

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

**Tuesday, November 30, 2010
Conference Call
MINUTES**

The Academic Affairs Standing Committee of the Kansas Board of Regents met by Conference Call in Conference Room B of the Kansas Board of Regents, 1000 S.W. Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka, Kansas, at 11:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 30, 2010. This meeting had been properly noticed pursuant to the Kansas Open Meetings Law on November 24, 2010.

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

Member absent: Regent Ed McKechnie

Staff present: Gary Alexander, Jean Redeker, Jacqueline Johnson, Joan Warren, Chuck Kater, and Julene Miller

Present: Scott Rothschild, Lawrence Journal World

Others present by phone: Gayle Shaw, Kansas Association of Community College Trustees; Arvin Agah and Barbara Romzek, University of Kansas; Allen Rawitch and Glen Cox, University of Kansas Medical Center; Sheree Utash, Wichita Area Technical College; Martin Straub, Hays High School; Cia Verschelden, Highland Community College; Steve Loewen, Flint Hills Technical College; and Chris Crawford and Larry Gould, Fort Hays State University

Meeting opened at 11:00 a.m.

Approve Minutes

November 2, 2010 Minutes

November 17, 2010 Performance Agreement Review Minutes

Regent Perkins moved and Regent Edwards seconded the motion to approve the November 2, 2010 Conference Call Minutes and the November 17, 2010 Performance Agreement Review Minutes. Motion carried.

Act on Performance Agreements Reviewed Wednesday, November 17, 2010

Jean Redeker asked the Committee to approve the nine proposed performance agreements that were presented at the November 17, 2010 BAASC meeting. BAASC was unable to take action at the November 17 meeting due to lack of a quorum. No discussion followed.

Regent Edwards moved and Regent Perkins seconded the motion to recommend approval of the performance agreements reviewed on November 17, 2010. Motion carried.

Agenda Planning

Wednesday, 12/15/2010 Consent Agenda

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

- **Concord Career College**

Jacqueline Johnson presented Concord Career College's proposed Associate of Applied Science Degree in Occupational Therapy Assistant and in Health Information Technology.

There was no discussion. Regent Perkins moved and Regent Edwards seconded the motion to recommend placing agenda item 3.1.a. on the Kansas Board of Regents December 15, 2010 Consent Agenda. Motion carried.

Act on Requests for Degree and Certificate Programs Submitted from Community Colleges and Technical Colleges – Wichita Area Technical College (WATC)

Chuck Kater described the Committee about Wichita Area Technical College's proposed program in Robotics (CIP 15.0405) at the Associate of Applied Science and Technical Certificate levels. This program addressed all criteria requested and was subjected to the 14 day comment period required by policy. No letters of objection were received. The program was reviewed by the Technical Program and Curriculum Committee and the Postsecondary Technical Education Authority recommends approval.

Discussion followed:

- The Committee congratulated WATC for partnering with industry and business
- The collaboration in this proposal is commendable
- Surveys of the high school students and current WATC students showed interest in the program
- The Standing Committee appreciated the information included in this proposal.

Regent Edwards moved and Regent Perkins seconded the motion to recommend placing agenda item 3.1.b. on the Kansas Board of Regents December 15, 2010 Consent Agenda. Motion carried.

Act on 2011-2013 (Cycle 8) Performance Agreements

Jean Redeker informed the Committee that it needed to take action to place the nine performance agreements it just approved on the December Board agenda. There was no discussion.

Regent Perkins moved and Regent Hedges seconded the motion to recommend placing agenda item 3.1.c. on the Kansas Board of Regents December 15, 2010 Consent Agenda. Motion carried.

Thursday, 12/16/2010 Consent Agenda

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

Joan Warren presented the University of Kansas' proposed Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Computing (CIP 11.0101). This program will allow students to study computing within the context of other disciplines. The proposed program will utilize the existing faculty, staff, and resources in the Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (EECS). It will offer five areas of specialization, namely, Astronomy, Chemistry, Biology, Geography, and Physics. The program will be funded by internal reallocation.

BAASC commended the University of Kansas on its forward looking program.

Regent Perkins moved and Regent Edwards seconded the motion to recommend placing agenda item 3. 2. on the Wednesday, Kansas Board of Regents December 15, 2010 Consent Agenda. Motion carried.

Thursday, 12/16/2010 Discussion Agenda

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

Gary Alexander presented the University of Kansas Medical Center's proposed reorganization of 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. The Council of Presidents and Council of Chief Academic officers recommend approval of this request.

The new school will be formed from four existing departments: Preventive Medicine and Public Health (Kansas City); Preventive Medicine and Public Health (Wichita); Biostatistics; and Health Policy Management. The proposed school will be supported by internal reallocation of funds under the direction of the chancellor and Executive Vice chancellor, along with seeking new private funding to support a dean, selected faculty, and necessary administrative personnel.

Discussion followed:

- The health services provided through this reorganization will be more than just government services
- Training within regions helps retain health care workers in the area
- The emphasis is on healthy communities versus just treating the sick
- BAASC commended University of Kansas Medical Center for a quality proposal

Regent Hedges moved and Regent Edwards seconded the motion to recommend placing agenda item 3.3.a. on the Kansas Board of Regents Thursday, December 16, 2010 Discussion Agenda. Motion carried.

