEL FOR TECHNICAL EDUCATION AND TIERED MODEL FOR FUNDING OF ALL OTHER ELIGIBLE CREDIT HOURS

Vice President Flanders presented the Postsecondary Technical Education Authority’s (TEA) policy recommendations on the tiered funding distribution model for technical education. The recommendations are as followed:

1. Include postsecondary credit hours earned by secondary students in the cost model calculations.
2. Do not include the credit hours earned by non-residents at this time and charge staff with proposing a way in the future to align community and technical colleges’ residency requirements for state funding and report recommendations to the Board in Fall 2011.
3. The State share of the calculated cost should be 80%, but not set in statute.
4. Local taxing authority should be recognized by deducting 30% from the State share, which at 80% would result in 50% State share for those institutions. This deduction would apply only to in-district student credit hours at the community colleges because community colleges have local taxing authority. If taxing authority is granted to technical colleges, they would be treated in the same manner.

Regent Boettcher moved to approve the recommendations and Regent Downey-Schmidt seconded. Following discussion regarding implementation and because the Board still needed to discuss the request by the

community colleges to use the model for distribution of all eligible credit hours (not just technical education hours), Regent Boettcher withdrew his motion.

Diane Duffy, Vice President of Finance and Administration, presented the Kansas Association of Community College Trustees' request to repeal the community college operating grant formula, which is in statute, and consider adopting the model of a "tier 0" for general education credit hours. Vice President Duffy stated that by eliminating the community college operating grant statute and by not including a strict formula in statute but granting this authority to the Board, the Board will have more flexibility to make distribution decisions. Following discussion the Board made the following motions:

Regent Boettcher moved to adopt the TEA policy recommendations on the tiered funding model for technical education. Regent Downey-Schmidt seconded, and the motion carried.

Regent Emert moved to adopt the tier 0 concept for community colleges and include in the Board's legislative package a request to the Kansas legislature to repeal the statutory distribution formula related to the community college operating grant and to give the Board the authority to distribute those funds. Following the second of Regent Edwards, the motion carried.

Regent Emert moved to add 20% of the estimated total cost of the new tiered technical education funding formula (\$11.6 million) to the budget request to assist with the implementation and transition to the new tiered funding model. Regent Lykins seconded, and the motion carried.

PENDING SYSTEMWIDE LEGISLATIVE POLICY INITIATIVES

Kip Peterson, Director of Government Relations and Communications, presented the amendments to the two legislative items that were tabled at last month's Board meeting. The Vocational Educational Scholarship proposal was revised to retain the current merit-based aspect rather than changing it to a completely need-based program. The revised Kansas Distinguished Scholarship proposal changed the individual award amount to a dollar limit. Regent Downey-Schmidt moved to include these two items in the Board's 2011 legislative package. Following the second of Regent Lykins, the motion carried.

BOARD APPOINTMENTS TO THE KANSAS POSTSECONDARY TECHNICAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY

President Tompkins stated that last month the Board adopted a process for appointing members to the Kansas Postsecondary Technical Education Authority. In accordance with that process, the Board needs to appoint persons to represent the community colleges and the technical colleges. Regent Downey-Schmidt moved to reappoint Shelia Frahm as the community college representative and to appoint Steve Kearney as the technical college representative. The period of service will begin on January 1, 2011. Regent Emert seconded and the motion carried.

RECESS

Chairman Sherrer recessed the meeting at 3:55 p.m.

RECONVENE

Chairman Sherrer reconvened the meeting at 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, November 18.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gary Sherrer, Chairman
Jerry Boettcher
Christine Downey-Schmidt
Mildred Edwards
Tim Emert
Dick Hedges

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ed McKechnie, Vice Chairman
Dan Lykins
Janie Perkins

AMEND AGENDA

Chairman Sherrer announced that the agenda would be amended to add “Receive Update on the School of Business at the University of Kansas.” This item will be number 4 under the Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee’s Discussion Agenda.

REPORTS

REPORT FROM COUNCIL OF PRESIDENTS

Chancellor Gray-Little presented the Council of President’s report. COPs approved a Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Computing (CIP 11.0101) for the University of Kansas and the request to organize the Preventive Medicine, Biostatistics and Health Policy and Management Programs into a School of Public Health for the University of Kansas Medical Center. Both items will be forwarded to the Board for consideration. Additionally, COPs discussed salary increases for faculty and staff, sustainability reports, and the overlap in the Comprehensive Grant Program and the Kansas Commitment goal “Kan-Help.” Chancellor Gray-Little stated that there is little overlap between the two items.

REPORT FROM COUNCIL OF FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENTS

Barbara Phipps thanked the Board for hosting breakfast for the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents earlier in the day. Ms. Phipps reported that the Council nominated two representatives to serve on the Transfer and Articulation Task Force and discussed the differences of the faculty governance structure on each university campus.

REPORT FROM STUDENTS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Michael Smith presented the Students’ Advisory Committee report. Mr. Smith played the student testimonial videos from the campuses for the Board. These videos can be viewed on the Kansas Commitment website. Mr. Smith reported that the State Higher Education Day for students is tentatively set for February 8 and that the SAC received an update from Kansas Corps. Additionally, Mr. Smith reviewed the SAC’s Kansas Commitment Student Advocacy Plan.

(Handout filed with Official Minutes)

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Regent Boettcher moved, with the second of Regent Downey-Schmidt, that the Consent Agenda be approved. The motion carried.

Fiscal Affairs and Audit

LEASE AND TRANSFER OF PROPERTY – KU

The University of Kansas entered into a lease with the KU Endowment Association for the purchase of a 67,250 GSF industrial building in the East Hills Business Park. The lease was paid in full at the end of Fiscal Year 2010 and the property is being transferred to the University.

SALE OF REAL PROPERTY – KU

The University of Kansas received authorization to sell the real property located at Lots 7, 8, and 9 in Block 13 in Lane’s Second Addition to the City of Lawrence.

EXECUTION OF LEASE AGREEMENT – TRANSIT AUTHORITY KU

The University of Kansas received approval to enter into a ten (10) year lease with the City of Lawrence for the bus transit facility. The City will pay rent, which is contingent on the procurement of buses. The University and the City will share the utilities and other operational costs.

CONSIDERATION OF DISCUSSION AGENDA

Academic Affairs

EXTENSION PROGRAM IN KC METRO AREA – ESU

Gary Alexander, Vice President of Academic Affairs, presented Emporia State University's (ESU) request to offer a Bachelor of Science in Education with an elementary education major in the Kansas City metropolitan area. The program is a partnership between ESU and Johnson County Community College (JCCC). Students will be able to take education course work taught by ESU faculty on the JCCC campus. Following discussion, Regent Downey-Schmidt moved to approve. Regent Hedges seconded and the motion carried.

MASTER OF ARTS AND PH.D IN WOMEN, GENDER AND SEXUALITY STUDIES (CIP 05.0207) – KU

Vice President Alexander reported that the University of Kansas requested approval for a Master of Arts and Ph.D in Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies (CIP 05.0207). The program will use existing facilities and equipment. Financing will be within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and no new funding is required. Following discussion, Regent Emert moved to approve. Regent Edwards seconded and the motion carried.

Fiscal Affairs and Audit

HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICE RATE ADJUSTMENTS SUBMITTED BY STATE UNIVERSITIES (FIRST READING)

Proposed rates for housing and food service for FY 2012 were introduced by Vice President Duffy. Discussion followed on the fund balances. Board staff will work with the Council of Business Officers to provide additional information in response to Regent Sherrer's request regarding the fund balances. The Board will act on the proposed rate adjustments at its December meeting.

KU REPORT ON TUITION AND FEE WAIVER PROGRAM (JAYHAWK GENERATIONS SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM) AND REQUEST TO MAKE THE PILOT PROGRAM PERMANENT

Chancellor Gray-Little presented the Jayhawk Generations Scholarship Program report. Since the start of the pilot program in the Fall of 2009, applications have increased. Currently 123 students are receiving the scholarships waivers. Chancellor Gray-Little stated that compared to other nonresident scholarships, the Jayhawk Scholarship yields a higher student enrollment and retention rate. The scholarship waiver has also increased the academic standing of students. Chancellor Gray-Little requested to make the pilot program permanent and asked for the University of Kansas to have authority to set waiver amounts on an annual basis and those amounts for academic year 2011-2012 are as shown on the attached handout. The goal is for the program to be revenue neutral or better. Nonresident tuition would not go below 150% of the resident rate and would be at least 100% of the cost of the education. Following discussion, Regent Emert moved to approve making the program permanent and giving KU the authority to set waiver amounts. Regent Boettcher seconded and the motion carried.

(Handout filed with Official Minutes)

AMEND STUDENT HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM REGULATION TO EXTEND THE EMPLOYER PREMIUM CONTRIBUTION TO GRADUATE ASSISTANTS AND TO FURTHER CLARIFY STUDENT EMPLOYEE COVERAGE

General Counsel Julene Miller presented the proposed regulation amendments to the Student Health Insurance Program (K.A.R. 88-30-1). The proposed amendments include the following: 1) extending the employer's contribution to the student-only cost of health insurance to eligible Graduate Assistants, and 2) allowing an otherwise qualified student employee whose official work station is on the main campus, but who is enrolled only in on-line courses, to be eligible for the university employer contribution. Regent Boettcher moved to adopt the changes and asked staff to move forward with the regulation process. Regent Edwards seconded and the motion carried.

UPDATE ON THE BUSINESS SCHOOL USE OF DIFFERENTIAL TUITION – KU

Chancellor Gray-Little and Provost Jeffrey Vitter presented an update on the University of Kansas Business School's differential tuition expenditures. The Chancellor stated that after a group of students questioned some of the expenditures, the University had an external review conducted by BKD, LLP. The BKD report found that 99.8 percent of the school's differential tuition funds were spent in accordance with the DT (Differential Tuition) Proposal. Additionally, BKD reported that there could be differences of opinions on whether or not the remaining .2 percent conflicted with the expenditure guidelines.

Provost Vitter stated that the School of Business has re-established the Student Differential Tuition Advisory Committee. This committee is responsible for ensuring that the Business School is accountable for the use of differential tuition funds. Provost Vitter also stated that since differential tuition was adopted, the School of Business has expanded curriculum and programs.

BREAK

The Chairman called for a short break at 10:35 a.m. and resumed the meeting at 10:46 a.m.

Other Matters

STATE UNIVERSITY SUSTAINABILITY REPORTS

The following are the sustainability reports from the universities:

Emporia State University

Emporia State University's Sustainability Report was presented by President Lane. President Lane stated that the actions the University took last year by moving the thermostats up, improving facilities, and closing the University on Fridays in the summer resulting in a combined savings of \$175,000. ESU will continue to work on improving facilities and its recycling efforts. President Lane also reported that the Sustainability Committee is working on a sustainability curriculum.

Fort Hays State University

President Hammond presented the Fort Hays State University's Sustainability Report. FHSU has a three part commitment to sustainability: 1) Administration and Finance, 2) Student Affairs, and 3) Academic Affairs. One project that Administration and Finance is working on is the Build Wind Project, which includes the construction of two wind turbines on campus. The Sustainability Committee in Residential Life in the Student Affairs division is seeking ways to promote recycling, and the Academic Affairs division received an Energy NET grant for sustainability.

Kansas State University

President Schulz reported that Kansas State University will incorporate sustainability into its 2025 strategic plan. K-State held its statewide sustainability conference earlier in the year. The theme of the conference was

the development of a statewide higher education sustainability network. Additionally, K-State created a new Gameday Recycling program.

Pittsburg State University

President Scott reported that Pittsburg State University updated its Strategic Plan to include sustainability. PSU is a participant in the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education's Sustainability Tracking Assessment and Rating System (STARS). PSU's Sustainability Committee will be creating a sustainability plan and begin gathering data for STARS.

University of Kansas

Chancellor Gray-Little presented the Sustainability Report for the University of Kansas. The Chancellor stated that sustainability is being incorporated into classes and research on campus. Outside the classroom, student housing has conducted a sustainability challenge, which has saved 97,810 gallons of water and 8,940 kilowatts of electricity.

Wichita State University

President Beggs presented the Sustainability Report for Wichita State University. WSU has updated its recycling operations in Rhatigan Student Center and installed a geothermal heating system in Brennan residence hall. President Beggs stated that 52 courses in four Colleges have a sustainability focus and that the College of Engineering is holding a sustainability summer camp for high school students.

Regent Sherrer directed President Tompkins to have the Board office report on its sustainability efforts.

PRESIDENTIAL EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Regent Sherrer announced that the presidential evaluation subcommittee members are Regent Edwards, Regent Sherrer, Deb Teeter from the University of Kansas, and Julene Miller. The committee will work with a consultant on the multi-rater feedback process.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 11:45 a.m., Regent Downey-Schmidt moved, followed by the second of Regent Emert, that the Board of Regents recess into executive session for 45 minutes to discuss personnel matters of non-elected personnel. Participating in the executive session were members of the Board and President Tompkins. At 12:30 p.m., the meeting returned to open session. Regent Hedges moved, followed by the second of Regent Emert, to extend the executive session for an additional 15 minutes. Open meeting resumed at 12:45 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Sherrer adjourned the meeting at 12:46 p.m.

Andy Tompkins, President and CEO

Gary Sherrer, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

II. General Reports

A. *Introductions*

B. *Report from the Chair*

C. *Report from the President & CEO*

Regent Sherrer, Chair

Andy Tompkins, President & CEO

III. Standing Committee and Other Reports

A. *Academic Affairs*

B. *Fiscal Affairs & Audit*

C. *P-20 Council*

Regent Hedges

Regent Boettcher

Regent Downey-Schmidt

IV. Approval of Consent Agenda

A. *Academic Affairs*

1. **Act on Requests for Additional Degree Granting Authority for Concord Career College**

Regent Hedges

Gary Alexander,
VP, Academic Affairs

Staff Recommendation

Concord Career College requests 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.

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.

2. Approve Request for Degree and Certificate Program Submitted from Wichita Area Technical College

**Blake Flanders,
VP, Workforce Development**

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.

DISCUSSION AGENDA

V. Consideration of Discussion Agenda

A. Academic Affairs

1. Act on 2011-2013 (Cycle 8) Performance Agreements

Regent Hedges
Gary Alexander,
VP, Academic Affairs

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. (12/1/10)

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.

2. Discuss Proposed Admission 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 were presented to the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee for consideration. BAASC forwards these proposed university admission standards for discussion and eventual approval by the Board, and Staff concurs.

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.*

B. *Other Matters*1. **Receive Report on Operating Procedures for the New Tiered Funding Distribution Model****Diane Duffy,
VP, Finance & Administration****Summary and Recommendation**

Last month the Kansas Board of Regents adopted TEA policy recommendations on the tiered funding model for technical education. Furthermore, the Board added \$11.6 million or 20% of the estimated total cost of the new tiered technical education funding formula to the unified budget request to assist with the implementation and transition to the new tiered funding model. In addition, the Board adopted the tier 0 concept for state funds related to the academic credit hours of community and technical colleges. Its legislative package will include a request to the Kansas legislature to repeal the statutory distribution formula related to the community college operating grant and to give the Board the authority, in consultation with the colleges, to distribute the funds related to state aid for academic credit hours. Staff indicated that additional discussions with the colleges were planned to iron out a variety of details, and staff would update the Board on these discussions at the December meeting.

Background

The Kansas Board of Regents initiated a policy discussion in 2005 about postsecondary technical education and long-standing concerns among policymakers about its governance, programs, and funding. Over the past five years, significant changes have occurred, including the creation of the Kansas Postsecondary Technical Education Authority (TEA) in 2007. The TEA and Board of Regents have spent a good deal of time focused on responding to the legislative directive to develop a new approach to state funding for technical education.

Statutory Charge Related to Technical Education

Kansas law requires the TEA to “(11) (A) develop and recommend to the State Board of Regents a credit hour funding distribution formula for postsecondary technical education training programs that (i) is tiered to recognize and support cost differentials in providing high-demand, high-tech training, (ii) takes into consideration target industries critical to the Kansas economy, (iii) is responsive to program growth and (iv) includes other factors and considerations as deemed necessary or advisable; and (B) establish and recommend to the State Board of Regents the rates to be used in such funding distribution formula.”

At the November meeting, the Board adopted the tiered funding model for technical education.

Develop and recommend to the State Board of Regents a credit hour funding distribution formula for postsecondary technical education training programs

The tiered approach to technical education provides a method for distribution based on student credit hours. Qualifying student credit hours are generated from enrollments in postsecondary technical education programs approved by the Kansas Board of Regents and are submitted as a student unit record level to the Board’s Kansas Higher Education Data System (KHEDS).

Tiered to recognize and support cost differentials in providing high-demand, high-tech training

The proposed approach for technical education funding is based on a tiered cost model that recognizes cost differentials in delivery of courses. There are four main components in computing the overall cost of any technical education course: instructor costs, instructional support costs, extraordinary costs, and institutional support costs. The cost model uses a per-credit hour calculation for each component. The components are added together (instructor costs + instructional support costs + extraordinary costs + institutional support costs) to calculate a total cost per technical education course. The total cost can then be used in calculations to determine the state share of the total calculated cost and the allocation of state funding among the 26 two-year institutions delivering courses based on credit hour production and a consistent calculation of costs.

Takes into consideration target industries critical to the Kansas economy

Technical programs supporting industries critical to the Kansas economy are tiered based on the calculated cost. The basic model is structured so that incentives could be added for program enrollments supporting specific industries.

Is responsive to program growth

The tiered cost model utilizes student credit hour enrollment and calculated costs based on national/regional benchmark costs to determine a calculation of the total cost. As program enrollment changes, the tiered cost model is responsive to program growth.

Includes other factors and considerations as deemed necessary or advisable

The other factors that have been identified thus far are statutory changes necessary to change the system based on final recommendations by the Board of Regents and any other changes made in the legislative process.

Establish and recommend to the State Board of Regents the rates to be used in such funding distribution formula

Individual rates have been established for each technical education course based on the tiered cost study. A summary of data for each institution is contained in the most recent scenario workbook and can be viewed at <http://kspsd.org/IR/index.shtml>.

State Aid for Academic Credit Hours

In October, the Kansas Association of Community College Trustees requested the Board to consider using the tiered cost model for distribution of all eligible credit hours (not just technical education hours). The Association requested repeal of the community college operating grant formula, which is in statute, and adopting the model of a “tier 0” for general education credit hours.

Discussion Topics with Community and Technical Colleges

1. Establish FY 2011 as the base funding year
2. Discuss the possibility of a base funding reduction in FY 2012 and the possibility of base funding being flat
3. Discuss the concept of readjusting the FY 2011 base if a college’s enrollment drops by a certain percentage to allow the base to “re-center” over time
4. Discuss the proposed non-tiered funding formula and how the distribution would work
5. Draft Distribution Scenario Spreadsheets for FY 2012 – specifically finalizing the method used for distributing technical education aid and general education aid

- 2. Approve Recommended Statutory Changes to Implement the Tiered Funding Distribution Model for Technical Education and the New Non-Tiered Course Funding Process** **Julene Miller, General Counsel**

Summary and Recommendation

The Kansas Board of Regents approved a new tiered technical education funding distribution model at its November 2010 meeting. Additionally, the Board approved the repeal of the current Community College Operating Grant statutes and approved the concept of using a “tier 0” approach for funding general education. Staff has drafted statutory language to be recommended to the Kansas Legislature and Governor to implement these decisions and recommends approval of the attached statutory changes.