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

Gary Alexander presented the requests to change the academic affairs calendars for Wichita State University and Pittsburg State University. The changes requested are as follows:

Wichita State University		
	Move From	To
Fall 2011		
Fall Classes Begin	Thursday, August 18, 2011	<i>Monday, August 22, 2011</i>
Fall Break	October 13-14, 2011	<i>October 17-18, 2011</i>
Total Instructional Days	75	<i>73</i>
Spring 2012		
Spring Classes End	Monday, May 7, 2012	<i>Thursday, May 3, 2012</i>
Total Instructional Days	75	<i>73</i>
Exams	May 9-15, 2012	<i>May 5-11, 2012</i>
Fall 2012		
Classes Begin	Thursday, August 23, 2012	<i>Monday, August 27, 2012</i>
Fall Break	October 18-19, 2012	<i>October 22-23, 2012</i>
Total Instructional Days	75	<i>73</i>
Spring 2013		
Classes End	Monday, May 13, 2013	<i>Thursday, May 9, 2013</i>
Total Instructional Days	75	<i>73</i>
Exams	May 15-21, 2013	<i>May 11-17, 2013</i>

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

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

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

These requested changes comply with KBOR policy.

There was no discussion. Regent Edwards moved and Regent Perkins seconded the motion to recommend placing agenda item 3.3.b. on the Kansas Board of Regents Thursday, December 16, 2010 Discussion Agenda. Motion carried.

Act on Revised Academic Program Review Guidelines

Gary Alexander presented the proposed revised Academic Program Review Guidelines to the Standing Committee. The proposed revisions were developed in consultation with the Council of Chief Academic Officers (COCAO) and the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC).

The proposed program review process 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.

Discussion followed:

- The revisions eliminate outdated timelines
- It clarifies use of data
- Review materials will be provided especially with programs that need additional/intensive review
- This review process incorporates Foresight 2020

Regent Perkins moved and Regent Edwards seconded the motion to recommend placing agenda item 3.3.c. on the Kansas Board of Regents Thursday, December 16, 2010 Discussion Agenda. Motion carried.

A copy of the proposed revised program review process will be attached to the official minutes as Appendix 1.

Act on Proposed Admission Standards

Gary Alexander presented the proposed Admissions Standards. The Admissions Task Force spent significant time developing the proposed standards. The Task Force worked with stakeholders and heard their input, researched other states' admissions procedures, and revised the proposed standards based upon all the information and input gathered.

The proposed admissions standards will be attached to the official minutes as Appendix 2.

BAASC discussed whether or not to recommend the admissions standards for a first and second reading. The Standing Committee by consensus agreed to place the proposed admissions standard on the December agenda for a first reading.

Regent Hedges moved and Regent Edwards seconded the motion to recommend placing agenda item 3.3.d. on the Thursday, December 16, 2010 Discussion Agenda on the Kansas Board of Regents December agenda for a first reading. Motion carried.

Other Business

Act on Highland Community College and Fort Hays State University Request to Revise Performance Agreement

Jean Redeker presented the following:

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

Chris Crawford and Larry Gould, Fort Hays State University and Cia Verschelden, Highland Community College, were present to answer any questions.

Discussion followed:

- Fort Hays State University's changes were due to the K-12 hiring freezes and more institutions offering alternative teaching certification programs than two years ago
- Highland Community College's changes were due in part to BAASC's comments on its 2009 Performance Report – overly dependent on others and too much lead time

Regent Edwards moved and Regent Hedges seconded the motion to approve the revisions to Fort Hays State University's and Highland Community College's Performance Agreements. Motion carried.

BAASC Update Private Postsecondary Education – December 2010

Jacqueline Johnson reported to the Standing Committee an update on the Private Postsecondary Education activities for the month as follows:

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

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

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

There being no other business, meeting adjourned at 11:46 a.m.

GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

November 2010

Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose of Academic Program Review.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Program Review Process

Program Review Cycle

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

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

Program Review Process and Criteria

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

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

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

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

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

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

Data and Minima Tables

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

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

Data minima are established for the following categories:

Undergraduate programs:

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

Master's and Doctoral programs

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

Programs Requiring Additional Review or Monitoring for Improvement

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

Programs Selected for Additional Review or Monitoring

Based on review of both qualitative reports and of these data, Board staff and/or institutions will identify areas of possible concern and consult with institutions to determine what, if any, steps should be taken to resolve problem areas. Institutions may find that some programs require additional review, beyond that provided by the regular review cycle. In addition, some programs may require monitoring for a period of time to assess their progress in rectifying problems identified in the regular program review. Guidelines for prompting additional review or monitoring include minimum data criteria in specific categories. Academic programs which fail to meet any one of these minimum criteria may be targeted for intensive reviews in addition to the regularly scheduled self-study.

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

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

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

Final Report and Recommendations

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

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

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

**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.*