Background

In order to implement the decisions of the Board regarding the new tiered technical education funding distribution approach and the new method for distribution of general education aid, a number of new and amended statutes have been proposed. Additionally statutes that need to be repealed have also been identified. Highlights of the changes included in the attached proposed statutes are as followed:

- Sections 1-11 would create a new act, called the Postsecondary Tiered Technical Education State Aid Act; staff drew heavily from the Community College statutes in developing this new Act (for instance, sections 4 through 10 of the bill are modified versions of K.S.A. 71-603, 71-605, 71-609a, 71-613, 71-613a, 71-614 and 71-802)
 - Section 1 is the title
 - Section 2 contains key definitions—the most important being “non-tiered course” and “tiered technical course”
 - Section 3 provides that each community college, tech college and WIT will be eligible for postsecondary tiered technical state aid for those postsecondary tiered technical course credit hours that
 - Have been approved by the Board, and
 - Are delivered by the institution to Kansas residents (residency is to be determined in accordance with existing provisions, which differ for the sectors; a proposal to define residency the same for all, for purposes of this funding, will be brought forward for future consideration)
 - Section 3 also establishes that the amount of Postsecondary Tiered Technical Education State Aid for each institution is to be determined by the Board using a credit hour cost calculation model that takes 4 specific factors into account—this language comes from the TEA statutory directive to develop such a credit hour funding distribution model, but also includes recognition of local taxing authority; the Board is to set the rates to be used when it makes the “ask” each year
 - Finally, section 3 clarifies that while funds for technical education will be distributed using this new model, only that amount that is in excess of what the college received in FY2011 will be considered “new funds” for purposes of the performance agreement compliance
 - Sections 4 and 5 establish processes for institutions certifying credit hours and other necessary info to the Board and the timing and pro-rating of distributions
 - Section 6 precludes receipt of both tiered tech credit hour aid and non-tiered credit hour aid for the same credit hour.
 - Section 7 gives the Board a mechanism for enforcing the provisions of the Act and any policies adopted by the Board to administer the Act
 - Sections 8 through 10 establish accounting requirements so that the tiered tech state aid can be tracked
 - Section 11 gives the Board authority to develop policies to implement and administer the Act

- Sections 12-17 amend existing statutes, and create 2 new sections, to implement the new Act and/or provide for distribution of non-tiered course credit hour aid
 - Sections 12 and 13 amend provisions in the Community College Operating Grant statutes to remove obsolete terminology and repeal the community college operating grant formula, replacing it with funding for non-tiered course credit hours in an amount to be determined by the Board; the method of distribution of such funds would be determined by the Board after consultation with the community college presidents.
 - Sections 14-16 amend and/or create new sections dealing with technical college funding for non-tiered course credit hours—these changes are intended to make technical college funding and distribution for these credit hours consistent with the funding and distribution for community colleges and WIT; the method of distribution of such funds would be determined by the Board after consultation with the technical college presidents.
 - Section 17 amends a Washburn statute to make WIT’s funding provisions consistent with those of the community colleges and technical colleges.
- Section 18 would repeal the Postsecondary Aid statutes, as well as each of those statutes being amended by the bill (this is common Revisor practice)
- Section 19 would require the Act to take effect upon publication in the Register, as opposed to July 1, 2011.

Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the changes for recommendation to the Kansas Legislature and Governor.

Recommended Statutory Changes

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas:

New Section 1. Sections 1 through 11, and amendments thereto, shall be known and may be cited as the postsecondary tiered technical education state aid act.

New Sec. 2. As used in the postsecondary tiered technical education state aid act:

- (a) "Community college" means any community college established in accordance with chapter 71.
- (b) "Community college operating grant" means the operating grant provided for under subsection (a) of K.S.A. 71-620, and amendments thereto, prior to fiscal year 2012.
- (c) "Credit hour" means the basic unit of collegiate level instruction, as determined by the state board, in a subject or course offered by an eligible institution at a postsecondary level not higher than those programs or courses normally offered to freshmen and sophomores in four-year public institutions of postsecondary education, in a program that has been approved by the state board. Credit hour does not include within its meaning instruction in a program or course taken by a student enrolled for audit or not for postsecondary credit, or in any program or course not approved by the state board. The state board shall determine whether the programs and courses offered are at the level of freshmen and sophomore programs and courses offered in the state educational institutions and shall not approve for funding any program or course offered at a higher level.
- (d) "Eligible institution" or "institution" means any community college, technical college, or the institute of technology.
- (e) "Institute of technology," "institute" or "Washburn institute of technology" means the institute of technology at Washburn university.
- (f) "Non-tiered course" means any postsecondary credit bearing course offered by an eligible institution and identified by the state board as not meeting the definition of a tiered technical course. Non-tiered courses include courses that are generally designed to (1) contribute to academic knowledge and/or skills across multiple disciplines and occupations, such as communication, writing, mathematics, humanities, social or behavioral science, and natural or physical science courses, some of which may be considered for transfer as general education credit toward a baccalaureate degree; (2) contribute to general knowledge and/or skills in areas such as critical thinking and reasoning, problem solving, use of technology, and teamwork skills; (3) provide instruction in basic/foundational skills necessary for individuals to effectively participate in technical programs; (4) prepare individuals for certification or licensure exams or re-certifications and skill updates; or (5) allow individuals to explore various career opportunities. Seminars, workshops or other courses typically supplemental to the primary instruction required for the occupationally specific technical program are also generally considered non-tiered courses.
- (g) "State board of regents" or "state board" means the state board of regents provided for in the constitution of this state and established by K.S.A. 74-3202a, and amendments thereto.
- (h) "Technical college" means a technical college designated pursuant to K.S.A. 72-4472, 72-4473, 72-4474, 72-4475, 72-4477, or 72-4477a, and amendments thereto.
- (i) "Technical college operating grant" means the operating grant provided for under subsection (a) of K.S.A. 72-4480, and amendments thereto.
- (j) "Technical program" means any program of study comprised of a sequence of tiered technical courses and non-tiered courses, which program is identified by the state board as a technical program for funding purposes. Technical programs must (1) be designed to prepare individuals for gainful employment in current or emerging technical occupations requiring other than a baccalaureate or advanced degree; (2) lead to technical skill proficiency, an industry-recognized credential, a certificate, or an associate degree; and (3) be delivered by an eligible institution.
- (k) "Tiered technical course" means a postsecondary credit bearing course included in the sequence of courses comprising a technical program, which course is itself designed to provide competency-based applied instruction to prepare individuals with occupationally specific knowledge and skills necessary for employment, and which the state board has identified as a tiered technical course.

(l) “Tiered technical course credit hour” means a credit hour in a tiered technical course.

(m) “Washburn institute of technology operating grant” means any legislative appropriation designated for non-tiered courses delivered by the Washburn institute of technology.

New Sec. 3. In each fiscal year, commencing with the 2012 fiscal year, each community college, technical college and the Washburn institute of technology is eligible for postsecondary tiered technical education state aid from the state general fund for postsecondary tiered technical course credit hours approved by the state board and delivered by the institution to students who are residents of the state of Kansas, in an amount to be determined by the state board using a credit hour cost calculation model that (a) is tiered to recognize and support cost differentials in providing high-demand, high-tech training, (b) takes into consideration target industries critical to the Kansas economy, (c) is responsive to program growth, (d) takes into consideration local taxing authority for credit hours generated by in-district students and (e) includes other factors and considerations as deemed necessary or advisable by the state board. The state board shall establish the rates to be used as the state’s share in a given year, as well as in the actual distribution.

For purposes of this act, residency for all community college students shall be determined in accordance with K.S.A. 71-406 and 71-407, and amendments thereto, and residency for all technical college and Washburn institute of technology students shall be determined in accordance with laws or policies applicable to those institutions

In fiscal year 2012, any portion of the appropriation for postsecondary tiered course state aid that an institution actually receives that is in excess of the amount of community college operating grant or postsecondary aid that the institution received for fiscal year 2011 shall be considered “new state funds” for purposes of K.S.A. 74-3202d, and amendments thereto.

New Sec. 4. In accordance with deadlines established and published by the state board of regents, the chief administrative officer of each eligible institution shall certify under oath to the state board any information the state board deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, in such form as required by the state board.

New Sec. 5. Half of the distribution of the appropriation for postsecondary tiered technical education state aid shall be made on August 1 and the other half on January 1 of each fiscal year, or as soon thereafter as possible. The state board shall certify, on or before July 20 and December 20 of each fiscal year, to the director of accounts and reports the amount due on August 1 or on January 1, as the case may be, to each institution eligible for postsecondary tiered technical education state aid from such appropriation, and the director of accounts and reports shall draw a warrant upon the state treasurer in favor of the eligible institution for such amount. Upon receipt of the warrant, the treasurer of the eligible institution shall credit the amount of the warrant to the postsecondary tiered technical education fund of the eligible institution.

New Sec. 6. No amount of postsecondary tiered technical education state aid shall be based upon any credit hour for which the eligible institution is receiving or eligible to receive state aid for non-tiered course credit hours.

New Sec. 7. At any time, if the state board of regents finds that an eligible institution previously approved or deemed approved has failed to comply with the provisions of this act or with any provision of a policy adopted pursuant to this act, or otherwise fails to meet the standards contained in this act, the state board of regents shall so advise the institution. If after 12 calendar months subsequent to any such notification such institution has failed to correct the deficiency noted, the state board of regents shall withdraw approval of the institution and the institution shall not be entitled to postsecondary tiered technical education state aid during the continuance of any such period of withdrawal. Any action of the state board of regents in granting, denying or withdrawing approval of an institution shall be subject to review by the legislature.

New Sec. 8. (a) There is hereby established a postsecondary technical education fund in each community college and at Washburn university for the Washburn institute of technology. All moneys received by a community college or the institute for establishing, conducting, maintaining and administering any technical program shall be deposited in the postsecondary technical education fund, unless required by federal or state law to be deposited in the institution's general fund. The expenses of a community college or the institute of technology at Washburn university that are attributable to career technical education shall be paid from the postsecondary technical education fund.

(b) There is hereby established a general operating fund in each technical college budget. All moneys received by a technical college for delivering tiered technical course credit hours and non-tiered course credit hours shall be deposited in the general operating fund of the college. The expenses of a technical college that are attributable to career technical education shall be accounted for separately from the expenses of the college that are not attributable to career technical education.

(c) Community colleges, technical colleges and the Washburn institute of technology shall maintain fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper accounting for funds for career technical education courses, whether received directly from the federal government or any of its agencies, or received through the state or any of its agencies.

New Sec. 9. All amounts of postsecondary tiered technical education state aid received by community college or for the institute of technology at Washburn university shall be deposited in the institution's postsecondary technical education fund.

New Sec. 10. Any lawful transfer of money from the general fund of a community college or Washburn institute of technology to the postsecondary technical education fund shall be an operating expense in the year the transfer is made. The board of any community college or Washburn institute of technology may transfer moneys from its general fund to its postsecondary technical education fund. Expenditures for career technical education shall not be made from the general fund of a community college or the Washburn institute of technology.

New Sec. 11. The state board may adopt such policies as are necessary or desirable to implement and administer this act.

Sec. 12. K.S.A. 71-601 is hereby amended to read as follows: 71-601. (a) "Credit hour" means the basic unit of collegiate level instruction, as determined by the state board, in a subject or course offered at a level not higher than those subjects or courses normally offered to freshmen and sophomores in four-year institutions of postsecondary education which subject or course is approved by the state board. Credit hour does not include within its meaning instruction in a subject or course taken by a student enrolled for audit or in any subject or course not approved by the state board. The state board shall determine whether the subjects and courses offered in the community colleges are at the level of freshmen and sophomore subjects and courses offered in the state educational institutions and shall not approve for funding any subject or course offered at a higher level.

~~(b) "Full-time equivalent enrollment" or "FTE enrollment" means the quotient obtained by dividing by 30 the total credit hour enrollment in a fiscal year of students of a community college who are residents of the state of Kansas, or are considered residents of the state of Kansas pursuant to the provisions of K.S.A. 71-407, and amendments thereto.~~

~~(c) "State grant" means the operating grant provided for under subsection (a) of K.S.A. 71-620, and amendments thereto, and if entitlement is determined, the quality performance grant provided for under subsection (b) of K.S.A. 71-620, and amendments thereto.~~

Sec. 13. K.S.A. 71-620 is hereby amended to read as follows: 71-620. (a) In each fiscal year, commencing with the 2001 2012 fiscal year, each community college is entitled to eligible for an operating a grant from the state general fund, in an amount to be determined by the state board, for non-tiered course credit

hours approved by the state board and delivered by the community college. The method of distribution of such funds shall be established by the state board after consultation with the community college presidents.

(b) No amount of grant under this section shall be based upon any credit hour for which the community college is receiving or eligible to receive postsecondary tiered technical education state aid in accordance with section 3. Only the credit hours of students who are residents of the state of Kansas enrolled in courses for postsecondary credit shall be considered for funding. For purposes of this section, residency for all community college students shall be determined in accordance with K.S.A. 71-406 and 71-407, and amendments thereto. The state board shall:

~~—(1) Determine the average amount of moneys from the state general fund expended per FTE lower division undergraduate student in the preceding fiscal year at the regional state educational institutions;~~

~~—(2) (A) in the 2001 fiscal year, compute 50% of the amount determined under (1); (B) in the 2002 fiscal year, compute 55% of the amount determined under (1); (C) in the 2003 fiscal year, compute 60% of the amount determined under (1); in the 2004 fiscal year and in each fiscal year thereafter, compute 65% of the amount determined under (1);~~

~~—(3) determine the total number of FTE students of all the community colleges;~~

~~—(4) multiply the amount computed under (2) by the total number of FTE students determined under (3).~~

~~Subject to the provisions of subsection (e) of K.S.A. 74-3202d, and amendments thereto, the product is the total amount of operating grants the community colleges are entitled to receive for the fiscal year.~~

~~—(5) Each community college which is not an officially designated area vocational school shall receive an amount equivalent to the difference between credit hour state aid received in the 1999 fiscal year for credit hours in any subject or course approved as a vocational education subject or course and 1 1/6 times the amount of credit hour state aid received in the 1999 fiscal year for credit hours in any subject or course approved as a vocational education subject or course. The amount determined under this provision shall be distributed in equal installments in the 2001 through 2004 fiscal years as a part of the community college's operating grant, but shall not be subject to the provisions of K.S.A. 71-204, and amendments thereto.~~

~~—(6) In each fiscal year, the state board, for the purpose of allocating the amount determined under (4) to the community colleges, shall deduct the total of the amounts determined under (5) from the amount determined under (4).~~

~~—(7) In the 2001 fiscal year, the remaining balance determined under (6) shall be allocated to each community college according to the ratio the total amount of state aid received by the community college in the 2000 fiscal year bears to the total amount of state aid received by all community colleges in the 2000 fiscal year, subject to adjustments for changes in each community college's FTE enrollment from the 2000 fiscal year to the 2001 fiscal year.~~

~~—(8) In the 2002 fiscal year and in each fiscal year thereafter, the remaining balance determined under (6) shall be allocated to each community college according to the ratio the amount of the operating grant received by the community college in the prior fiscal year bears to the total amount of operating grants received by all community colleges in the prior fiscal year, subject to adjustments for changes in each community college's FTE enrollment from the prior fiscal year to the current fiscal year.~~

~~(b) In each fiscal year, commencing with the 2003 fiscal year, each community college is eligible to receive a quality performance grant from the state general fund. If the state board determines that the community college has demonstrated effectiveness in complying with its role and mission statement and has met or exceeded the core indicators of quality performance for community colleges identified and approved by the state board, the community college shall receive a quality performance grant in an amount which shall be determined by the state board by computing 2% of the amount of the operating grant the community college received in the preceding fiscal year. The computed amount is the amount of the quality performance grant the community college shall receive for the fiscal year.~~

~~—(c) For the purposes of this section, the FTE enrollment of the community college shall be based on: (1) Enrollment of students who are residents of the state of Kansas, or are considered residents of the state of Kansas pursuant to the provisions of K.S.A. 71-407, and amendments thereto; and (2) the greater of FTE enrollment of the community college in the current fiscal year or FTE enrollment in the preceding fiscal year.~~

~~(d) As used in this section, the term regional state educational institutions means Emporia state university, Fort Hays state university and Pittsburg state university and the term lower division undergraduate student means a freshman or sophomore.~~

Sec. 14. K.S.A. 72-4480 shall be amended to read as follows: 72-4480. (a) In each fiscal year, commencing with the 2012 fiscal year, each technical college, as defined by section 2, and amendments thereto, is eligible for a grant from the state general fund, in an amount to be determined by the state board of regents, for non-tiered course credit hours approved by the state board and delivered by the technical college. The method of distribution of such funds shall be established by the state board after consultation with the technical college presidents.

(b) No amount of grant under this section shall be based upon any credit hour for which the technical college is receiving or eligible to receive postsecondary tiered technical education state aid in accordance with section 3. Only the credit hours of students who are residents of the state of Kansas enrolled in courses for postsecondary credit shall be considered for funding.

(c) The state board of regents shall identify and approve core indicators of quality performance for vocational education schools and technical colleges and shall establish and implement a data management system that includes a process and format for collecting, aggregating and reporting common and institution-specific information documenting effectiveness of the schools and colleges in meeting the role and mission thereof.

~~(b)(c) In each fiscal year, commencing with the 2003 fiscal year, each vocational education school and technical college is eligible to receive a quality performance grant from the state general fund. If the state board determines that the school or college has demonstrated effectiveness in complying with its role and mission statement and has met or exceeded the core indicators of quality performance for vocational education schools and technical colleges identified and approved by the state board, the school or college shall receive a quality performance grant in an amount which shall be determined by the state board by computing 2% of the amount of postsecondary aid the school or college received in the preceding fiscal year. The computed amount is the amount of the quality performance grant the school or college shall receive for the fiscal year.~~

(e)(d) The distribution of the appropriation for quality performance grants under this section to vocational education schools and technical colleges entitled to eligible for such grants shall be made at a time to be determined by the state board in substantially equal payments on August 1 and January 1 of each fiscal year, or as soon thereafter as possible. The state board shall certify, on or before July 20 and December 20 of each fiscal year, to the director of accounts and reports the amount due on August 1 or January 1, as the case may be, to each vocational education school and technical college entitled to eligible for a grant, and the director of accounts and reports shall draw a warrant upon the state treasurer in favor of the school or technical college for such amount. Upon receipt of the warrant, the treasurer of the school or technical college shall credit the amount of the warrant to the general fund of the technical college.

New Sec. 15. (a) On or before November 1 and on or before March 1 of each year, the chief administrative officer of each technical college, as defined by section 2, and amendments thereto, shall certify under oath to the state board the total number of duly enrolled credit hours of students of the technical college during the current session who are state residents. Each November 1 and March 1, certification for payment shall set forth separately the credit hour enrollment for preceding sessions and for the current fall session. The state board may require the technical college to furnish any additional information deemed necessary by it to carry out the provisions of this act, and shall prescribe such forms and policies as may be necessary for making such reports.

(b) "Credit hour" means the basic unit of collegiate level instruction, as determined by the state board, in a subject or course offered at a level not higher than those subjects or courses normally offered to freshmen and sophomores in four-year institutions of postsecondary education which subject or course is approved by the state board. Credit hour does not include within its meaning instruction in a subject or course taken by a student enrolled for audit or in any subject or course not approved by the state board. The state board shall determine whether the subjects and courses offered in the technical colleges are at the level of freshmen and sophomore

subjects and courses offered in the state educational institutions and shall not approve for funding any subject or course offered at a higher level.

New Sec. 16. (a) If the amount of any appropriation for non-tiered credit hour grant aid is insufficient to pay in full the amount each technical college is eligible to receive, the amount appropriated shall be prorated among all technical colleges in proportion to the amount each is eligible to receive.

(b) If any technical college is paid more than the amount it is eligible to receive, the state board shall notify the technical college of the overpayment and the technical college shall remit the same to the state board and the state board shall deposit the same in the state treasury to the credit of the general fund, and if any such technical college fails so to remit, the state board shall deduct the excess amount so paid from future payments becoming due to such technical college.

(c) If any technical college is paid less than the amount it is eligible to receive, the state board shall pay the additional amount due at any time within the fiscal year in which the underpayment was made or within 60 days after the end of such fiscal year.

Sec. 17. K.S.A. 72-6503 shall be amended to read as follows: 72-6503. (a) ~~In~~ Except to the extent provided in subsection (a)(4) below, in each fiscal year, the university is entitled to an operating grant from the state general fund in an amount to be determined by the state board. The state board shall:

(1) Determine the average amount of moneys from the state general fund expended per FTE lower division undergraduate student in the preceding fiscal year at the regional state educational institutions;

(2) (A) in the 2002 fiscal year, compute 55% of the amount determined under (1); (B) in the 2003 fiscal year, compute 60% of the amount determined under (1); (C) in the 2004 fiscal year and in each fiscal year thereafter, compute 65% of the amount determined under (1);

(3) multiply the amount computed under (2) by the number of FTE students of the university. Subject to the provisions of subsection (e) of K.S.A. 74-3202d, and amendments thereto, the product is the amount of the operating grant the university is entitled to receive for the fiscal year.

(4) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, no amount of the university's operating grant shall be based upon any credit hour for which the university or its affiliated institute of technology is receiving or eligible to receive postsecondary tiered technical education state aid in accordance with section 3.

~~(b) In each fiscal year, commencing with the 2003 fiscal year, the university is eligible to receive a quality performance grant from the state general fund. If the state board determines that the university has demonstrated effectiveness in complying with its mission and goals statement and has met or exceeded the core indicators of quality performance identified and approved for the university by the state board, the university shall receive a quality performance grant in an amount which shall be determined by the state board by computing 2% of the amount of the operating grant the university received in the preceding fiscal year. The computed amount is the amount of the quality performance grant the university shall receive for the fiscal year.~~

~~(e)~~ (1) For the purposes of this section, the FTE enrollment of the university shall be based on: (A) Enrollment of students who are residents of the state of Kansas; and (B) the greater of FTE enrollment in the second or third fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the appropriation for the operating grant is made.

(2) As used in this section, the term regional state educational institutions means Emporia state university, Fort Hays state university and Pittsburg state university and the term lower division undergraduate student means a freshman or sophomore.

~~(d)~~ (c) Moneys received as state grants from the state general fund shall not be expended for the purpose of expansion of graduate programs or for the purpose of expansion of off-campus programs without the prior approval of the state board.

Sec. 18. K.S.A. 71-601; 71-620, 71-1706, 72-4430, 72-4431, 72-4432, 72-4480 and 72-6503 are hereby repealed.

Sec. 19. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its publication in the Kansas Register

3. Review the Kansas Commitment Components and Finalize Recommendations for KAN-HELP

**Kip Peterson,
Director, Government Relations &
Communications**

Summary

On September 15, the Board of Regents approved the Kansas Commitment, a five-part \$50 million initiative aimed at boosting the Kansas economy. The Kansas Commitment, whose approval is essential to the success of Foresight 2020 (the Board's 10-year strategic plan), was approved under the condition that two of the five components would require further review and finalization.

Background

On August 17, during its annual retreat, the Board discussed possible budgetary enhancement requests for the 2011 legislative session. Possible enhancements included: 1) a systemwide inflationary budget request; 2) systemwide deferred building maintenance funding; 3) the creation of a new need-based financial aid program for state university students; and 4) a systemwide workforce and economic development initiative.

During its September 15 meeting, the Board approved a five-part \$50 million initiative aimed at boosting the state's economy. The initiative, entitled "The Kansas Commitment," included the following components: 1) KAN-PROTECT, a systemwide inflationary budget request; 2) KAN-BUILD, a systemwide deferred building maintenance funding request; 3) KAN-HELP, a need-based financial aid program for state university students; 4) KAN-GROW, a systemwide workforce and economic development initiative; and 5) KAN-CONNECT, continued funding for the Board's Kan-ed program. The Kansas Commitment was approved with the following conditions: 1) the exact details of the KAN-HELP program would be finalized before January 1, 2011; and 2) the Board would further review the three regional university components contained in the KAN-GROW initiative.

The KAN-HELP Program

The initial and conceptual KAN-HELP program, approved by the Board on September 15, included the following components:

- 1) Funding:
 - a. A \$10 million need-based financial aid program for state university students.
 - b. Re-coup the state sales tax generated on the state university campuses (approximately \$6 million annually).
 - c. The state universities and their athletic departments will contribute \$4 million through a to-be-determined formula.
- 2) Eligibility:
 - a. Resident state university students whose families are at or below the statewide median family income level (currently \$50,174) would be eligible for a KAN-HELP Loan that would be applied to tuition and fee costs.
- 3) Loan Forgiveness:
 - a. Students who receive a KAN-HELP Loan, and who live and work in Kansas for a to-be-determined period of time following graduation, would be eligible for complete loan forgiveness.
 - b. Students who receive a KAN-HELP Loan, and who depart Kansas following graduation or who fail to graduate, would be required to pay back what would become a low-interest loan.

On September 21, the state university CEOs, Chairman Sherrer, President Tompkins, and Kip Peterson met via conference call to discuss the KAN-HELP program. At the conclusion of that meeting, the CEOs asked for time to visit with their respective student financial aid directors about the program.

On October 15, the state university CEOs, Chairman Sherrer, Vice Chairman McKechnie, President Tompkins, and Kip Peterson met via conference call for further discussion. Issues discussed included: 1) Should there be a matching requirement since need-based aid has traditionally been a state responsibility? 2) What would count for the university match? 3) How many students at each of the universities would qualify for this aid? 4) Should this be a loan program where the student would have the loan forgiven if they work in Kansas or should it be a pure scholarship program since it is for Kansas residents? 5) If we were to get this funded, how would the funds be distributed? At the conclusion of that meeting, it was decided that President Tompkins should meet with the state university financial aid directors to obtain their advice on how to formally structure the KAN-HELP program.

On November 22, President Tompkins and Diane Lindeman, the Board's Student Financial Aid Director, met with the state university financial aid directors. The financial aid directors' recommendations for the KAN-HELP program included: 1) Allow the university to determine the source of its match; 2) Make the program a grant program not a loan program; 3) Provide a grant of up to \$2,000 per year for direct expenses – may continue to qualify for the grant if they remain a student in good standing with the university; and 4) Available to Kansas resident students who: a) may or may not be Pell eligible; b) have the greatest unmet financial need; and c) are attending full-time in a four or five-year undergraduate program at one of the six state universities.

On December 6, five of the six state university CEOs, Chairman Sherrer, President Tompkins, and Kip Peterson met via conference call to discuss the financial aid directors' recommendations. The conversation focused on the following questions: 1) Do we agree that the university will determine the source of its match? 2) Should this be a grant program or a loan program? 3) Should we utilize the original parameters for qualification which were resident state university students whose families are at or below the statewide median family income level (\$50,174) to be applied to tuition and fees or should we use the parameters recommended by the financial aid directors which were: available to Kansas resident students who: a) may or may not be Pell eligible; b) have the greatest unmet financial need; c) are attending full time in a four or five-year undergraduate program at one of the six state universities; and d) be up to \$2,000 per year for direct expenses – may continue to qualify if they remain a student in good standing with the university? As a result of this meeting, final proposal recommendations are currently being reviewed by the state university CEOs and will be forwarded to the Regents via e-mail prior to the Board's December 15 meeting.

The KAN-GROW Initiative

The initial KAN-GROW initiative, approved by the Board on September 15, included the following components for the three regional universities:

- 1) Funding:
 - a. \$2.25 million SGF + \$1.125 million regional university match = \$3.375 million total.
 - b. \$750,000 per university + \$375,000 university match = \$1.125 million total per university.
- 2) Regional University Proposals:
 - a. ESU: New degree programs – eCommerce, Student Affairs Administration, and Sustainability.
 - b. FHSU: New Bachelor of Science in Information Systems Engineering degree program, and a new Kansas Academy of Mathematics and Science Summer Engineering Institute.
 - c. PSU: New School of Construction.

On September 24, ESU requested that the original Student Affairs Administration program proposal be removed from consideration and that a new program in Nursing Informatics be inserted in its place. ESU provided the following Nursing Informatics outline:

“This master’s degree will prepare graduates to enter a relatively new nursing specialty area - nursing informatics. The American Nurses Association defines nursing informatics as a “specialty that integrates nursing science, computer science, and information science to manage and communicate data, information, and knowledge in nursing practice. Nursing informatics facilitates the integration of data, information, and knowledge to support patients, nurses, and other providers in their decision-making in all roles and settings (ANA, 2008, p. 65). A nurse with a degree in nursing informatics works in various settings to pair clinical care with current technology, including patient information management systems, administrative computer systems such as scheduling programs or insurance databases, and other systems that are crucial to providing patients with the best possible care. Some nursing informatics specialists work in education, consumer health, insurance, medical software companies, pharmaceutical companies, public health, and nursing research. Specialists in nursing informatics also have opportunities with companies that supply healthcare systems and with healthcare consulting firms. Nursing informatics specialists are in high demand, and with most hospitals and clinics in the United States moving toward computer-based records, this demand will continue to grow over the next several years. The U.S. Department of Labor estimates a 49% job growth in health information and health informatics. Healthcare informatics was named one of the top careers in U.S. News & World Report in 2010. Emporia State University (ESU) is ideally suited for the degree because of its existing programs (e.g., the School of Library and Information Management; the School of Business, including the department of Accounting and Information Systems; the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, including the department of Mathematics, Computer Science and Economics; and the Teachers College, including the department of Instructional Design and Technology) that would contribute to the foundation and strength of the master’s program in nursing informatics . A search of programs offering this same degree in Kansas identified only the University of Phoenix (Wichita/online) as an option for students interested in obtaining the degree. The American Nurses Credentialing Center (ANCC) offers the Informatics Nurse Board Certification Exam for the RN-BC credential. It is estimated this program will contribute an average of 25 to 30 graduates each year to the Kansas workforce.”

VI. Executive Session

Board of Regents – Personnel Matters Related to Non-Elected Personnel

CONSENT AGENDA

Thursday, December 16, 2010

VII. Reports

- A. *Introductions*
- B. *Report from Council of Presidents* Chancellor Gray-Little
- C. *Report from Council of Faculty Senate Presidents* Barbara Phipps
- D. *Report from Students' Advisory Committee* Michael Smith

VIII. Approval of Consent Agenda

- A. *Academic Affairs* Regent Hedges
 - 1. **Act on Request to Approve a Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Computing (CIP 11.0101) – KU** **Gary Alexander,
VP, Academic Affairs**

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. The 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

<p>3. Program Description</p>	<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>
<p>4. Demand/Need for the Program</p>	<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>
<p>5. Comparative /Locational Advantage</p>	<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>

<p>6. Curriculum</p>	<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. The curriculum is specified in detail in the proposal.</p>
<p>7. Faculty Profile</p>	<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>
<p>8. Student Profile</p>	<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>
<p>9. Academic Support</p>	<p>The current academic support services will meet the needs of the proposed program.</p>
<p>10. Facilities and Equipment</p>	<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.</p> <p>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	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		
OOE	0		0		0		
Total	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: _____							

B. Fiscal Affairs & Audit

Regent Boettcher

1. Authorize Acceptance of Property Under the Deferred Maintenance Tax Credit Program and the Sale of Property to the KU Endowment Association – KU

**Eric King,
Director of Facilities**

A donor is interested in donating approximately eight acres of land in rural Douglas County to the University of Kansas under the Deferred Maintenance Tax Credit Program. The land has an appraised value of \$50,000. Donations of real property are authorized under the Tax Credit program but regulations adopted by the Department of Revenue for the program (K.A.R. 92-12-140 et. seq.) require the property to be sold and converted to cash within eighteen months of the donation. Since the donated property is contiguous to property that is currently owned by the KU Endowment Association, the University will sell the donated property to the KU Endowment Association at its appraised value.

The legal description of the property is as follows:

Beginning at a point on the East line of Section Eight (S8), Township Twelve South (T12S), Range Twenty East (R20E), said point being 1371.52 feet North of the Southeast corner of Section Eight (S8); thence West 630.8 feet; thence North 582.10 feet; thence East 630.95 feet to the East line of Section Eight (S8); thence South 582.10 feet to the point of beginning, all in Douglas County, Kansas.

2. Approve Architectural Program for a New Fine and Performing Arts Center – PSU

Pittsburg State University (PSU) requests approval of the Architectural Program for a new Fine and Performing Arts Center. The new facility will replace the lost performance auditorium when Carney Hall was demolished. The new facility will include a large flexible use performance hall with approximately 1,100 seats, a full fly stage, and hydraulic orchestra pit along with a second smaller 250 seat performance theater. Dressing rooms and other support spaces are also included. The program also includes shelved space for both an art gallery and a rehearsal room. The planned facility is approximately 85,000 square feet. The estimated construction budget is \$25,000,000 which will be funded from private gifts. No new state funding will be requested for operational costs per Board policy. The final program will be submitted to the Board of Regents Office in the near future. Approval is contingent on Board of Regents staff review and support.

3. Amend FY 2011 and FY 2012 Capital Improvement Plan – KSU

- Kansas State University requests approval to modify its FY 2011 Capital Improvements Plan to add a \$1.2 million project to replace the turf at Snyder Family Stadium and Tointon Stadium. The project will be funded with private gifts on deposit at the K-State Foundation.
- Kansas State University requests approval to modify its FY 2011 Capital Improvements Plan to add a \$600,000 project to remodel the Technology Assistance Center on the Salina Campus. The project will be funded with restricted fees.
- Kansas State University requests approval to modify its FY 2011 and FY 2012 Capital Improvement Plans. The \$13 million Grain Science Center Feed Mill project is a joint effort of K-State’s Department of Grain Science and Industry and the Department of Animal Science and Industry. The project will replace the feed-production capability provided by the feed

mill at the corner of Denison and Kimball that is on the NBAF site and significantly enhance the research capacity of both departments. The project was approved by the Board of Regents (BOR) as a privately funded FY 2012 capital improvement in spring 2010. Because the existing feed-production facility is on the NBAF site, K-State had requested \$5.4 million in NBAF relocation funds to be combined with \$8 million in private funds to complete the project. Recently, it has been made clear that \$5.4 million in NBAF relocation funding will not be made available. Other sources to provide \$5.4 million are being pursued, however those efforts have not been successful. The requirement to relocate the existing facility by September 1, 2013 will require K-State to provide partial project funding. The university must begin construction this summer to meet the NBAF deadline. K-State requests changing the project to a university funded project and approval to seek \$5.4 million in bonding authority.

DISCUSSION AGENDA

IX. Consideration of Discussion Agenda

A. Academic Affairs

1. **Act on Request to Reorganize the Institute of Community and Public Health into a School of Public Health – KUMC**

Regent Hedges
Gary Alexander,
 VP, Academic Affairs

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 concurs 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.



**School of Public Health Fact Sheet 09-019-10 updates at
www.kumc.edu**

In August 2010, the University of Kansas submitted to the Kansas Board of Regents a plan to reorganize the Preventive Medicine and Public Health, Biostatistics, and Health Policy and Management Programs at the University of Kansas Medical Center into a **School of Public Health**. The decision to develop and pursue accreditation for a School of Public Health was made based upon significant background research and stakeholder input and will entail the installation of new programs and a new organizational structure.

How will Kansas benefit from having a School of Public Health?

The overall goals of public health are to: (1) prevent epidemics and the spread of disease; (2) protect against environmental hazards; (3) prevent injuries; (4) promote and encourage healthy behaviors; (5) respond to disasters and assist communities in recovery; and (6) assure the quality and accessibility of health services. Reorganizing KU's public health-related programs into a School of Public Health:

- **Enhances our ability to develop a stable public health and health care workforce.** Hospitals, nursing homes, home health agencies, insurance companies, pharmaceutical companies, and informatics companies are all desperately seeking individuals with skills in the public health/population health sciences. Individuals trained in our school of public health will be leaders in the design and implementation of innovative programs to promote health, prevent disease, manage chronic illness, and control health care costs.
- **Increases the potential for federal grant funding.** On a per capita basis in 2009, Kansas ranked 40th in overall state funding for public health, 47th in Health Services and Resources Administration (HRSA) funding, and 37th in Centers for Disease Control (CDC) prevention funding¹. Having a School of Public Health in Kansas will allow us to more successfully compete for federal grant funding in support of health care and public health education, service and research programs.
- **Leverages a new emphasis on population health and control of health care costs.** New resources directed toward disease prevention and health promotion, as well as increasing the quality and effectiveness of health care delivery through greater use of health information technology are available at the federal level. Our public health doctoral students will be trained to lead the much needed transformation of health care delivery to improve health outcomes and control health care costs.
- **Supports the state's efforts to apply for National Cancer Institute (NCI) designation.** Having a School of Public Health nicely dovetails with KU's goal of obtaining NCI designation and will continue to build on the momentum of the Cancer Control and Population Health program, which currently has over \$4 million in NCI-funded grants.

Proposed School of Public Health Programs

Departments of Preventive Medicine and Public Health (Wichita and Kansas City)

- *Master of Public Health (MPH)*
(concentrations in epidemiology; social and behavioral health; environmental and occupational health)
- *Master of Clinical Research (MCR)*
- *Doctor (PhD or DrPH) of Public Health*

Department of Biostatistics

- *Master of Science (MS) of Biostatistics*
- *Master of Public Health with a concentration in Biostatistics*
- *Doctor (PhD) of Biostatistics*

Department of Health Policy and Management

- *Master of Health Services Administration (MHSA)*
- *Master of Public Health with a concentration in Health Policy and Management.*
- *Doctor (PhD) of Health Policy and Management*

Benefit to other Regents institutions

Other Regents institutions are also interested in improving the health system in Kansas, including expanding health care and public health research, training, and education. Having a School of Public Health creates opportunities to collaborate on public health-related grants as well as provides the chance for current students in public health-related disciplines to be enrolled and participate in public health coursework. In addition, KU's various PhD programs that will be offered through a School of Public Health can also provide faculty for other health degree programs throughout the state.

Benefit to local health departments

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, which serve to enhance public health by ensuring clean water, air, food safety, providing immunizations, controlling disease outbreaks, etc. 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.

Cost and structure of a School of Public Health

Four departments will be reorganized into the School of Public Health: 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. The four departments house over 45 faculty actively engaged in public health education, service and research. Currently, the four departments hold over \$30 million in grant support. New funding and the use of internal budget reallocations will make the reorganization of existing programs as a School of Public Health cost-effective, and it will 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. 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 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 be effect at the start of FY 2012 (July 1, 2011).

Vision for reorganization

The proposed reorganization will support and strengthen the public health workforce in both the private and public sectors. It will assure that Kansas is well-prepared to benefit from the economies that can be recognized with a public health focus, and it will strengthen collaboration across major academic units and create opportunities for joint educational and research programs throughout the Regents' system.

The proposed School will:

- Meet the missions of public health education, service and research to the state and region
- Span the KU campuses in Kansas City, Lawrence, Wichita and Overland Park
- Create collaborations in research, education, and service with Kansas Regents' institutions, the public health practice community, and other public health agencies and associations
- Build upon existing public health expertise and programs in the region
- Create and maintain interdisciplinary education, service, and research programs
- Be accredited by CEPH (Council on Education for Public Health)

**For more information about the University of Kansas Medical Center,
please contact Marci Nielsen at mnielsen@kumc.edu**


ⁱ Trust for America's Health (2009). State data. Retrieved 8-28-2010 from <http://healthyamericans.org/states/?stateid=KS9-1-2010>



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.

2. Act on Requests to Change the Academic Calendars – 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 requested 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	73
Spring 2013		
Classes End	Monday, May 13, 2013	<i>Thursday, May 9, 2013</i>
Total Instructional Days	75	73
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	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 <i>May 05 Sat</i>	May 07 Mon	May 07, Mon	May 05 Sat
Exams End	May 11 Fri	May 11 Fri	May 15 Tues <i>May 11 Fri</i>	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 Aug 27 Mon	Aug 15 Wed	Aug 20, Thurs - Mon	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 Jan 14 Mon	Jan 16 Wed
Classes End	May 09 Thurs	May 10 Fri	May 13 Mon May 9 Thurs	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 May 11 Fri	May 13 Mon	May 06, Mon	May 11 Sat
Exams End	May 17 Fri	May 17 Fri	May 21 Tue May 17 Thurs	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*

3. Act on Revised Academic Program Review Guidelines

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.

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 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 individual 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 recommends 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 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 Data, Research, and Planning 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.

**Kansas Board of Regents
Academic Affairs
Approved - September 18, 1997**

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
3. Campus Report of Statistical Overview Data to the Board Office	March 16, 1998
4. Development of Campus Plans for Program Review	September 1997 - March 1998
5. Board consideration of Campus Plans and Schedules for Program Review	March 1998
6. Campus Reviews of Programs Identified for 1998 Reviews	March 1998 - December 1998
7. Board staff will notify chief academic officers of questions, issues or problems	May 1, 1998
8. Submission of Campus Reports and Recommendations to the Board of Regents	January 1, 1999
9. Consideration of Campus Reports and Recommendations by the Board of Regents	February 18, 1999

<u>Activity for 1999 Cycle</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>
1. Campus Report of Statistical Overview Data to Board Office	March 16, 1999
2. Campus Reviews of Programs Identified for 1999 Reviews	March 1999 - December 1999
3. Submission of Campus Reports and Recommendations to the Board of Regents	January 1, 2000
4. Consideration of Campus Reports and Recommendations by the Board of Regents	February 17, 2000

**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%).

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

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

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)

(1) 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

B. *Fiscal Affairs & Audit*

Regent Boettcher

1. Act on FY 2012 Housing and Food Service Rate Adjustments Submitted by State Universities (Final Action)

**Diane Duffy,
VP, Finance & Administration**

Summary

All six state universities submitted housing and food service rate proposals for FY 2012. The details are described in documentation submitted by each university and attached to this issue paper. The documentation includes: (1) proposed rates; (2) justification for the proposed rates; (3) summary housing and food service financial information (FY 2008-FY 2012). Staff recommends the proposed rates be considered for final action by the Board.

Background

Pursuant to Board policy, the state universities submit housing and food service rates to the Board for first reading in November, with final action taken by the Board in December. Accordingly, all six universities submitted proposals which, if approved, become effective July 1, 2011 at KU, KSU and WSU or fall semester 2011 at ESU, FHSU and PSU for the academic year 2011-2012.

Housing and food service operations are auxiliary enterprises; therefore, user fees must cover total costs of operation. The six universities have different housing and food service rate structures due to factors such as the amount of outstanding bonded debt, occupancy rates, age of facilities, and economies of scale related to the capacity of the housing and food service operation. In order to illustrate the level of the proposed rate increases for each, the following table compares the current and proposed yearly (two semester) rate at each institution for a typical double occupancy room and board contract.

	Current Rate FY 2011	Proposed Rate FY 2012	\$ Increase	% Increase
KU	\$6,982*	\$7,080	\$98	1.4%
KSU	\$6,954	\$7,198	\$244	3.5%
WSU	\$6,200	\$6,350	\$150	2.4%
ESU	\$6,230	\$6,380	\$150	2.4%
PSU	\$6,016	\$6,288	\$272	4.5%
FHSU	\$6,625	\$6,837	\$212	3.2%

*Meal plans proposed for FY 2012 are completely reconfigured; therefore, there is not a direct comparison to FY 2011; the table includes the meal plan most comparable to the former default meal plan.

Each university describes in their respective documentation the business case for the various proposed increases. Furthermore, each state university provides summary financial information describing for its housing system.

Generally, the proposed increases are driven by anticipated inflationary costs and facility maintenance and enhancements. Each university indicates the proposed increases were reviewed by the appropriate campus groups with student representation.

The College Board’s report, “Trends in College Pricing, 2010” calculates an average room and board charge weighted by the number of undergraduates living in college housing and reports for four-year, public institutions in the Midwest a room and board figure of \$7,787 which compares to the FY 2011 column above. States included in the Midwest region are: Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and West Virginia.

**THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
Department of Student Housing
FY2012 Business Case for Increasing Student Housing Rates**

I. PROPOSED RATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

Since fiscal year 2005, room and meal plan rates have been proposed and reported separately. The proposed rate for a traditional residence hall double room will increase from \$3,642 to \$3,700 or 1.6%. Meal plans proposed for 2011-12 are completely reconfigured and therefore not a direct comparison with previous years. The new meal plan most comparable to the former default meal plan is \$3,380, for a combined total of \$7,080 for the academic year. This compares to \$6,982 in 2010-2011, which is a 1.4% increase.

Rates for facilities and meal plans proposed to be effective July 1, 2011 follow:

RESIDENCE HALLS

	2010-11	2011-12	\$ Incr.	% Incr.
Traditional Residence Halls				
Double Room (<i>2 residents per room</i>)	\$3,642	\$3,700	\$58	1.6
Single Room*	\$4,916	\$4,996	\$80	1.6
Renovated Residence Halls				
Double Room w/Sink (<i>Ellsworth & Hashinger</i>)	\$4,610	\$4,712	\$102	2.2
Double Room w/Bath & 4-Person Suite (<i>All</i>) & Large 2-Person w/Sink (<i>Hashinger</i>)	\$4,886	\$4,994	\$108	2.2
2-Person Suite (<i>All</i>) & 2-Person Studio (<i>Ellsworth</i>)	\$5,256	\$5,372	\$116	2.2
Double Room w/Sink as Single** (<i>Ellsworth & Hashinger</i>) & 1-Person Suite (<i>Templin</i>)	\$6,224	\$6,362	\$138	2.2

Contract rates listed in the chart above are for the 9-month academic year.

The above rates include utilities and basic cablevision

* 2-person room contracted by a single resident on a space-available basis

SUNFLOWER DUPLEX APARTMENTS

	2010-11	2011-12	\$ Incr.	% Incr.
Two Bedroom Apartment	\$644	\$656	\$12	2.0

This monthly contract rate includes water and sanitation. All other utilities, including telephone service, are paid by residents. Furnishings are not included.

Most Sunflower Duplex Apartments are short-term, transitional housing for newly hired faculty and staff relocating to Lawrence. These facilities include central air conditioning and heating, renovated bath and kitchen areas, additional insulation, and energy-efficient windows.

STOUFFER PLACE STUDENT FAMILY APARTMENTS

	2010-11	2011-12	\$ Incr.	% Incr.
One Bedroom Apartment	\$321	\$327	\$6	2.0
Two Bedroom Apartment	\$374	\$381	\$7	2.0
Two Bedroom Apartment – Renovated	\$500	\$512	\$12	2.5
Three Bedroom Apartment – Renovated	\$645	\$661	\$16	2.5

These monthly contract rates do not include utilities. All utilities are paid directly by residents. Stouffer Place Apartments are unfurnished. Contracts are for a 12-month period.

JAYHAWKER TOWERS APARTMENTS

	2010-11	2011-12	\$ Incr.	% Incr.
Two-Bedroom Apartments				
4 residents per apartment, <i>cost for each</i>	\$2,910	\$2,962	\$52	1.8
2 residents per small apartment, <i>cost for each*</i>	\$4,186	\$4,266	\$80	2.0
2 residents per apartment, <i>cost for each</i>	\$5,140	\$5,242	\$102	2.0
Renovated Two-Bedroom Apartments				
4 residents per apartment, <i>cost for each</i>	\$3,746	\$3,820	\$74	2.0
2 residents per small apartment, <i>cost for each*</i>	\$5,390	\$5,508	\$118	2.2
2 residents per apartment, <i>cost for each</i>	\$6,618	\$6,764	\$146	2.2

Contract rates listed above are for the 9-month academic year and include utilities and basic cablevision

* Total of 6 of these small, non-standard size apartments in the Jayhawker Towers complex.

Jayhawker Towers residents may also arrange summer contracts (*for year-round occupancy*) if they have contracted for the following academic year. Apartments are partially furnished.

SCHOLARSHIP HALLS

	2010-11	2011-12	\$ Incr.	% Incr.
Traditional Scholarship Halls <i>(Battenfeld, Douthart, Grace Pearson, Pearson, Sellards, Stephenson)</i>				
	\$3,184	\$3,248	\$64	2.0
Suite-Style Scholarship Halls <i>(Dennis E. Rieger, K.K. Amini, Margaret Amini, Krehbiel)</i>				
	\$3,452	\$3,528	\$76	2.2
Meal Charges for the 10 halls listed above				
	\$1,822	\$1,858	\$36	2.0
Miller and Watkins Halls <i>(women in these halls purchase and prepare their own food)</i>				
	\$2,190	\$2,226	\$36	1.6

Contract rates are for the 9-month academic year and include utilities.

The newer suite-style halls offer amenities including private baths and more square footage per resident which result in higher operating costs. The Elizabeth Miller Watkins Trust provides a rate subsidy for Miller and Watkins residents and because Miller and Watkins residents cooperatively purchase and prepare their own food, there is no meal plan charge.

RESIDENTIAL DINING MEAL PLANS

The proposed new meal plans are the result of months of incorporating feedback and input from various stakeholders. The new meal plans will meet the expressed needs of students and provide outstanding value and flexibility. When students participate in the on-line contracting process, they will choose their meal plan, thus eliminating the concept of a ‘default’ meal plan. The new “unlimited access” options provide extreme flexibility and represent the greatest value for the students’ dollars.

	2011-2012
Jayhawk Unlimited Access	\$3,798
Unlimited residential dining; \$500 Cuisine Cash; up to 2 Cuisine To Go meals/day; 10 Bring-a-Friend Meals; six 14" pizzas; 5% Cuisine Cash discount at register	
Rock Chalk Unlimited Access	\$3,598
Unlimited residential dining; \$300 Cuisine Cash; up to 2 Cuisine To Go meals/day; 6 Bring-a-Friend Meals; four 14" pizzas	
Crimson Flex	\$3,380
400 residential dining meals; \$200 Cuisine Cash; up to 2 Cuisine To Go meals/day; 4 Bring-a-Friend Meals	
Blue Basic	\$2,798
10 residential dining meals/week; \$100 Cuisine Cash; up to 2 Cuisine To Go meals/day; 4 Bring-a-Friend Meals	
Campanile (not available to residence hall students)	\$1,040
\$500 Cuisine Cash; 2 residential dining meals/week; up to 2 Cuisine To Go meals/day; 4 Bring-a-Friend Meals; 5% Cuisine Cash discount at register	

Rates for 2011-12 in this document are proposed following study and review by staff of the Department of Student Housing, KU Dining Services, and the Student Housing Advisory Board (SHAB) which consists of faculty, staff, and students, including representatives from the Stouffer Neighborhood Association (SNA); the Association of University Residence Halls (AURH); the Jayhawker Towers Tenants’ Association (JTTA); the All Scholarship Hall Council (ASHC); and, the Student Senate University Affairs Committee. The various rate proposals were discussed by SHAB membership at the September 10, 17, 24, and October 1 meetings. In addition to SHAB meetings, the Student Housing director and KU Dining director met with student government leaders and student groups for further discussion and to answer questions. These rates have been reviewed and recommended by the Vice Provost for Student Success. SHAB’s unanimous approval of these rates was confirmed at the October 8, 2010 meeting.

II. EXPENDITURE IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

Rates are established to cover costs of maintenance, materials, food (where applicable), utilities (where applicable), salaries, and benefits to maintain a qualified staff and operate facilities. The proposed housing rates incorporate projected cost increases, the most significant of which include utilities and employee health insurance. Operating costs have been positively affected by the decision to deactivate telephone lines in student rooms and apartments, saving nearly \$500,000 per year. This decision, coupled with prudent management strategies, will allow for a minimal rate increase in these challenging economic times.

Operational efforts have focused on security enhancements, increased energy efficiency, and improving amenity levels throughout the system. Security cameras were installed at all residence hall entrances and exits in 2010. Windows and mechanical systems are upgraded as an ongoing commitment to achieve greater energy efficiency.

While the desire to holding rates as low as possible remains strong, it should be noted that students' expectations continue to rise with regard to their living accommodations. Upgrades and renovations of the traditional facilities must continue in the future to ensure that campus housing remains competitive in a community environment which includes many options from which students may choose. After the upcoming renovation of GSP Hall, KU will, for the first time, offer more renovated spaces than traditional spaces in its residence halls. This momentum must also carry over to renovations in the scholarship halls as well as the revitalization of the Stouffer Place Apartments.

The proposed new meal plans will allow KU Dining Services to continue to provide quality cuisine in a high service standard environment, while allowing students the mix of value and flexibility that meets their needs. KU Dining continues to employ sound management practices that include controlling expenses and implementing efficiencies that lead to cost savings. The proposed rate structure will allow for expenditures related to the renovation of the GSP dining facility, as well as planning for the renovation of the Ekdahl Dining Commons. These facilities have been in operation for 20+ years, and funding these renovations is essential to the future operations.

With the proposed increases for fiscal year 2012, KU housing and meal rates will remain below both Big 12 and national averages, reflecting good management practices and a commitment to being good stewards of students' money. There are no peripheral obligations or other budget formulas affected by this rate proposal.

III. POTENTIAL REVENUE IMPACT OF PROPOSAL

All projected revenue is restricted use funds. Estimated revenue increases for each rate proposal are:

Residence Halls	\$263,800	Sunflower Apartments	\$3,650
Scholarship Halls	\$35,800	Stouffer Place Apartments	\$24,200
Jayhawker Towers	\$71,500		

Potential Housing Revenue Impact \$399,000
Potential Dining Revenue Impact \$394,600 (*a unit of Kansas Memorial Unions since FY'05*)

See attached supplemental financial information.

IV. EXPECTED BENEFITS FROM PROPOSAL

Approximately 4,800 students currently live in Student Housing facilities. The proposed increases will enable the housing and dining operations to continue providing exceptional on-campus living experiences, which remain a great value for the students' dollar.

V. ALTERNATIVES TO PROPOSAL

None identified. Only basic services are being provided and these charges are established to cover expenses associated with the cost recovery of basic services. There are no State-appropriated funds in this auxiliary operation; therefore, user fees must cover total costs.

VI. IMPACT OF NOT IMPLEMENTING PROPOSAL

The annual operating budget of the auxiliary housing operation is approximately \$21.8 million, with a physical plant insured replacement value in excess of \$290 million. Failure to increase revenue commensurate with increased operating expenses would jeopardize the fiscal stability of the operation. These proposed rates were carefully evaluated prior to presentation to the Student Housing Advisory Board and senior staff in Student Success. Rental income is pledged as part of a long-range renovation program which will continue to be financed by bonds. Each project is evaluated carefully to ensure the building's income can support its operation and debt service. The bonds to finance the GSP renovation which we expect to sell early in 2011 are no different. Inability to guarantee bond obligations would compromise the department's ability to finance future renovation projects.

Prepared: October 26, 2010
Diana L. Robertson, Director
Department of Student Housing

**The University of Kansas Department of Student Housing
Supplemental Financial Information
KBOR Rate Increase Request**

	Projected FY 2012*	Estimated FY 2011	Actual FY 2010	Actual FY 2009
Gross Operating Revenue	21,609,000	22,426,000	21,833,230	21,276,021
Gross Operating Expense	<u>(17,862,000)</u>	<u>(17,359,000)</u>	<u>(16,867,578)</u>	<u>(16,064,996)</u>
Gross Operating Revenue (Loss)(1)	3,747,000	5,067,000	4,965,652	5,202,025
Capital Improvements Expense	(2,120,000)	(2,060,000)	(1,032,255)	(3,986,087)
Annual Debt Service	(2,802,433)	(2,802,771)	(1,771,965)	(2,000,146)
Other Capital Expenditures	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	<u>(1,175,433)</u>	<u>204,229</u>	<u>2,161,432</u>	<u>(784,208)</u>
Ending Balance (2)	6,509,653	7,685,086	7,480,857	5,319,425
Occupancy Rate	97.0%	91.9%	92.4%	98.4%

*GSP Hall closed for renovation in Fiscal Year 2012: reduced capacity = higher occupancy rate

Long-Term Debt Outstanding (as of 6/30)	36,790,000	38,160,000	27,805,000	28,600,000
Includes Lewis Hall (1998D), Ellsworth Hall (2002A-1), Hashinger Hall (2005E-2), Templin Hall Refunding (2005E-1), and Jayhawker Towers A and D renovations (2010A)				

Capital Improvements Planned

FY11-12	\$13.10m	Gertrude Sellards Pearson Residence Hall renovation
FY13	\$11.75m	McCollum Residence Hall – Phase I renovation

Capital Improvements Description

FY12 – full renovation of this 428-bed, all-female facility to a 377-bed, coed facility with a combination of single and double occupancy rooms and suite-style rooms (Gertrude Sellards Pearson Hall)

FY13 – phase one of a three-phase full renovation of this 920-bed, coed facility to a 776-bed coed facility with a variety of suite-style rooms (McCollum Residence Hall)

- (1) Bond covenants require 1.15 times annual debt service.
- (2) Fund Balance excludes unearned advance payments that have been collected for the upcoming academic year. The remaining balance is primarily in place for cash flow needs such as those associated with payroll and operating expenses during the months when no revenue is being collected, funding for capital projects, and emergency equipment and building repairs. KU’s housing buildings have a replacement value in excess of \$290 million. Long term market competitiveness and fiscal stability requires a properly maintained physical plant.

**Kansas State University
HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICE RATES**

I. PROPOSED RATES (Room and Board)

These rates have been thoroughly reviewed by staff and overwhelmingly supported by the Association of Residence Halls.

**Regular Semester
Effective July 1, 2011**

<u>Single Students Per Person</u> ***	Room & Meals *	
	<u>Present</u>	<u>Recommended**</u>
Residence Halls - 20 Meal Plan		
Double Room	\$3,477.00	\$3,599.00
Small Single Room	3,666.00	3,794.00
Double Room - Continuous	3,804.00	3,937.00
Residence Halls - 15 Meal Plan (any 15 per week)		
Double Room	\$3,432.00	\$3,552.00
Small Single Room	3,620.00	3,747.00
Double Room - Continuous	3,721.00	3,851.00
Residence Halls - 10 Meal Plan (any 10 per week)		
Double Room	\$3,401.00	\$3,520.00
Small Single Room	3,590.00	3,716.00
Double Room - Continuous	3,665.00	3,793.00
Cooperative House - 20 Meal Plan ****		
Double Room	\$2,921.00	\$3,023.00
Suite Options		
1 Person Regular Semester	\$981.00	\$1,015.00
1 Person Continuous	1,143.00	1,183.00
2 Person Regular Semester	\$820.00	\$849.00
2 Person Continuous	955.00	988.00
3 Person Regular Semester	\$655.00	\$678.00
3 Person Continuous	763.00	790.00
4 Person Regular Semester	\$494.00	\$511.00
4 Person Continuous	575.00	595.00

* Includes house keeping service other than within rooms. Sunday evening meals are not served.

** Plus a non-refundable application fee of \$30.00 per academic year or \$15.00 for second semester, from which a sum not to exceed \$25.00 may be deducted as a recreational and social fee.

*** For payment due dates, cancellation dates and charges, please refer to “Student Housing Contract Terms”.

**** Plus assisting with house and food service operations on an average of one hour per day.
No house keeping service.

**Salina Campus Regular Semester^{1,2}
Effective July 1, 2011**

Single Students Per Person

	Room & Meals	
	<u>Present</u>	<u>Recommended</u>
Residence Halls - 14 Meal Plan		
Double Room	\$2,785.00	\$2,882.00
Single Room	4,461.00	4,617.00
Residence Halls - 19 Meal Plan		
Double Room	\$2,979.00	\$3,083.00
Single Room	4,655.00	4,818.00
Other Salina Campus Housing Fees		
Application Fee	\$30.00	\$30.00
Cancellation Fee	200.00	200.00

¹ A sum not to exceed \$25.00 may be deducted as a recreational and social fee.

² The Cancellation Fee will be charged for all signed contracts that are terminated. Refund of hall payments will be based on the University refund schedule for tuition and fees.

**Manhattan Campus Apartments^{1,2}
Effective July 1, 2011
Rate Per Month**

<u>Traditional Rate Per Apartment 1, 2,</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Recommended</u>
One Bedroom Furnished	\$400.00	\$414.00
One Bedroom Unfurnished	378.00	391.00
Two Bedroom Furnished	462.00	484.00
Two Bedroom Unfurnished	446.00	461.00
<u>Renovated Rate Per Apartment 1, 2</u>		
One Bedroom Furnished	\$452.00	\$467.00
One Bedroom Unfurnished	431.00	444.00
Two Bedroom Furnished	520.00	538.00
Two Bedroom Unfurnished	499.00	516.00
<u>Highly Renovated Rate Per Apartment 1, 2, 3</u>		
One Bedroom Unfurnished	\$465.00	\$480.00
Two Bedroom Unfurnished	550.00	575.00
Three Bedroom Unfurnished	645.00	675.00
Four Bedroom Unfurnished	735.00	760.00
<u>New Construction Rate Per Person 1, 2, 3</u>		
One Bedroom Unfurnished	\$546.00	\$565.00
Two Bedroom Unfurnished	484.00	484.00
Three Bedroom Unfurnished	418.00	418.00
Four Bedroom Unfurnished	375.00	390.00
Studio Unfurnished	505.00	525.00
Town House Unfurnished	998.00	998.00
Studio Loft Unfurnished	525.00	540.00

¹In addition to the monthly rates, a refundable deposit of \$400.00 is required at time of application and a non-refundable application fee of \$30.00 for each application from which a sum not to exceed \$25.00 may be deducted as a recreational and social fee. A late payment fee of \$10.00 will be charged for apartment rent not paid when due.

²Students provide linen, dishes, telephone and electricity.

**Summer Session
Effective May, 2011**

Room and 20 Meals Weekly	Double Room as Single		Double Room	
	<u>Present</u>	<u>Recommended</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Recommended</u>
	\$319.00	\$330.00	\$212.00	\$219.00
Room and 15 Meals Weekly	Double Room as Single		Double Room	
	<u>Present</u>	<u>Recommended</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Recommended</u>
	\$316.00	\$327.00	\$209.00	\$216.00
Room and 10 Meals Weekly	Double Room as Single		Double Room	
	<u>Present</u>	<u>Recommended</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Recommended</u>
	\$313.00	\$324.00	\$207.00	\$214.00
<u>Salina Campus</u>				
Room and 15 Meals Weekly	Single Room		Double Room	
	<u>Present</u>	<u>Recommended</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Recommended</u>
	\$206.00	\$213.00	\$171.00	\$177.00
Room and 10 Meals Weekly	Single Room		Double Room	
	<u>Present</u>	<u>Recommended</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Recommended</u>
	\$184.00	\$190.00	\$149.00	\$154.00

Optional Meal Plans For Residents of Housing and Dining Services Apartments Per Semester

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Recommended</u>
<u>Manhattan Campus</u>		
Optional 5 Meal Plan (Lunch, M-F)	\$ 535.00	\$ 554.00
Optional 10 Meal Plan	1,390.00	1,439.00
Optional 15 Meal Plan	1,420.00	1,470.00
Optional 20 Meal Plan	1,450.00	1,501.00
<u>Salina Campus</u>		
Optional 5 Meal Plan (Lunch, M-F)	\$ 414.00	\$ 428.00

II. Expenditure Impact of Proposal.

The proposed rates are recommended to cover increased costs. Expenditures for salaries and benefits, facility maintenance, food, utilities, and other operational categories such as technology are expected to rise about 3.5% collectively. Because K-State does not require any student to live in university owned residence halls or apartments, we must provide excellent facilities and exemplary service to maintain the optimal number of residents.

Classified Pay Plan	\$120,000	Student Labor	\$100,000
Food costs Increase	\$127,000	Technology	\$30,000
Health Insurance Increase	\$217,000	Facility Maintenance	\$100,000
Utilities Increase	\$150,000	Household Supplies	\$100,000
		Other Operational Categories	\$60,000

III. Revenue Impact of Proposal

Our Housing System operates as an auxiliary unit so all projected revenue is deposited to auxiliary funds. The estimated additional revenue, an increase of about 3.5% over FY 2011 Residence Hall and Apartment income, is categorized as follows:

Residence Halls	\$ 1,125,000
-----------------	--------------

Apartments	\$ 116,000
Total Revenue	\$ 1,241,000 (including dining service)

IV. Estimated Benefits from Proposal

Approximately 5,200 students living in Residence Halls, Cooperative House and apartments will be affected. The proposed increases are primarily driven by inflationary increases in costs for labor, utilities, food and facility maintenance. Additionally, planned upgrades to roofs, elevators, dining service facilities and academic support facilities require resources. Even though it's a challenge, we successfully maintain room and board rates that are below national and Big XII averages. Within the Big XII, we will remain in the lower one-fourth.

V. Alternatives to Proposal.

None identified. Because Housing and Dining is entirely self supporting, user fees must cover costs.

VI. Impact of Not Implementing Proposal

The Housing and Dining Services annual operating budget is approximately \$35.6 million. The insured replacement value of the housing facilities is about \$280 million. Prudent management and legally binding bond covenants require a fiscally stable budget and a properly maintained physical plant – in other words a stable future. Failure to properly plan, budget and operate would compromise our ability to meet core responsibilities to students. Additionally, failure to meet bond covenants would jeopardize any University efforts to finance future capital improvements.

VII. Supplemental Financial Information

Salina and Manhattan Campuses	Projected FY 2012	Projected FY 2011	Actual FY 2010	Actual FY 2009	Actual FY 2008
Gross Operating Revenue	36,841,000	35,600,000	34,562,000	32,392,000	28,970,000
Salaries and Wages	16,258,000	15,821,000	15,458,000	14,253,000	13,717,000
Other Operating Expenditures	13,610,000	13,043,000	12,793,000	13,231,000	10,312,000
Total Gross Operating Expense	29,868,000	28,864,000	28,251,000	27,484,000	24,029,000
Gross Operating Revenue(Loss) (1)	6,973,000	6,736,000	6,311,000	4,909,000	4,941,000
Capital Improvements Expense	3,498,000	3,295,000	1,526,000	676,000	450,000
Annual Debt Service	4,520,000	4,529,000	4,317,000	4,169,000	3,366,000
Other Capital Expenditures	100,000	100,000	22,000	263,000	185,000
Net Operating Revenue(Loss)	(1,145,000)	(1,188,000)	445,000	(199,000)	941,000
Occupancy Rate	98.71%	99.58%	98.33%	99.58%	98.33%
Housing System Earned Fund Balance (2)	8,918,000	10,062,000	11,251,000	10,806,000	11,005,000
L/T Debt Outstanding	64,505,000	66,125,000	67,700,000	69,210,000	70,675,000

*Capital Improvements Planned:

FY 2011 - \$3,295,000 (Roofs, Elevators, Furniture, \$1 million West Hall upgrade and \$1 million Food Service facility upgrade)

FY 2012 - \$3,497,500 (Roofs, Elevators and Furniture and \$2 million Food Service facility upgrade)

- (1) Bond covenants require 1.25 times annual debt service.
- (2) Fund Balance excludes unearned advance payments that have been collected for the upcoming academic year. The remaining balance is primarily in place for cash flow needs such as those associated with dining services, employment protection issues, reserves for capital projects (as noted above), and emergency equipment and

building repairs. KSU's housing buildings have a replacement value in excess of \$250 million. Long term fiscal stability requires a properly maintained physical plant.

Proposed Housing and Board Rates for Fiscal Year 2012

Wichita State University requests authorization to amend the Comprehensive Fee Schedule for Fiscal Year 2012 for the following adjustments to housing rates in the residence halls.

**Wichita State University
Proposed Housing and Board Rates for Fiscal Year 2012
Academic Year 2011-2012**

Brennan Halls Proposed Fiscal Year 2012 Room and Board Options

<u>Plan Type</u>	<u>FY 2011 Double Occupancy</u>	<u>Proposed FY 2012 Double Occupancy</u>	<u>Percent Increase</u>	<u>FY 2011 Single Occupancy</u>	<u>Proposed FY 2012 Single Occupancy</u>	<u>Percent Increase</u>
<u>Academic Year 2011-2012</u>						
<u>Standard Size Room</u>						
19 Meal Plan with \$200 Shocker Dollars	\$5,450	\$5,600	2.75%	\$6,530	\$6,680	2.30%
15 Meal Plan with \$200 Shocker Dollars	\$5,410	\$5,560	2.77%	\$6,490	\$6,640	2.31%
10 Meal Plan with \$200 Shocker Dollars	\$5,250	\$5,390	2.67%	\$6,330	\$6,470	2.21%
5 Meal Plan with \$200 Shocker Dollars	\$4,020	\$4,120	2.49%	\$5,100	\$5,200	1.96%
19 Meal Plan with \$300 Shocker Dollars	\$5,550	\$5,700	2.70%	\$6,630	\$6,780	2.26%
15 Meal Plan with \$300 Shocker Dollars	\$5,510	\$5,660	2.72%	\$6,590	\$6,740	2.28%
10 Meal Plan with \$300 Shocker Dollars	\$5,350	\$5,490	2.62%	\$6,430	\$6,570	2.18%
5 Meal Plan with \$300 Shocker Dollars	\$4,120	\$4,220	2.43%	\$5,200	\$5,300	1.92%
\$500 Shocker Dollars	\$3,200	\$3,250	1.56%	\$4,280	\$4,330	1.17%
\$750 Shocker Dollars	\$3,450	\$3,500	1.45%	\$4,530	\$4,580	1.10%
\$1,000 Shocker Dollars	\$3,700	\$3,750	1.35%	\$4,780	\$4,830	1.05%
\$1,500 Shocker Dollars	\$4,200	\$4,250	1.19%	\$5,280	\$5,330	0.95%
<u>Large Size Room</u>						
19 Meal Plan with \$200 Shocker Dollars	\$5,675	\$5,800	2.20%	\$6,755	\$6,880	1.85%
15 Meal Plan with \$200 Shocker Dollars	\$5,635	\$5,760	2.22%	\$6,715	\$6,840	1.86%
10 Meal Plan with \$200 Shocker Dollars	\$5,475	\$5,590	2.10%	\$6,555	\$6,670	1.75%
5 Meal Plan with \$200 Shocker Dollars	\$4,245	\$4,320	1.77%	\$5,325	\$5,400	1.41%
19 Meal Plan with \$300 Shocker Dollars	\$5,775	\$5,900	2.16%	\$6,855	\$6,980	1.82%
15 Meal Plan with \$300 Shocker Dollars	\$5,735	\$5,860	2.18%	\$6,815	\$6,940	1.83%
10 Meal Plan with \$300 Shocker Dollars	\$5,575	\$5,690	2.06%	\$6,655	\$6,770	1.73%
5 Meal Plan with \$300 Shocker Dollars	\$4,345	\$4,420	1.73%	\$5,425	\$5,500	1.38%
\$500 Shocker Dollars	\$3,425	\$3,450	0.73%	\$4,505	\$4,530	0.55%
\$750 Shocker Dollars	\$3,675	\$3,700	0.68%	\$4,755	\$4,780	0.53%
\$1,000 Shocker Dollars	\$3,925	\$3,950	0.64%	\$5,005	\$5,030	0.50%
\$1,500 Shocker Dollars	\$4,425	\$4,450	0.56%	\$5,505	\$5,530	0.45%

Summer Session 2011

Standard Size Room

Pre-Session with \$75 Shocker Dollars ((\$55 Shocker Dollars in Summer Session 2009))	\$255	\$255	0.00%	\$345	\$345	0.00%
--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Note: The following plans include \$125 Shocker Dollars

Four Week Session	\$405	\$405	0.00%	\$545	\$545	0.00%
Pre-Session Plus Four Week Session	\$585	\$585	0.00%	\$815	\$815	0.00%
Eight Week Session	\$685	\$685	0.00%	\$965	\$965	0.00%
Pre-Session Plus Eight Week Session	\$865	\$865	0.00%	\$1,235	\$1,235	0.00%

**Brennan Halls
Proposed Fiscal Year 2012 Room and Board Options (cont.)**

Summer Session 2011 (cont.)

Large Size Room

Pre-Session with \$75 Shocker Dollars	\$273	\$273	0.00%	\$363	\$363	0.00%
---------------------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Note: The following plans include \$125 Shocker Dollars

Four Week Session	\$433	\$433	0.00%	\$573	\$573	0.00%
Pre-Session Plus Four Week Session	\$631	\$631	0.00%	\$861	\$861	0.00%
Eight Week Session	\$741	\$741	0.00%	\$1,021	\$1,021	0.00%
Pre-Session Plus Eight Week Session	\$939	\$939	0.00%	\$1,309	\$1,309	0.00%

Fairmount Towers
Proposed Fiscal Year 2012 Room and Board Options

<u>Plan Type</u>	<u>FY 2011 Double Occupancy</u>	<u>Proposed FY 2012 Double Occupancy</u>	<u>Percent Increase</u>	<u>FY 2011 Single Occupancy</u>	<u>Proposed FY 2012 Single Occupancy</u>	<u>Percent Increase</u>
<u>Academic Year 2011-2012</u>						
19 Meal Plan with \$200 Shocker Dollars	\$6,200	\$6,350	2.42%	\$7,280	\$7,280	0.00%
15 Meal Plan with \$200 Shocker Dollars	\$6,160	\$6,310	2.44%	\$7,240	\$7,240	0.00%
10 Meal Plan with \$200 Shocker Dollars	\$6,000	\$6,140	2.33%	\$7,080	\$7,080	0.00%
19 Meal Plan with \$300 Shocker Dollars	\$6,300	\$6,450	2.38%	\$7,380	\$7,380	0.00%
15 Meal Plan with \$300 Shocker Dollars	\$6,260	\$6,410	2.40%	\$7,340	\$7,340	0.00%
10 Meal Plan with \$300 Shocker Dollars	\$6,100	\$6,240	2.30%	\$7,180	\$7,180	0.00%
<u>Summer Session 2011</u>						
Pre-Session with 10 Meal Plan	\$362	\$362	0.00%	\$461	\$461	0.00%
Four Week Session	\$562	\$562	0.00%	\$716	\$716	0.00%
Pre-Session Plus Four Week Session	\$889	\$889	0.00%	\$1,142	\$1,142	0.00%
Eight Week Session	\$1,124	\$1,124	0.00%	\$1,432	\$1,432	0.00%
Pre-Session Plus Eight Week Session	\$1,451	\$1,451	0.00%	\$1,858	\$1,858	0.00%

Note: The above plans include 10 meals per week with no Shocker Dollars. 15 and 19 meal plans are available for an additional \$20/week and \$30/week respectively.

Wheatshocker Hall

Proposed Fiscal Year 2012 Room and Board Options

<u>Apartment Style</u>	<u>FY 2011 Monthly Rate</u>	<u>Proposed FY 2012 Monthly Rate</u>	<u>Percent Increase</u>
<u>Plan 5, Single, Two Bedroom-One Bath</u>			
One Person in Each Bedroom	\$550	\$550	0.00%
<u>Plan 4, Two Bedroom-Two Bath</u>			
Two Persons Share Large Room as Double Room	\$450	\$450	0.00%
One Person in Small Room as a Single	\$550	\$550	0.00%
<u>Plan 3, Four Bedroom-One Bath</u>			
One Half Suite (One Apartment)	\$450	\$450	0.00%
One Fourth Suite	\$290	\$290	0.00%
<u>Plan 2, Large Corner Suite</u>			
Large Half Suite (One Apartment)	\$550	\$550	0.00%
<u>Plan 1, Studio, One Bedroom</u>			
One Bath, One Person	\$550	\$550	0.00%
<u>Plan 5, Double, Accessible One Bedroom-One Bath</u>			
Two Persons in Double Room	\$450	\$450	0.00%
<u>Plan 6, Large Studio, Accessible One Bedroom-One Bath</u>			
One Person	\$635	\$635	0.00%

**Other Housing Fees Proposed for
Fiscal Year 2012**

<u>Fee Description</u>	<u>FY 2011 Rate</u>	<u>Proposed FY 2012 Rate</u>	<u>Percent Increase</u>
<u>Fairmount Towers and Brennan Halls</u>			
Non-Refundable Application Fee	\$50	\$75	50.00%
Contract Prepayment	\$200	\$200	0.00%
Late Payment Fee	\$15	\$15	0.00%
Contract Cancellation Fee	\$250	\$250	0.00%
<u>Wheatshocker Apartments</u>			
Non-Refundable Application Fee	\$50	\$75	50.00%
Late Payment Fee	\$15	\$15	0.00%
Refundable Deposit	\$200	\$200	0.00%
Contract Cancellation Fee	\$250	\$250	0.00%
Furnished Room Monthly Fee for Plan 3	\$50	\$50	0.00%

Note: The \$200 deposit is refundable, but subject to damage, cancellation and/or check-out charges.

Expenditure Impact of the Proposal

The revenue received from the proposed housing and board rates will be used to pay for operating expenditures, utilities, staffing, capital expenditures, major remodeling and improvements and debt service on the residence halls. The Fiscal Year 2012 rate increases will also cover mandatory meal plan cost increases in accordance with the WSU’s food service management contract.

Revenue Impact of the Proposal

The increased revenue anticipated from the proposed housing and board rates are estimated to be approximately \$75,000. This would impact 1,010 students.

Student Involvement with the Proposal

The proposed rate changes were submitted to the Residential Housing Association and other student housing groups. The members approved the proposed rates for Fiscal Year 2012 without changes.

Estimated Benefits from the Proposal

Students who live on campus accrue a variety of benefits, including easy access to classrooms, laboratories, dining facilities, Ablah Library, the Heskett Center and the Rhatigan Student Center. Professional and paraprofessional staff members live in each building to provide academic and personal support services to the residents. Additionally, residents are provided with computer rooms, laundry facilities, meeting facilities, and are more easily able to participate in campus events and activities compared to those who commute. Cable television service, local telephone service and Ethernet connections are provided to each student room. Extensive renovations to Fairmount Towers have resulted in improvements to the quality of the residential living experience. Scheduled facilities maintenance projects for Fiscal Years 2011 and 2012 are listed in the Supplemental Financial Information below. The cost of the aforementioned items is included in the recommended rates outlined in this proposal and from existing reserves.

Alternatives to the Proposal

Alternatives to the proposed rate increases have not been identified. The projected revenue from the increased rates is to be used for inflationary increases in expenditures for basic services, planned improvements and contractual agreements as mentioned above. As an auxiliary operation, housing must cover all expenses through fees charged to students living in the residence hall facilities.

Impact of Not Implementing the Proposal

If the proposed housing and board rates are not implemented, the current financial stability of the housing and residence life operations would be compromised. Financial stability is also important to maintaining quality ratings on the outstanding revenue bonds.

Implementation Date

If approved, the rates will become effective on July 1, 2011. Rates for the summer session housing will become effective with the beginning of the summer contract.

Wichita State University
Supplemental Financial Information

	<u>Projected FY 2012</u>	<u>Projected FY 2011</u>	<u>Actual FY 2010</u>	<u>Actual FY 2009</u>	<u>Actual FY 2008</u>	
Gross Operating Revenue	\$6,137,677	\$6,062,677	\$6,275,415	\$6,610,994	\$6,021,270	(1)
Gross Operating Expense	4,650,000	4,597,242	3,783,882	3,416,481	3,244,588	
Gross Operating Revenue (Loss) (2)	<u>\$1,487,677</u>	<u>\$1,465,435</u>	<u>\$2,491,533</u>	<u>\$3,194,513</u>	<u>\$2,776,682</u>	
Capital Improvements Expense (See Below)	\$800,000	\$1,223,000	\$1,288,515	\$1,287,425	\$1,130,244	
Annual Debt Service	1,207,526	1,202,687	956,798	953,698	958,998	
Other Capital Expenditures	0	4,500	766,704	136,184	127,558	
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	<u>(\$519,849)</u>	<u>(\$964,752)</u>	<u>(\$520,484)</u>	<u>\$817,206</u>	<u>\$559,882</u>	
Occupancy Rate	88.7%	88.7%	92.3%	95.1%	98.3%	
Housing System Earned Fund Balance (3)	\$3,119,986	\$3,639,835	\$4,604,587	\$5,125,071	\$4,307,865	
Long Term Debt Outstanding	\$8,455,000	\$9,250,000	\$10,010,000	\$9,235,000	\$9,755,000	

Notes to Supplemental Financial Information

- (1) Fiscal Year 2008 actual revenue included a one time increase of \$283,000 from nonrefundable deposits that were held in a Housing System Suspense Fund.
- (2) Bond covenants require coverage of 1.25 times the annual debt service.
- (3) Balances in the Housing Funds are needed for cash flow purposes, current and future capital equipment purchases, current and future major maintenance needs, and the final debt service payment. The Housing Bond Reserve Account has a bond covenant required fund balance of over \$950,000 to fund the balloon debt service payment in Fiscal Year 2021. Fund balances also provide additional security for bondholders and enhance the financial security for bond rating purposes.

Capital Improvement Expense

Fiscal Year 2011: WSU is working with FCIP to replace units in Brennan Hall with heat pumps that use geothermal technology for heating and cooling. In addition, occupancy sensors have been added to Fairmount Towers to assist with energy conversation. The following infrastructure improvements are also planned for Fiscal Year 2011:

Replace Boilers	\$250,000
Upgrade and Modernize Elevator Controls	500,000
Replacement of Lock Systems	248,000
Roof Replacement-Wheatshocker	225,000

Fiscal Year 2012: Continue replacement of lock systems, and major repainting and carpet replacement.

**Emporia State University
Division of Student Affairs
Department of Residential Life and Memorial Union Corporation**

**Statement of proposed Residence Hall and Contract Board Rates
Academic Year 2011-2012**

Emporia State University requests authorization to amend the Comprehensive Fee Schedule, effective fall semester 2011 as follows:

Description of Fee Adjustment: Figures shown represent academic year totals, unless otherwise noted. The housing and meal contract's default time period includes both the fall 2011 and the spring 2012 semesters.

Room & Board Options

	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>% Increase</u>	<u>Total Standard Double Room+Board, % Increase</u>
Standard Double Rate (Morse, Singular, Trusler)	\$3,180	\$3,270	\$90	2.83%	
Single Room Rate (Morse, Singular, Trusler)	\$4,150	\$4,270	\$120	2.89%	
Morse Triple Rate	\$3,660	\$3,760	\$100	2.73%	
Towers Double Rate	\$3,550	\$3,650	\$100	2.82%	
Towers Suite Rate	\$3,740	\$3,850	\$110	2.94%	
Towers Single Rate	\$4,500	\$4,630	\$130	2.89%	
All Access Meal Plan	\$3,050	\$3,110	\$60	1.97%	\$6380, 2.41%
15 Block Meal Plan	\$2,970	\$3,030	\$60	2.02%	\$6300, 2.44%
10 Block Meal Plan	\$2,560	\$2,610	\$50	1.95%	\$5880, 2.44%
One Bedroom Apt.	\$2,340	\$2,430	\$90	3.85%	
Two Bedroom Apt.	\$3,060	\$3,150	\$90	2.94%	

Justification for Fee Adjustment and Projected Revenue

Residence Hall Impact

Proposed room rates for FY12 have been held to increases of approximately 3.00%. Rate increases will generate additional gross revenue of approximately \$90,000. Estimated expenses for FY 2012 are expected to hold flat or increase moderately, with most depending upon changes to utility rates, fringe benefit rates, or to salaries through phase three of the classified pay plan adjustments. Any additional revenue, not obligated by operating increases, will be utilized to finance capital improvements in the residence halls.

Memorial Union Impact

The proposed rates for meal plans represent a 2.00% increase in food plan costs. Proposed adjustments to the board rate are needed to meet the higher food costs of dining operations. All students living in the Residence Halls participate in the one of the meal plans. The proposed increase would generate approximately \$39,000 of additional revenue, which will be used to fund projected increased costs of the food service contract for FY12.

Review of Proposal Increases

The Residence Hall and meal plan increases were developed in consultation with students who live in the residence halls, serve on the Memorial Union board of directors and Associated Student Government. The proposed increases contained in this document were presented to the Memorial Union Board of Directors and approved by that body on October 8, 2010. Housing rate increases were presented to and discussed through the residence hall Complex Governments on October 24-25, 2010. They were discussed with the University's Budget Development and Tuition Committee on October 22, 2010.

**Emporia State University
Housing System Financial Report Summary Prepared for KBOR Increase Request
Fiscal Years 2008 through 2012**

	Projected <u>FY 2012</u>	Estimated <u>FY 2011</u>	Actual <u>FY 2010</u>	Actual <u>FY 2009</u>	Actual <u>FY 2008</u>
Gross Operating Revenue	\$3,543,450	\$3,095,217	\$3,423,330	\$3,376,618	\$3,577,872
Salaries and Wages	1,484,852	1,455,738	1,343,922	1,388,806	1,406,789
Other Operating Expenditures	763,138	763,138	753,078	855,514	832,551
Gross Operating Expense	<u>2,247,990</u>	<u>2,218,876</u>	<u>2,097,000</u>	<u>2,244,320</u>	<u>2,239,340</u>
Gross Operating Revenue Gain/(Loss) (a)	<u>\$1,295,460</u>	<u>\$876,341</u>	<u>\$1,326,330</u>	<u>\$1,132,298</u>	<u>\$1,338,532</u>
Capital Improvements Expense	\$350,000	\$200,000	\$265,334	\$368,215	\$193,837
Annual Debt Service	720,960	713,880	688,226	707,938	673,571
Other Transfers	250,000	250,000	319,403	193,497	321,523
Other Transfers - Topeka Cuts			4,569	61,843	
Bond Reserve Matured			(173,256)		
Net Operating Revenue Gain/(Loss)	<u>(\$25,500)</u>	<u>(\$287,539)</u>	<u>\$222,054</u>	<u>(\$199,195)</u>	<u>\$149,601</u>
Operating Fund Balance-June 30th (b)	\$659,916	\$685,416	\$972,955	\$750,901	\$950,096
Occupancy Rate (c)	85.0%	85.0%	72.0%	74.0%	93.0%
Long Term Debt Outstanding	\$7,425,000	\$7,825,000	\$8,205,000	\$8,580,000	\$8,960,000

Capital Improvements Planned (d)

Fiscal Year 2011:		\$200,000
Fiscal Year 2012:	\$350,000	

- (a) Bond covenants require 1.25 times annual debt service
- (b) Operating Fund Balance excludes advance payments which have been collected as a debt service reserve.
The Operating Fund Balance is primarily in place to: (1) protect operations from unexpected fluctuations in revenue; (2) finance changes in employment costs; (3) provide reserves for capital projects; and (4) provide financing for emergency equipment or repairs
- (c) Occupancy rates reflect adjustment for reduction in capacity of 120 beds
- (d) Capital Improvements Actual/Planned
 - FY 09 Continued Remodeling of Singular/Trusler Area
 - FY10 Continued remodeling and windows in Singular/Trusler Area; Improved Internet in Morse, Singular/Trusler
 - FY11 Finish internet in Morse and Towers
 - FY12 Phase 1 of Substantial remodeling of Morse (assuming availability of funding)

REQUEST AMENDMENT TO HOUSING RATES - Pittsburg State University

In accordance with Board Policy, Pittsburg State University requests that the Board of Regents consider for final action at its December, 2010, meeting the following adjustments in housing rates to be effective with the 2011 Fall Semester.

Residence Halls

Academic Year

	<u>10-11</u>	<u>11-12</u>
Double Room/Seven Day Access	\$6016	\$6288
Double Room/Any 14 Access	5656	5910
Double Room/Any 10 Access	5314	5524
Single room charge (maximum)	900	900
Crimson Commons room additional charge*	1000	1000
Willard Hall room additional charge	440	440
Renovated Hall room additional charge	220	220
Application fee	45	45
Installment fee (optional payment plan)**	32	32
Late Payment fee**	30	30

*New residence hall complex opened Fall 2010

**University Housing merged with university consolidated billing and payment plan Fall 2009

	<u>10-11</u>	<u>11-12</u>	Increase for <u>Debt Service</u>	<u>%</u>	Increase for <u>Annual Cost</u>	<u>%</u>
Double Room/Unlimited Meal Plan	\$6016	\$6288	\$100	1.66	\$172	2.86
Double Room/14 Meal Plan	5656	5910	100	1.77	154	2.72
Double Room/10 Meal Plan	5314	5524	100	1.88	110	2.10

Student Family Apartments

Academic Year

	<u>10-11</u>	<u>11-12</u>
Two Bedroom	\$480	\$480
Three Bedroom	545	545
Processing Fee for each new lease	45	45
Late Payment Fee	30	30

	<u>10-11</u>	<u>11-12</u>	Increase for <u>Debt Service</u>	<u>%</u>	Increase for <u>Annual Cost</u>	<u>%</u>
Two Bedroom	\$480	\$480	---	--	\$00.00	
Three Bedroom	545	545	---	--	\$00.00	

The proposed rates were developed by the Director of University Housing in consultation with the University Housing Accountant and the Associate Vice President for Campus Life and Auxiliary Services.

**Pittsburg State University
Financial Impact Statement
Housing Rates**

I. DESCRIPTION OF RATE ADJUSTMENT

An increase in the rates is proposed. If approved, the new rate schedule would be effective for the 2011 fall semester.

Residence Halls	Academic Year		Increase for		Increase for	
	<u>10 – 11</u>	<u>11 – 12</u>	<u>Debt Service</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Annual Cost</u>	<u>%</u>
Double Room/Unlimited Meal Plan	\$6016	\$6288	\$100	1.66	\$ 172	2.86
Double Room/14 Meal Plan	5656	5910	100	1.77	\$ 154	2.72
Double Room/10 Meal Plan	5314	5524	100	1.88	110	3.09
Single room charge (maximum)	900	900	--	----	---	----
Crimson Commons room charge*	1000	1000	--	----	---	----
Willard Hall room charge	440	440	--	----	---	----
Renovated Hall room charge	220	220	--	----	---	----
Application fee	45	45	--	----	---	----
Installment fee (optional payment plan)**	32	32	--	----	---	----
Late payment fee**	30	30	--	----	---	----

*New residence hall complex opened Fall 2010

**University Housing merged with university consolidated billing and payment plan Fall 2009

Crimson Village Apartments

Two Bedroom	\$480	\$480	--	----	--	----
Three Bedroom	545	545	--	----	--	----
Processing Fee (new lease)	45	45	--	----	--	----
Late Payment fee	30	30	--	----	--	----

II. JUSTIFICATION FOR RATE ADJUSTMENT

In late May, 2009, Pittsburg State University began an ambitious but critical, multi-year, \$22 million effort to renovate all existing residence halls (approximately 1,100 beds) and a twelve month project to construct a new residence hall complex designed to accommodate 204 additional students. Funding for the new construction and an initial phase of renovation (\$14 million) was derived from sale of bonds to be repaid from the revenues received from operation of the housing system. The revenue pledged for repayment of the bonds, approved in the initial authorization for the overall project, included in part, targeted room rental rate increases beyond those authorized for annual operating cost increases (\$100 per occupant per year for each of five consecutive years beginning FY09). The remaining increased revenue for debt service will come from occupancy growth derived from the additional bed space in the new construction and reallocation of historically large and growing annual expenditures for maintenance of facilities from that category to debt service. The \$100 addition per occupant represents 1.66 percent of the 4.52 percent proposed increase.

Aside from annual debt service, the remaining majority of University Housing expenditures are tied to areas that are subject to annual increases (food service board plan rate increase negotiated with contract provider, utility costs, and salaries and benefits). In recent fiscal years, these expenses have increased at a significantly higher rate than general sectors of the economy. Although the economy and state budget have provided a moratorium on annual across the board wage increases for staff for the current fiscal year, the university funded a 1% increase for faculty and unclassified staff (self-funded by auxiliary operations such as University Housing). Food service, utilities, and benefits costs continue to increase. Specifically, over the past five fiscal years, expenditures for food service, energy, salary and benefits have increased an average of nearly 7% annually. Approximately 2.86 percent of the proposed 4.52 percent rate increase will be targeted to cover those items subject to annual increases and inflation.

III. STUDENT REVIEW OF FEE ADJUSTMENT

The rate adjustment for residence halls was presented to the Residence Hall Assembly at their September 28, 2010, regular session. The assembly voted in favor of the proposed changes at that same meeting, by the following vote: 34 affirmative, 0 negative, and 1 abstention. The group endorsed the university's continuing efforts to invest funds in the updating and improvement of the residence halls and the construction of new facilities to provide additional on-campus housing.

V. PROJECTION OF REVENUE FROM AND NUMBER OF STUDENT AFFECTED BY FEE ADJUSTMENT

The rate increases should increase annual revenue by approximately \$300,000. Over 1,200 students are projected to live in the residence halls.

VI. PROJECTED IMPACT OF RATE ADJUSTMENT ON STUDENT OCCUPANCY

Because residence halls are in direct competition with off-campus rentals for student occupancy, any rate increase must remain within the appropriate levels that the overall market will support. University Housing is committed to providing students with high quality accommodations at reasonable rates. Given the proximity to campus, the programmatic efforts of the departmental staff, the amenities and services provided, and the reliable maintenance provided by the university, residence hall rates are very competitive with other student housing options of equal quality in the community.

Pittsburg State University Housing
KBOR Rate Increase Request
Supplemental Financial Information
October 4, 2010

Pittsburg State University Housing Supplemental Financial Information KBOR Rate Increase Request	Projected FY 2012	Estimated FY 2011	Actual FY 2010	Actual FY 2009
Gross Operating Revenue	\$ 6,900,000.00	\$ 6,600,000.00	\$6,317,422.00	\$6,113,599.00
Salaries and Benefits	1,850,000.00	1,795,903.00	1,572,754.00	1,588,500.00
Other Operating Expenses	<u>3,103,916.00</u>	<u>2,956,111.00</u>	<u>2,512,756.00</u>	<u>2,529,192.00</u>
Gross Operating Revenue(Loss) *a	\$ 1,946,084.00	\$ 1,847,986.00	\$2,231,912.00	\$1,995,907.00
Capital Improvements Expense	430,000.00	736,946.00	0.00	1,640,000.00
Annual Debt Service	1,429,332.00	1,049,780.00	1,024,986.00	422,236.00
Other Capital Expenditures	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Net Operating Revenue(Loss) * b	<u>\$ 86,752.00</u>	<u>\$ 61,260.00</u>	<u>\$ 1,206,926.00</u>	<u>\$ (66,329.00)</u>
Operating Fund Balance (EOY)	\$ 3,136,500.00	\$ 3,049,748.00	\$ 2,988,489.00	1,781,562.00
L/T Debt Outstanding	\$ 18,300,000.00	\$ 18,930,000.00	\$19,045,000.00	\$ 4,765,000.00
Occupancy Rate	100.00%	101.90%	99.40%	108.30%

Footnotes:

- a) There are currently three outstanding bond issues all carrying a 1.15 coverage ratio. Of the \$22.0 million approved for the current renovation project, \$14.630 million has been issued leaving \$7.370 million yet to be issued over the next couple of years.
- b) The operating fund balance is in place to provide adequate cash flow protection over an extended period of time. The estimated replacement value for existing housing facilities exceeds \$80.0 million. Some of the carryforward balance will be utilized in the next round of renovations (Tanner Hall) scheduled for next summer. The short term bridging between bond issues is expected to be in the range of \$1.1 million.

**FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY
DIVISION OF STUDENT AFFAIRS**
Department of Residential Life

Consistent with Board of Regents policy, the following amendments to the Comprehensive Fee Schedule are submitted to the Board's November 2010 meeting.

Recommended Residence Hall & Apartment Rates – 2011-2012
Rates are reported for both fall and spring semesters

Double Room Rates, Fall & Spring Semester

Accommodations/Plan	2010-2011 Rate	2011-2012 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
No meal plan	\$3,335	\$3,435	\$100	3%
Open access meal plan	\$6,625	\$6,837	\$212	3.2%
10 meals per week	\$6,457	\$6,682	\$207	3.2%
7 meals per week	\$6,430	\$6,635	\$205	3.2%

Single Room Rates, Fall & Spring Semester

Accommodations/Plan	2010-2011 Rate	2011-2012 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
No meal plan	\$4,415	\$4,547	\$132	2.9%
Open access meal plan	\$7,705	\$7,949	\$244	3.2%
10 Meals per week	\$7,555	\$7,794	\$239	3.2%
7 Meals per week	\$7,510	\$7,747	\$237	3.2%

Apartment Rental Rates Per Month

Accommodations (Unfurnished)	2010-2011 Rate	2011-2012 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
1 Bedroom	\$480	\$480	\$0	0%
2 Bedroom	\$558	\$558	\$0	0%
2 Bedroom Shared	\$408	\$408	\$0	0%

Additional Fees

Fee	2010-2011 Rate	2011-2012 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
Upgrade charge for a suite	\$1,236	\$200	(\$1,036)	(84%)
Application fee	\$35	\$35	\$0	0%
Late fee	\$25	\$25	\$0	0%

Weekly Rates

Accommodations	2010-2011 Rate	2011-2012 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
Room only between terms for persons not on continuing contract	\$110	\$113	\$3	2.7%
Guest room	\$160	\$165	\$5	3.1%

Daily Rates

Accommodations	2010-2011 Rate	2011-2012 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
Early arrival for students with housing contracts	\$50	\$52	\$2	4%
Guest Room	\$25	\$26	\$1	4%

Summer Term

Accommodations	2010-2011 Rate	2011-2012 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
Camper daily rate for a double room	\$13	\$13	\$0	0%
Camper daily rate for a single room	\$25	\$26	\$1	4%

**FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY
PROPOSED INCREASES IN RESIDENCE HALL, CONTRACT BOARD AND APARTMENT
RENTAL RATES AND FEES**

2011 -2012

Business Impact of Proposed Rates

Expenditures Impact

The proposed increase of 3% in traditional residence halls and 3.4% in contract board rates and no increase in campus-owned apartment rates will generate approximately \$200,000 in additional revenue for the 2012 fiscal year. These resources will become part of the base budget and will be expended for both salary and non-salary purposes. This increase is necessitated by a variety of facility and service upgrades from which our residents will immediately benefit. These improvements include remodeling and modernizing the McMIndes Hall community bathrooms, upgrades in furnishings within traditional halls, replacing outdated doors and windows in McMIndes Hall and necessary upgrades within the cafeteria including equipment and servery renovation. Due to past rate increases and the need to remain market competitive, no rate increase is recommended for the campus-owned Wooster Place apartment community.

Estimated Benefits from Proposal

The proposed increases will allow Residential Life to enhance departmental efficiency while improving facilities to meet the environmental quality standards our residents expect. The educational and developmental mission of the department and FHSU can be further developed through enhanced programming and student services funded through this proposal.

Alternatives to Proposal

The proposed rates of increase depicted on the accompanying “Recommended Residence Hall and Apartment Rates—2011-2012” were determined to be the most advantageous to all parties concerned. The rate proposal was presented to the Residence Hall Association at its regular meeting on Thursday, November 4, 2010.

Impact of Not Implementing Proposal

If rates are not increased as recommended for the coming year, it would be difficult to maintain facilities and would delay facility improvement creating a situation of sub-standard on-campus housing for FHSU students. Failure to increase rates may also result in adjustments in staffing and services to residents of the halls. If the proposed increases are not implemented, it would require deferment of essential maintenance on some facilities which may limit our ability to house students as demand warrants. The increased revenues will provide the necessary resources to operate with increased efficiency while improving student satisfaction.

Residential Life Supplemental Financial Information KBOR Rate Increase Request	Projected FY 2012	Estimated FY 2011	Actual FY 2010	Actual FY 2009
Gross Operating Revenue	\$ 6,180,435	\$ 5,901,605	\$ 5,886,311	\$ 5,427,628
Gross Operating Expense	\$ 4,218,988	\$ 4,040,164	\$ 3,959,888	\$ 3,946,805
Gross Operating Revenue(Loss)	\$ 1,961,447	\$ 1,861,441	\$ 1,926,423	\$ 1,480,823
Capital Improvements Expense	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 422,951	\$ 1,067,341
Annual Debt Service**	\$ 510,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 579,489	\$ 833,432
Other Capital Expenditures	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Net Operating Revenue(Loss)	\$ 451,447	\$ (38,559)	\$ 923,982	\$ (419,950)
Occupancy Rate	87%	85%	84%	80%
Reserve Balance (EOY) (1)	\$ 1,947,291	\$ 1,495,844	\$ 1,534,403	\$ 610,421
L/T Debt Outstanding	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,595,000
Capital Improvements Planned*				
FY 2011		\$ 1,400,000		
FY 2012	\$ 1,000,000			

*** Capital Improvements**

Description:

FY 2011- Second phase of a complete plumbing and restroom upgrade within McMindes Hall

FY 2012- First phase McMindes doors and windows project

**** Stadium Place project's estimated cash flow owed to the partnership.**

(1) The remaining balance is primarily in place for cash flow needs such as those associated reserves for capital projects (as noted above), emergency equipment replacement and building repairs. Long term fiscal stability requires a properly maintained physical plant. Facility repairs have been deficient in past years requiring additional reserves to complete improvement projects to meet expectations of today's students.

2. Approve Allocation of FY 2012 Rehabilitation and Repair Appropriation – Systemwide **Eric King,
Director of Facilities**

Allocation of Funds for Rehabilitation and Repair Projects for Institutions of Higher Education as Appropriated to the Kansas Board of Regents

FY 2012 - \$15,000,000 Educational Building Fund (EBF)

Adjusted gross square feet (GSF) (mission-critical buildings only):

	<u>GSF</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
The University of Kansas	5,488,301	26.87
The University of Kansas Medical Center	2,297,176	11.25
Kansas State University	6,105,374	29.90
Wichita State University	2,243,148	10.98
Emporia State University	1,232,601	6.04
Pittsburg State University	1,507,841	7.38
Fort Hays State University	<u>1,548,171</u>	<u>7.58</u>
	20,422,612	100.00

Priority Listing of Projects

Allocation

The University of Kansas

1. Campus Fire Code Improvements	\$400,000
2. Campus Tuckpointing	70,000
3. Campus Roof Repair/Replacement	560,000
4. Campus Window Replacement	320,000
5. Campus Elevator Improvements	150,000
6. Campus Electrical Service Improvements	1,024,000
7. Research Laboratory Improvements	150,000
8. ADA Improvements	100,000
9. Campus HVAC Improvements	<u>1,257,000</u>
	\$4,031,000

The University of Kansas Medical Center

1. Campus Energy Conservation Improvements	\$50,000
2. Campus Exterior Maintenance	75,000
3. Campus Fire Code Improvements	315,000
4. Campus Fire Alarm/Sprinkler Systems	100,000
5. Campus Interior Maintenance	450,000
6. Campus Utility Infrastructure Improvements	475,500
7. Campus BAS Infrastructure	70,000
8. Campus Elevator Repairs	36,000
9. Campus Utility Infrastructure Improvements (Wichita)	<u>115,500</u>
	\$1,687,000

Kansas State University

1. Campus Roof Repair & Replacement	\$1,000,000
2. Campus Infrastructure Improvements	772,000
3. Campus Utility Maintenance	675,000
4. Campus Fire Code Improvements	698,400
5. Campus Classroom Improvements	650,000

6. Campus Hazardous Material Abatement	105,000
7. Campus Cyclic Painting	300,000
8. Campus Masonry Repairs & Exterior Joint Caulking	<u>283,600</u>
	\$4,484,000

Wichita State University

1. Campus Floor Covering Replacement	\$150,000
2. Campus Sidewalk Repairs	75,000
3. Campus Street Repair	100,000
4. Campus Interior & Exterior Door/Hardware Replacements	125,000
5. Campus Installation Automatic Door Operations	25,000
6. West Campus Chilled/Steam Line Replacement	400,000
7. Wallace Hall Settlement/Masonry Repairs	100,000
8. Geology Building Air Handling Units Replacement	125,000
9. Media Resource Center North Window Replacement	45,000
10. Campus Restroom Improvements	200,000
11. Fiske/Engineering Halls Step Replacements	35,000
12. Wilner Auditorium Replace Seating & Repair Termite Damage	<u>268,000</u>
	\$1,648,000

Emporia State University

1. Campus Laboratory Improvements	\$371,000
2. Visser Hall Heating Pipe Repairs/Replacement	125,000
3. Campus Roof Repairs & Maintenance	50,000
4. Campus Elevator Repairs & Maintenance	30,000
5. Campus Fire Alarm Repairs & Maintenance	30,000
6. Campus Sidewalk & Exterior Repairs & Maintenance	75,000
7. Campus Asbestos Abatement	75,000
8. Campus HVAC Repairs & Maintenance	75,000
9. Campus Interior Corridor Improvements	<u>75,000</u>
	\$906,000

Pittsburg State University

1. Kelce Center Masonry Repairs	\$450,000
2. Hartman Hall Window Replacement & Masonry Restoration	457,000
3. Campus Roof Repairs & Maintenance	150,000
4. Campus Fire Code Improvements	<u>50,000</u>
	\$1,107,000

Fort Hays State University

1. Campus Sidewalk Replacements	\$20,000
2. Campus HVAC Repair/Replacement	25,000
3. Campus Asbestos Abatement	5,000
4. Campus Steam Generation and Distribution Upgrades	10,000
5. Campus Exterior Utility Repair/Replacement	10,000
6. Campus Floor Covering Replacement	110,000
7. Campus Fire Code Improvements	7,000
8. Beach Hall Precast Panel & Window Sealant Replacement	53,000
9. Rarick Hall VAV Replacements @ Third Floor	117,000
10. Malloy Hall Air Handling Unit Replacement	25,000
11. Campus Emergency Sirens Replacement	125,000
12. Cunningham Hall Repaint Central Corridors	40,000
13. Cunningham Hall Replace Central Corridor Floor Finishes	100,000
14. Utility Tunnel Cap Replacement between Forsyth Library/Heather Hall	35,000
15. Farm Dairy Cottage Septic System Replacement	10,000

16. Old Power Plant Life Safety Improvements	20,000
17. Tomanek Hall Masonry Cleaning, Sealing & Joint Repairs	60,000
18. Cunningham Hall Central Corridor Ceiling/Lighting Replacement	165,000
19. Utility Tunnel Cap Replacement – Picken Hall to Sheridan Hall	<u>200,000</u>
	\$1,137,000

SUMMARY

	<u>Allocation</u>
The University of Kansas	\$4,031,000
The University of Kansas Medical Center	1,687,000
Kansas State University	4,484,000
Wichita State University	1,648,000
Emporia State University	906,000
Pittsburg State University	1,107,000
Fort Hays State University	<u>1,137,000</u>
TOTAL	\$15,000,000

3. Receive Project Status Report for ARRA/SFSF Funds

Summary

The Federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (enacted February, 2009) included funding for public higher education institutions. A total of \$90 million ARRA, State Fiscal Stabilization Funds (SFSF) was appropriated to the Kansas Board of Regents -- \$9.6 million in FY 2009, \$40 million in FY 2010, and \$40.4 million in FY 2011. The Board determined that the allocation of the SFSF funds (\$90 million) would be based on each sectors current share of SGF. The amount allocated to the state universities totals \$72.4 million. The Board directed that \$45.8 million be expended on deferred maintenance projects and \$26.6 million related to tuition mitigation. In accordance with the federal law, the universities have until September 30, 2011 to expend or encumber their total federal ARRA/SFSF funds, but all funds must be expended by December 31, 2011. Attached is a project status report on the deferred maintenance portion of the funding.

PROJECT STATUS REPORT - ARRA/SFSF FUNDS							
November 9, 2010							
<u>Campus/Projects</u>		<u>Original Allocations</u>	<u>Revised Allocations</u>		<u>Status</u>		
				Funds Expended	Funds Committed/ Encumbered	% Complete	Est. Completion Date
	THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS						
1.	Campus Fire Code Improvements	\$ 273,228	\$-0-			NA	NA
2.	Campus Roof Repair/Replacement:						
2a.	Carruth-O'Leary	98,000	208,761	159,429.	208,761	100%	Complete
2b.	Strong Hall	42,000				NA	NA
2c.	Military Science	60,000	99,286	99,285	99,285	100%	Complete
3.	Campus Electrical Service Improvements	400,000	400,000	10,605	400,255	3%	9/1/11
4.	Research Laboratory Improvements	200,000	-0-			NA	NA
5.	ADA Improvements	50,000	-0-			NA	NA
6.	Site & Utility Infrastructure Improvements	200,000	268,945	255,284	268,945	100%	Complete
7.	Dyche Hall HVAC Improvements	750,000	1,388,027	91,998	1,225,218	7%	9/1/11
	FY 2009 Total	\$2,073,228	\$2,365,019	\$ 616,601	\$2,202,464		
1.	Murphy Hall HVAC Improvements	\$ 3,094,171	\$3,491,399	\$ 228,915	305,400	8%	9/1/11
2.	Spencer Art Museum Chiller Replacement	874,244	1,335,986	6,670	8,545	1%	5/1/11

<u>Campus/Projects</u>		<u>Original Allocations</u>	<u>Revised Allocations</u>		<u>Status</u>		
				Funds Expended	Funds Committed/ Encumbered	% Complete	Est. Completion Date
3.	Utility Tunnel Waterproofing	1,100,000	869,081	795,405	869,082	100%	Complete
FY 2010 Total		\$5,068,415	\$5,696,466	\$1,030,990	\$ 1,183,027		
1.	Strong Hall HVAC Improvements	\$ 2,867,000	\$-0-			NA	NA
2.	Art & Design HVAC/Chiller	1,601,415	475,000	-0-	-0-	0%	9/1/11
3.	Lindley Hall Windows and Tuckpointing	691,491	691,491	-0-	-0-	0%	9/1/11
4.	Lindley Hall Electrical	-0-	500,000	-0-	-0-	0%	8/1/11
5.	Green Hall Electrical	-0-	588,573	-0-	-0-	0%	8/1/11
6.	Watson Library Ramp Repair	-0-	160,000	-0-	-0-	0%	8/1/11
7.	Robinson Center Reroof	-0-	420,000	-0-	-0-	0%	9/1/11
8.	Bailey Hall Install Fire Sprinkler System	-0-	300,000	-0-	-0-	0%	8/15/11
9.	Strong Hall Window Replacement	-0-	360,000	-0-	-0-	0%	9/1/11
10.	Blake Hall Electrical Impr.	-0-	170,000	-0-	-0-	0%	8/1/11
11.	Bailey Hall Electrical Service Improvements	-0-	300,000	-0-	-0-	0%	8/1/11
12.	Art & Design /Fowler Elec. Switch	-0-	275,000	-0-	-0-	0%	9/1/11
FY 2011 Total		\$5,159,906	\$4,240,064	\$-0-	\$-0-		
KU Total Allocations		\$12,301,549	\$12,301,549	\$1,647,591	\$3,385,491		
KU Total Projects		15	19				
THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS MEDICAL CENTER							
1.	Lied Infrastructure Improvements	\$ 368,000	\$238,000	\$126,689	\$ 182,697	53%	3/31/11

<u>Campus/Projects</u>		<u>Original Allocations</u>	<u>Revised Allocations</u>		<u>Status</u>		
				Funds Expended	Funds Committed/ Encumbered	% Complete	Est. Completion Date
2.	Campus Elevator Repairs	450,000	-0-			NA	NA
3.	Campus Roof Repair/Replacement	50,024	-0-			NA	NA
4.	RSF USDA Repairs		630,024	627,980	628,112	100%	9/30/10
	FY 2009 Total	\$868,024	\$868,024	\$ 754,669	\$ 810,809		
1.	Lied Control System Replacement	\$150,000	\$ -0-			NA	NA
2.	Campus Elevator Renovations	1,672,057	1,247,057	-0-	234,000.00	0%	8/19/11
3.	Campus Roof Repair/Replacement	225,000	-0-			NA	NA
4.	Wahl Hall Switchgear Replacement	75,000	-0-			NA	NA
5.	RSF USDA Repairs	-0-	175,000	175,000	175,000	100%	9/30/10
6.	Delp (f) Level 6 Infrastructure	-0-	700,000	254,964	558,947	36%	6/30/11
	FY 2010 Total	\$2,122,057	\$2,122,057	\$ 429,964	\$ 967,947		
1.	Elevator Replacements (Wichita, Delp D & Delp F & Breidenthal)	\$1,350,000	\$1,180,000	\$-0-	\$-0-	0%	8/19/11
2.	Roof Replacements (Eaton, Dykes & Delp D)	400,000	400,000	-0-	-0-	0%	6/30/11
3.	Mechanical/Electrical Infrastructure (Wescoe & Delp D)	410,341	410,431	10,000	124,902		
3.	Olathe Fire Marshal Corrections	-0-	150,000	-0-	-0-	2%	6/30/11
4.	Sudler Valve Replacement	-0-	20,000	-0-	-0-	0%	3/31/11
	FY 2011 Total	\$2,160,341	\$2,160,341	\$ 10,000	\$ 124,902	0%	
	KUMC Total Allocations	\$5,150,422	\$5,150,422	\$1,194,633	\$1,903,658		
	KUMC Total Projects	10	10				

<u>Campus/Projects</u>		<u>Original Allocations</u>	<u>Revised Allocations</u>	<u>Status</u>			
				<u>Funds Expended</u>	<u>Funds Committed/ Encumbered</u>	<u>% Complete</u>	<u>Est. Completion Date</u>
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY							
1.	Campus Utility Infrastructure & Power Plant Improvements	\$2,307,016	\$2,307,016	\$2,041,227	\$2,294,521	99%	Complete
FY 2009 Total		\$2,307,016	\$2,307,016	\$2,041,227	\$2,294,521		
1.	Campus Steam & Cooling Pipe Replacements	\$5,100,000	\$5,639,956	\$293,893	\$4,936,934	13%	7/31/11
2.	Campus Roof Repair/Replacement	539,956	-0-				
FY 2010 Total		\$5,639,956	\$5,639,956	\$293,893	\$4,934,934		
1.	Coles Hall Chiller Replacement	\$400,000	\$-0-				
1a.	Bluemont Hall/Burt Hall Chiller Replacement		346,000	-0-	345,550	0%	3/31/11
2.	Campus Roof Repair/Replacement	3,489,956	3,375,408	51,845	3,375,408	4%	7/31/11
3.	Campus Street Milling & Overlay	250,000	553,712	-0-	553,712	0%	7/31/11
4.	Campus Curb & Sidewalk Replacement	250,000	205,775	64,093	205,775	76%	12/31/10
5.	Campus Stone Tuckpointing & Joint Caulking	1,351,790	1,260,851	294,513	1,260,852	39%	7/31/11
FY 2011 Total		\$5,741,746	\$5,741,746	\$410,451	\$5,741,330		
KSU Total Allocations		\$13,688,718	\$13,688,718	\$2,745,571	\$12,970,785		
KSU Total Projects		8	7				

<u>Campus/Projects</u>		<u>Original Allocations</u>	<u>Revised Allocations</u>	<u>Status</u>			
				<u>Funds Expended</u>	<u>Funds Committed/ Encumbered</u>	<u>% Complete</u>	<u>Est. Completion Date</u>
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY							
1.	Engineering Building HVAC Replacement	\$847,192	\$-0-			N/A	N/A
2.	Duerksen Hall Phase 1 HVAC Replacement	-0-	847,192	847,192	847,192	89%	4/20/11
FY 2009 Total		\$847,192	\$847,192	\$847,192	\$847,192		
1.	Duerksen Hall Phase 1 HVAC Replacement	\$2,071,128	\$866,624	\$496,290	\$837,452	89%	4/20/11
2.	Duerksen Hall Phase 2 HVAC Replacement	-0-	1,204,504	6,504	1,204,504	1%	11/10/11
FY 2010 Total		\$2,071,128	\$2,071,128	\$502,794	\$2,041,956		
1.	Duerksen Hall Phase 2 HVAC Replacement	\$2,108,508	\$108,508	\$10,561	\$10,561	1%	11/10/11
2.	Duerksen Hall Window Replacement	-0-	240,000	-0-	-0-	0%	11/30/11
3.	Lindquist Hall Window Replacement	-0-	380,000	-0-	-0-	0%	11/30/11
4.	Geology Building Roof Replacement	-0-	185,000	-0-	-0-	0%	11/30/11
5.	Elliott Hall Roof Replacement	-0-	215,000	-0-	-0-	0%	11/30/11
6.	Jardine Hall Roof Replacement	-0-	230,000	-0-	-0-	0%	11/30/11
7.	McKinley Hall Roof Replacement	-0-	325,000	-0-	-0-	0%	11/30/11
8.	Morrison Hall Roof Replacement	-0-	150,000	-0-	-0-	0%	11/30/11
9.	Wallace Hall Roof Replacement	-0-	275,000	-0-	-0-	0%	11/30/11
FY 2011 Total		\$2,108,508	\$2,108,508	\$10,561	\$10,561		
WSU Total Allocations		\$5,026,828	\$5,026,828	\$1,360,547	\$2,899,709		
WSU Total Projects		3	10				

<u>Campus/Projects</u>		<u>Original Allocations</u>	<u>Revised Allocations</u>	<u>Status</u>		
				<u>Funds Expended</u>	<u>Funds Committed/ Encumbered</u>	<u>% Complete</u>
EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY						
1.	Bruekelman Science Hall Fume Hood/Ventilation System Replacement – Phase 1	\$466,012	\$360,012	\$360,012	\$360,012	100% Complete
FY 2009 Total		\$466,012	\$360,012	\$360,012	\$360,012	
1.	Bruekelman Science Hall Fume Hood/Ventilation System Replacement – Phase 2	\$34,000	\$-0-	\$-0-	\$-0-	
2.	Campus Light Fixture Replacements	350,000	366,079	366,079	366,079	100% Complete
3.	Campus Window Replacements	405,309	529,230	529,230	529,230	100% Complete
4.	Campus Network Wiring	350,000	350,000	226,092	234,983	67% 6/11
FY 2010 Total		\$1,139,309	\$1,245,309	\$1,121,401	\$1,130,292	
1.	Morse Hall S.E. Piping Replacement	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$-0-	\$30,000	6% 6/11
2.	Exterior Lighting Energy Efficient Re-lamping	100,000	100,000	-0-	-0-	0% 5/11
3.	Stormont Maintenance Facility HVAC Replacement	300,000	300,000	-0-	25,000	8% 6/11
4.	Computer Center HVAC Replacement	200,000	200,000	-0-	20,250	10% 5/11
5.	P.E. Building Underground Roof Drain Replacement	59,871	59,871	24,357	53,157	89% 2/11
FY 2011 Total		\$1,159,871	\$1,159,871	\$24,357	\$128,407	
ESU Total Allocations		\$2,765,192	\$2,765,192	\$1,505,770	\$1,618,711	
ESU Total Projects		10	9			

<u>Campus/Projects</u>		<u>Original Allocations</u>	<u>Revised Allocations</u>	<u>Status</u>			
				<u>Funds Expended</u>	<u>Funds Committed/ Encumbered</u>	<u>% Complete</u>	<u>Est. Completion Date</u>
PITTSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY							
1.	Yates Hall HVAC Replacement	\$219,424	\$206,563	\$206,563	\$206,563	100%	1/15/11
2.	Kelce Hall HVAC/Electrical/Fire Code Improvements	350,000	362,861	306,396	362,578	84%	12/15/10
FY 2009 Total		\$569,424	\$569,424	\$512,959	\$569,141		
1. Yates Hall Roof, HVAC, Windows/Doors & Electrical Upgrades		\$580,576	\$866,309	\$702,151	\$866,230	81%	1/15/11
2. Grubbs Hall HVAC, Windows/Doors & Electrical Upgrades		811,494	395,211	349,209	391,355	88%	1/15/11
3. Hughes Hall HVAC, Masonry & Window Upgrades			130,550	24,413	116,625	19%	8/15/11
FY 2010 Total		\$1,392,070	\$1,392,070	\$1,075,773	\$1,374,210		
1. Heckert Wells Infrastructure Upgrades		\$805,750	\$236,964	\$12,206	\$52,500	5%	8/15/11
2. Hughes Hall HVAC, Masonry & Window Upgrades		611,444	1,180,230	-0-	-0-	0%	8/15/11
FY 2011 Total		\$1,417,194	\$1,417,194	\$12,206	\$52,500		
PSU Total Allocations		\$3,378,688	\$3,378,688	\$1,600,938	\$1,995,851		
PSU Total Projects		6	7				

<u>Campus/Projects</u>		<u>Original Allocations</u>	<u>Revised Allocations</u>	<u>Status</u>			
				<u>Funds Expended</u>	<u>Funds Committed/ Encumbered</u>	<u>% Complete</u>	<u>Est. Completion Date</u>
FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY							
1.	Rarick Hall Roof Repair/Replacement	\$584,856	\$584,856	\$455,330	\$584,856	100%	8/30/10
	FY 2009 Total	\$584,856	\$584,856	\$455,530	\$584,856		
1.	Campus Utility Tunnel Replacement	\$660,000	\$660,000	\$387,177	\$660,000	100%	11/15/10
2.	Medium Voltage Power Distribution Improvements	769,795	769,795	-0-	\$769,795	0%	3/1/11
	FY 2010 Total	\$1,429,795	\$1,429,795	\$387,177	\$1,429,795		
1.	Medium Voltage Power Distribution Improvements – Phase 2	\$1,455,600	\$1,455,600	-0-	\$335,500	5%	12/31/11
	FY 2011 Total	\$1,455,600	\$1,455,600	\$ -0-	\$335,500		
	FHSU Total Allocations	\$3,470,251	\$3,470,251	\$842,707	\$2,350,151		
	FHSU Total Projects	4	4				
	SUMMARY						
		Original	Revised	Funds Expended	Funds Committed/ Encumbered		
	FY 2009 Total Allocations	\$7,715,752	\$7,901,543	\$5,588,190	\$7,668,995		
	FY 2010 Total Allocations	18,862,730	19,596,781	4,841,992	13,062,161		
	FY 2011 Total Allocations	19,203,166	18,283,324	467,575	6,393,200		
	Grand Total	\$45,781,648	\$45,781,648	\$10,897,757	\$27,124,356		

X. Adjournment

AGENDA

Fiscal Affairs and Audit Standing Committee
Wednesday, December 15, 2010
11:00am-Noon, Board Room

- I. Questions/Clarifications about the Fiscal Affairs and Audit Standing Committee Items on the Board's Agenda

- II. Other Committee Business
 - 1. Staff report on State Universities Campus Safety and Security Summary Status Reports
 - 2. Staff update on Federal US Department of Education Desk Audit on ARRA/SFSF
 - 3. Discussion of a concept for a license alternative for a KSU project, Bruce Shubert, VP Administration and Finance, KSU
 - 4. Staff review of last year's tuition documents

Upcoming Agenda Call for January Board Agenda -- Tuesday, January 4 , Noon

AGENDA

Council of Presidents
Kansas Board of Regents Office
1000 S.W. Jackson
Topeka, KS
December 15, 2010
11 a.m.-12 noon
Suite 530

1. Approve minutes of November 17, 2010 meeting
2. Report from Council of Business Officers
3. Report from Council of Chief Academic Officers
4. Request Approval for a Bachelor of Science in Exercise Science -- Pittsburg State University
5. Discussion about a Council of Research Officers
6. The case for faculty/staff salary increases

COPs December 2010 Agenda Item from COCAO November action taken

Request Approval for a Bachelor of Science in Exercise Science (CIP 31.0505) Pittsburg State University

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. Pittsburg State University of Kansas has submitted an application for approval of a Bachelor of Science in Exercise Science (CIP 31.0505). The proposing academic unit has responded to all of the requirements of the program approval process. One other institution has an undergraduate program utilizing this Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) code. The program will be funded through internal reallocation. The Council of Chief Academic Officers recommends approval. 11/30/10

Background

Criteria

Program Summary

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Program Identification: | Bachelors of Science in Exercise Science Suggested minors in Interdisciplinary Gerontology or Public Health
CIP 31.0505 |
| 2. Academic Unit: | College of Education
Department of Health, Human Performance & Recreation |
| 3. Program Description: | Exercise Science is the study of movement and the associated functional responses and adaptations. Exercise scientists must understand the scientific basis underlying exercise-induced physiological responses. |
| 4. Demand/Need for the Program: | The volume of students within the Physical Education major exceeds the number of positions available in the work force. The need for a non-teaching degree within our discipline is evident with the number of professionals not employed in the physical education field. A degree in Exercise Science will allow students the option to be a part of fitness employment opportunities without having to be in a P-12 educational setting. |
| 5. Comparative/Locational Advantage: | Each of the Regent Institutions has a similar program in one form or another. The proposed program will allow Pittsburg State University to remain competitive and allow students from the geographical area an option to pursue his/her degree at Pittsburg State University. |
| 6. Curriculum: | A total of 124 credit hours |
| 7. Faculty Profile: | Number of FTE faculty who teach in the major, including all concentrations/emphasis: 8

Rank of faculty: Assistant Professors: 1; Professors: 7 |
| 8. Student Profile: | Preparation of faculty (indicate level of degrees): Doctors: 8
Students will be drawn from existing Physical Education majors who prefer not to join in the P-12 educational systems. New students, incoming freshman, as well as transfer students interested in health and wellness careers will also be drawn into the program. |
| 9. Academic Support: | The academic services of advising services, library, audio-visual and academic computing resources are of sufficient volume and quality to support the proposed program. |
| 10. Facilities & Equipment: | New lab and equipment in 2008 (Student Recreation Center) |

- 11. Program Review, Assessment, Accreditation: Program review will be internal with current university standards. Entry and Exit exams will be given to students during their first and final years, respectively, of the proposed program. There are no current standards for accreditation or licensure; however, students may become certified through professional organizations such as the American College of Sports Medicine.
- 12. Costs, Financing: No impact on current budget.

**CURRICULUM OUTLINE
Kansas Board of Regents**

INSTITUTION: PITTSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY

- I. Identify the new degree: Bachelor of Science in Exercise Science
- II. Provide courses required for each student in the major:

Course Name & Number Credit Hours

Core Courses: 38 hours

BIOL 257/258 Anatomy and Physiology/Lab	5
HHP 150 Lifetime Fitness Concepts	1
HHP 260 First Aid/CPR	2
HHP 345 Measurement and Evaluation	3
HHP 460 Kinesiology	3
HHP 464 Physiology of Exercise	3
REC 425 Personal Training and Fitness Management	3
REC 441 Adult Health and Development	3
HHP 510 Physiology of Exercise II	3
HHP 512 Exercise Testing and Prescription	3
HHP 514 Clinical Exercise Physiology	3
HHPR 760 Technology and Instrumentation in Ex. Phys.	3
FCS 301 or 203 Nutrition	3

Electives: 21 hours minimum

BIOL 211 Principles of Biology I	4
BIOL 212 Principles of Biology II	4
BIOL 322/323 Genetics/Lab	5
BIOL 410 Biological/Medical Terminology	3
BIOL 660 Human Anatomy and Dissection	5
CHEM 215/216 General Chemistry I/Lab	5
CHEM 225/226 General Chemistry II/Lab	5
FCS 285 Lifespan Human Development	3
HHP 262 Care and Prevention of Athletic Injuries	2
HHPR 763 Scientific Principles of Strength & Cond.	3
NURS 314 Healthcare Terminology and Drug Calculations	3
NURS 265 Health Promotion and Disease Prevention	2
Other Approved Electives	

Research: 3 hours

HHP 516 Research Project in Exercise Science	3
--	---

Practicum: 6-12 hours

HHP 520 Clinical Practicum/Internship

6-12

Total:

68-74

IMPLEMENTATION YEAR: AY 2011
 Fiscal Summary for Proposed Academic Programs

Institution: PITTSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY

Proposed Program: Bachelor of Science in Exercise Science

Part I. Anticipated Enrollment	Implementation Year		Year 2		Year 3	
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-time	Part-Time
A. Full-time, Part-time Headcount:	25	15	35	25	45	35
B. Total SCH taken by all students in program	360	90	864	150	1080	210
Part II. Program Cost Projection						
A. In implementation year one, 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>Costs:</u>	No impact on current budget	No impact on current budget		No impact on current budget		
OOE	No impact on current budget	No impact on current budget		No impact on current budget		
Total	No impact on current budget					

Indicate source and amount of funds if other than internal reallocation:

No additional funds requested. The program will be unproblematic by using current faculty and efficient scheduling.

Revised: September 2003

Approved: _____

MINUTES

Council of Presidents
Kansas Board of Regents
November 17, 2010
Minutes of Meeting

Members present: President Don Beggs, Wichita State University
Chancellor Bernadette Gray-Little, University of Kansas
President Ed Hammond, Fort Hays State University
President Mike Lane, Emporia State University
President Kirk Schulz, Kansas State University
President Steve Scott, Pittsburg State University
President Andy Tompkins, Kansas Board of Regents

The meeting was convened at 11:00 a.m. by Chancellor Gray-Little.

1. Minutes from October 20, 2010 meeting—approved
2. Report from Council of Business Officers—Theresa Gordzica, Chief Business and Financial Planning Officer, KU

There was no report from the Council of Business Officers because COBO did not meet this month.

3. Report from Council of Chief Academic Officers—Dr. Jeff Vitter, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, KU

The Chief Academic Officers approved a Bachelor of Science in Exercise Science at Pittsburg State, which will be on the COPS agenda in December. They also approved a variety of program requests. In addition, COCAO discussed the coordination of academic calendars and received an update from the Admissions Task Force. COCAO also reported that the university research officers from all six Regents universities, the KU Medical Center, and Washburn, will meet in mid-December to talk about a strategic statewide research agenda.

4. Request for Approval of a Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Computing (CIP 11.0101) – University of Kansas—approved
5. Request Approval to Organize the Preventive Medicine, Biostatistics and Health Policy and Management Programs into a School of Public Health – University of Kansas Medical Center—approved

Chancellor Gray-Little reported that KU is moving forward with this initiative to take advantage of external funding available only to Schools of Public Health and to bring attention to public health issues.

6. The case for faculty/staff salary increases

COPS continued its discussion from October about the case for faculty and staff salary increases. The members expressed concern about a third straight year of no or minimal raises. Each president gathered data on faculty losses due to salary issues, especially the loss of highly productive and competitive faculty to other institutions or to business and industry. In some cases, investments were made in young associate professors only to have them leave just as the return in investment is beginning. Because of market issues, new faculty are being hired

at the same salaries as continuing faculty, leading to compression and equity concerns. Over the next month, the presidents will put their data into a common template so the need for salary increases can be more easily communicated.

7. Sustainability reports

President Scott asked to have this item added to the agenda. The presidents plan to work with President Tompkins to suggest an alternative reporting system that would feature two universities a year, while all six universities would continue to focus on sustainability efforts.

8. Other matters

At the October meeting, COPS discussed the overlap of non-Pell grant students in the Comprehensive Grant Program and Kan Help. President Tompkins reported that the overlap is only 133 students.

The meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

AGENDA

System Council of Chief Academic Officers

Wednesday, December 15, 2010
9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.
Kathy Rupp Conference Room
Kansas Board of Regents Office
1000 SW Jackson Street Suite 520
Topeka, Kansas

AGENDA

1. **Approve Minutes of November 17, 2010**

2. **Discussion:**
 - a. **Kansas Hunger Dialogue**
 - b. **Update on Transfer/Articulation Task Force**

3. **Other Business**

SCOCAO Meeting Schedule – September 2010 – June 2011

AGENDA MATERIALS DUE	MEETING DATES
August 25, 2010	September 15, 2010
September 20, 2010	October 20, 2010
October 20, 2010	November 17, 2010
November 16, 2010	December 15, 2010
December 15, 2010	January 19, 2011
January 19, 2011	February 16, 2011
February 16, 2011	March 16, 2011
March 23, 2011	April 20, 2011
April 20, 2011	May 18, 2011
May 18, 2011	June 15, 2011

MINUTES

System Council of Chief Academic Officers Minutes

Wednesday, November 17, 2010
8:00 a.m.
Room 530
Curtis State Office Building
Topeka, KS

The System Council of Chief Academic Officers met in the Room 530 of the Curtis State Office Building, 1000 S. W. Jackson, Topeka, Kansas, at 8:00 a.m. on Wednesday, November 17, 2010.

Members Present:

Kim Krull, Cloud County Community College
Allen Rawitch, University of Kansas Medical Ctr
Larry Gould, Fort Hays State University
Tes Mehring, Emporia State University
Lynette Olson, Pittsburg State University
Nancy Tate, Washburn University
Joe Burke, Labette Community College

Jeff Vitter, University of Kansas
April Mason, Kansas State University
Steve Loewen, Flint Hills Technical College
Alysha Johnston, Coffeyville Community College
Gary Miller, Wichita State University
Kevin Brungardt, Garden City Community College

Board Staff:

Gary Alexander, KBOR; Joan Warren, KBOR; Jacqueline Johnson, KBOR; Jean Redeker, KBOR; and Julene Miller, KBOR

Guests:

Rick McNary and Courtney James

Approve Minutes of October 20, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Alysia Johnston moved and Jeff Vitter seconded the motion to approve the October 20, 2010 minutes as submitted. The motion carried.

Discussion:

Rick McNary and Courtney James presented information about Numana, Inc. which is an international hunger relief organization. It is a non-profit 501(c)3 public charity formed in August 2008, looking at a new option to save the starving. Numana, Inc. and Universities Fighting World Hunger are working to develop statewide consensus among postsecondary institutions to impact hunger within the state first and ultimately the world. The Kansas Hunger Dialogue on March 10 and 11, 2011, in the Overland Park Convention Center presents an opportunity for state and private colleges, universities and community colleges to become aware of and support impacting hunger locally and globally. Desired outcomes are:

- *Consensus agreements among Kansas Colleges and Universities regarding a campus, system, and statewide commitment to integrating hunger awareness, advocacy, and action.*
- *Campuses will generate strategies and action plans for identifying campus-based initiatives consistent with the consensus agreements.*

- *Information will be compiled from collaborator efforts on strategies for impacting hunger on local and global levels and will be disseminated to all administrators, faculty, and students in those institutions, as well as media and the general public. (from The Kansas Hunger Dialogue)*

SCOCAO discussed as follows:

- Involve administrators, faculty and students
- The web site for Universities Fighting World Hunger is <http://www.universitiesfightingworldhunger.org/>
- Campuses will develop their own organizations
- Other states currently interested are Alabama and Minnesota
- Kansas “the bread basket” would be a good choice for the first state to adopt this focus

Transfer and Articulation Task Force

Jan Middendorf will facilitate SWOT exercise with the Task Force.

Questions to be considered are

- What can be done as a state
- Are there mechanisms that would improve the process
- What are possible outcomes

Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 a.m.

AGENDA

Council of Chief Academic Officers

Wednesday, December 15, 2010

9:30 a.m.

or upon adjournment of SCOCAO

Kathy Rupp Conference Room

Reconvene Noon to 1:15 p.m.

Kathy Rupp Conference Room

1000 SW Jackson Street Suite 520

Kansas Board of Regents

A G E N D A

1. **Approve Minutes of November 17, 2010**
2. **New Program**
KSU – Request Approval for a Professional Master of Technology (CIP 15.9999)
(FIRST READING)
3. **Program Information**
 - a. **PSU – Three new emphases in the Bachelor of Fine Art in Art (CIP: 50.0701) - 2D Studio Arts, 3D Studio Arts and Commercial Art**
 - b. **PSU – Two new emphases in the Bachelor of Science, Biology (CIP: 26.0101) - Field Biology and Environment and Ecology and Organismic Biology**
 - c. **KSU – Concurrent BS/MPH (or BA/MPH) degree programs – participating programs are: Animal Sciences & Industry, Athletic Training, Biochemistry, Biology, Dietetics, Food Science & Industry, Kinesiology, Life Sciences, Microbiology, Nutritional Sciences, Nutrition & Kinesiology Dual Degree, Psychology and Public Health Nutrition**
 - d. **KSU – Concurrent BS/MS Horticulture Degree Program in the Department of Horticulture Forestry and Recreation Resources**
 - e. **KSU – Collaborative Program Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership with Washburn University**
 - f. **KSU – Urban Food Systems Specialization within the MS in Horticulture**
4. **Midwest Student Exchange Program**
 - a. **WSU – Request to Add Performing Arts Degree to the Midwest Student Exchange Program**
 - b. **Discuss Procedures and Enrollment Caps**
5. **Other Business**

AGENDA MATERIALS DUE	MEETING DATES	LUNCH ROTATION
August 25, 2010	September 15, 2010	KSU
September 20, 2010	October 20, 2010	PSU
October 20, 2010	November 17, 2010	ESU
November 16, 2010	December 15, 2010	WSU
December 15, 2010	January 19, 2011	KU
January 19, 2011	February 16, 2011	KUMC
February 16, 2011	March 16, 2011	Washburn U
March 23, 2011	April 20, 2011	FHSU
April 20, 2011	May 18, 2011	KSU
May 18, 2011	June 15, 2011	PSU

MINUTES

Council of Chief Academic Officers

Wednesday, November 17, 2010

8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.

Room 530

Curtis State Office Building

Reconvene at

12:00 p.m. – 1:15 p.m.

Kathy Rupp Conference Room

Curtis State Office Building

1000 SW Jackson Street Suite 520

Kansas Board of Regents

MINUTES

The Council of Chief Academic Officers met on Wednesday, November 17, 2010 in the Room 530 Curtis State Office Building in Topeka, Kansas at 8:30 a.m. and reconvened in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room at 12:00 p.m.

Members Present:

Larry Gould, Provost, FHSU

Jeff Vitter, Provost and EVC, KU

April Mason, Provost, KSU

Lynette Olson, Provost, PSU

Allen Rawitch, VCAA, KU Med Center

Tes Mehring, Provost, ESU

Gary Miller, Provost, WSU

Nancy Tate, Interim VPAA, WU

Gary Alexander, KBOR

April Mason, Provost, KSU

Staff Present

Jean Redeker, KBOR, Jacqueline Johnson, KBOR and Joan Warren, KBOR

Approve Minutes of October 20, 2010

Gary Miller moved and April Mason seconded the motion to approve the Minutes of October 20, 2010 as revised on November 15, 2010. No discussion followed. Motion carried.

New Programs

PSU – Request for a Bachelor of Science in Exercise Science (CIP 31.0505) (SECOND READING)

No comments were received on the above listed proposed program. There was no discussion.

Gary Miller moved and Larry Gould seconded the motion to recommend placing the above listed new program request on the December 2010 Council of Presidents' Agenda. Motion carried.

Program Requests

ESU – Requests approval of the Center for Great Plains Studies (30.9999) an Academic Extension Specialty Program

There was no discussion on Emporia State University's Center for Great Plains Studies.

April Mason moved and Gary Miller seconded the motion approving the Center for Great Plains Studies. Motion carried.

- b. **PSU – Requests Approval to Merge Two Departments of History and Social Sciences into the new Department of History, Philosophy, and Social Sciences**
- c. **KU – Requests Approval to Change the Name of Two Degrees within Two Departments in the School of Education as Follows:**
 - (1) **the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies change the Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees from the Educational Policy and Leadership to Educational Leadership and Policy and**
 - (2) **the Department of Health, Sport and Exercise Sciences change the name of its specialization from “Sports Studies” to “Sport Management”**
- d. **KU – Requests Approval to Consolidate Offerings of the Department of Visual Art within the School of the Arts within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences as Follows:**
 - (1) **Combine the previous Bachelor of Arts in Fine Arts in Art (BAFA-Art) and the previous Bachelor of Arts in Fine Arts in Design (BAFA-Design) into one comprehensive degree and major – a Bachelor of Arts in Visual Art (BA-Visual Art);**
 - (2) **Combine the previous Bachelor of Fine Arts in Art (BFA-Art) and the previous Bachelor of Fine Arts in Design (BFA-Design) into one comprehensive degree and major – a Bachelor of Fine Arts in Visual Art (BFA-Visual Art); and**
 - (3) **Change the name of the program in Visual Arts Education, and the corresponding Master of Arts in Visual Arts Education to Visual Art Education**
- e. **KUMC – Requests Approval for a New Department of Cancer Biology as a Specialized and Focused Academic Department**
- f. **KUMC – Requests Approval for a New Department of Medical Sciences for the KU School of Medicine – Wichita**

There was no discussion on Program Requests agenda items b-f.

Tes Mehring moved and Larry Gould seconded the motion to approve the program request items b-f. Motion carried.

Academic Calendars Fall 2013 to Spring 2016

University Academic Calendars are due in the Board of Regents office January 15, 2011. Board policy states:

D. Academic Affairs

1. ACADEMIC CALENDAR (6-19-70; 1-18-90; 5-20-93; 6-25-09)

- 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.**

The academic calendars will be placed on the Board Agenda later in the spring.

Other Business

Admissions Task Force Update

COCAO discussed the admissions recommendations as follows:

- Completion of the pre-college curriculum with a 2.0 is required as a condition of admission for high school graduates
- One additional math course taken the year of graduation or meet the ACT math readiness scores was added to the precollege curriculum
- Funding for additional math courses was the most discussed topic at the Task Force meetings
- The universities will determine if unaccredited high school graduates demonstrate completion of coursework equivalent to the precollege curriculum
- ACT score of 21 or combined SAT scores include home schoolers
- GED students under 21 years of age must achieve ACT score of at least 21
- Requirements for students 21 years or older do not change
- Universities will verify international students have equivalent preparation as US students, which is an adaptation of current practice
- No changes for transfer students
- Exception window can be for super-prepared students as well as for underprepared students
- Freshmen resident exception window increase from 10% to 15%
- Freshmen exception window for non-resident students increase to 15% or 75 students, whichever is higher
- Other Precollege Curriculum changes:
 - Dropped proposed Civics requirement
 - Added 3 electives
 - Added ½ unit Speech option for English requirement
- Board staff are in conversation with the Kansas State Department of Education about “certifying” that students have met the precollege curriculum

COCAO members should provide comments to KBOR before November 30 Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee conference call.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m. and reconvened at 12:00 p.m. in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room.

Other Business

Online Education

COCAO discussed the best way to provide information to the Board about the economics and quality of online learning:

- evaluating online courses
- comparing online costs to construction of a new building
- hiring requirements when replacing “online champion faculty” who retire
- Serving place bound students

Mark Childers, ESU, and Barbara Romzek, KU, will serve with Joan Warren to develop a reporting template that may include course development, student readiness, student motivation, cost saving vs. expenses, online student support, samples of “stellar online offerings”, retention, and learning outcomes.

Meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Sincerely,

Jeff Vitter
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
University of Kansas

CURRENT FISCAL YEAR MEETING DATES

Fiscal Year 2011

<u>Meeting Dates</u>	<u>Agenda Material Due to Board Office</u>
August 17-19, 2010 – Retreat	
September 15-16, 2010	Noon, August 25, 2010
October 20-21, 2010	Noon, September 29, 2010
November 17-18, 2010	Noon, October 27, 2010
December 15-16, 2010	Noon, November 23, 2010
January 19,20, 2011	Noon, December 29, 2010
February 16-17, 2011	Noon, January 26, 2011
March 16-17, 2011	Noon, February 23, 2011
April 20-21, 2011	Noon, March 30,2011
May 18-19, 2011	Noon, April 27, 2011
June 15-16, 2011	Noon, May 25, 2011

TENTATIVE MEETING DATES

Fiscal Year 2012

Meeting Dates

- August 16-18, 2011 – Retreat
- September 14-15, 2011
- October 19-20, 2011
- November 16-17, 2011
- December 14-15, 2011
- January 18-19, 2012
- February 15-16, 2012
- March 14-15, 2012
- April 18-19, 2012
- May 16-17, 2012
- June 27-28, 2012

COMMITTEES (2010-2011)

Gary Sherrer, Chair

Ed McKechnie, Vice Chair

Standing Committees

<u>Academic Affairs</u>	<u>Fiscal Affairs and Audit</u>	<u>Regents Retirement Plan</u>
Dick Hedges, Chair Janie Perkins Mildred A. Edwards Ed McKechnie	Jerry Boettcher, Chair Dan Lykins Christine Downey-Schmidt Tim Emert	Dan Lykins, Chair Jerry Boettcher

Board Representatives and Liaisons

Education Commission of the States	Christine Downey-Schmidt
Postsecondary Technical Education Authority	Jim Grier Jack Wempe
Kansas Bioscience Authority	Jerry Boettcher Andy Tompkins
Kansas Campus Compact	Janie Perkins
KSU Research Foundation Board	Tim Emert
Midwest Higher Education Compact (MHEC)	Gary Sherrer
P20 Education Council	Christine Downey-Schmidt Dick Hedges
Washburn University Board of Regents	Dan Lykins