The Academic Affairs Standing Committee of the Kansas Board of Regents met by Conference Call at 11:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 5, 2013. This meeting had been properly noticed pursuant to the Kansas Open Meetings Law on October 29, 2013.

In Attendance:

Members:  Regent Robba Moran  
           Regent Mildred Edwards  
           Regent Van Etten  
           Regent Tim Emert  

Staff:   Gary Alexander, Jean Redeker, Karla Wiscombe, Jacqueline Johnson, Crystal Puderbaugh, Susan Fish, Julene Miller and Renee Burlingham  

Others:  Sara Rosen, University of Kansas; Rick Muma, Wichita State University; Tony Vizzini,  
          Wichita State University; Howard Smith, Pittsburg State University; Bill Ivy, Pittsburg State University; Jan Smith, Pittsburg State University; Ruth Dyer, Kansas State University; Brian Niehoff, Kansas State University; Nancy Tate, Washburn University; Randy Pembrook,  
          Washburn University; Gillian Gablemann, Washburn Institute of Technology; Clark Coco,  
          Washburn Institute of Technology; Eric Burks, North Central Kansas Technical College;  
          Jennifer Brown, North Central Kansas Technical College; Richard Fogg, Manhattan Area  
          Technical College; Pedro Leite, Salina Area Technical College; Scott Lucas, Wichita Area  
          Technical College; Diane Stiles, Northwest Kansas Technical College; Brenda Chatfield,  
          Northwest Kansas Technical College; Peggy Forsberg, Highland Community College;  
          Duane Dunn, Seward County Community College; Todd Carter, Seward County Community  
          College; Mike Worley, University of Kansas Medical Center; Chris Crawford, Fort Hays  
          State University; Rustin Clark, Hutchinson Community College; Mike Vitale, Kansas City  
          Kansas Community College; and Linda Fund, Kansas Association of Community College  
          Trustees (KACCT)  

Meeting called to order at 11:00 a.m.

Approve October 16, 2013 Minutes
Regent Van Etten moved, and Regent Emert seconded the motion, to approve the October 16, 2013 minutes. The motion carried.
Consent Agenda

Act on Requests for Additional Degree Granting Authority for:

- Vatterott College – Sunset Hills
- Spartan College of Aeronautics
- Rasmussen College
- University of South Dakota
- University of Nebraska

Jacqueline Johnson presented an overview of the above listed requests for additional degree granting authority. These institutions have been reviewed thoroughly by Board staff. The review covers: staff qualifications, record keeping systems, coursework, materials, website platforms, extended studies and campuses. These institutions meet and maintain compliance with all of the imposed requirements. These institutions are also accredited by accrediting agencies recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

Regent Emert moved, and Regent Van Etten seconded the motion, to recommend placing the above listed requests for additional degree granting authority on the November consent agenda of the Board of Regents. Motion carried.

Act on Request for Approval of a Master of Science in Geography (CIP 45.0701) – University of Kansas

Jean Redeker gave a brief overview of the University of Kansas’ request for a Master of Science in Geography (CIP 45.0701).

Regent Van Etten moved, and Regent Emert seconded the motion, to recommend placing the University of Kansas’ Master of Science in Geography on the November consent agenda of the Board of Regents. Motion carried.

Act on Request for Approval of Master of Science in Education (CIP 13.9999) – Pittsburg State University

Jean Redeker presented Pittsburg State University’s request for a Master of Science in Education (CIP 13.9999).

Regent Emert moved, and Regent Van Etten seconded the motion, to recommend placing the Pittsburg State University’s Master of Science in Education on the November consent agenda of the Board of Regents. Motion carried.

Discussion Agenda

Act on Requests for New Degree Granting Authority for Excelsior College and University of Cincinnati

Jacqueline Johnson presented the requests for new degree granting authority. Excelsior College is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, which is recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. The University of Cincinnati is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, which is recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.
Regent Emert moved, and Regent Van Etten seconded the motion, to recommend placing Excelsior College’s and the University of Cincinnati’s requests for new degree granting authority on the November discussion agenda of the Kansas Board of Regents. Motion carried.

Other Business

Performance Agreements 2014 - 2016 Review

BAASC reviewed eleven Performance Agreements for AY 2014, AY 2015, and AY 2016, for the purpose of making recommendations to the full Board.

Jean Redeker gave a brief overview of the following performance agreements:

1. **Emporia State University** – David Cordle was present representing Emporia State University. Indicator 1 targets retention. Indicators 2 and 5 focus on improving student learning outcomes. Indicator 3 compares ESU to peers in relationship to private giving. The other goals focus on growing enrollment of traditional students and increasing the number of student credit hours offered through distance education. All indicators proposed by Emporia State University are in *Foresight 2020* or are otherwise a Board goal (i.e. distance education). Staff recommends approval.

Regent Edwards moved, and Regent Emert seconded the motion, to recommend placing Emporia State University’s Performance Agreement on the Kansas Board of Regents January 2014 agenda for approval. Motion carried unanimously.

2. **Kansas State University** – Ruth Dyer and Brian Niehoff were present representing Kansas State University. Indicators 1 and 6 target retention. Indicator 2 focuses on the number of credentials completed while Indicator 5 measures the number of underrepresented students receiving a credential. Indicators 3 and 4 look at rankings related to research expenditures and annual giving. Indicators 1 through 5 proposed by Kansas State University are *Foresight 2020* measurements. Staff recommended Indicator 6 also be a *Foresight 2020* measurement. For Indicator 6, K-State measured completion of its First Year Seminar because it directly ties into K-State’s strategic goals for retention and graduation. K-State included two ranking indicators, which increased the difficulty of the agreement. Staff recommends approval.

Regent Emert moved, and Regent Edwards seconded the motion, to recommend placing Kansas State University’s Performance Agreement on the Kansas Board of Regents January 2014 agenda for approval. Motion carried unanimously.

3. **Pittsburg State University** – Howard Smith, Bill Ivy, and Jan Smith were present representing Pittsburg State University. Indicator 1 focuses on retention while Indicator 2 looks at student learning outcomes. Indicator 3 is a ranking indicator and PSU has measured itself against the peers approved by the Board last month in the areas of retention, graduation, research expenditures and faculty qualifications (institutions were ranked on each variable and an average rank was calculated to establish the baseline). Other indicators target growth in distance education, in the awarding of undergraduate degrees to domestic minorities and fund raising for scholarships. All indicators proposed by Pittsburg State University are in *Foresight 2020* or are otherwise a focus of the Board (i.e. distance education). Staff commends PSU for proposing a strong agreement and for developing a multi-faceted ranking indicator. Staff recommends approval of the agreement.
Regent Van Etten moved, and Regent Edwards seconded the motion, to recommend placing Pittsburg State University’s Performance Agreement on the Kansas Board of Regents January 2014 agenda for approval. Motion carried unanimously.

4. **Washburn University** – Randy Pembrook and Nancy Tate were present representing Washburn University. Indicator 1 focuses on retention. Indicator 2 focuses on attainment of certificates, and degrees while Indicator 4 looks at increasing the percent of students passing required exams for professional or board licensure. Indicator 3 is a ranking indicator and Washburn is comparing itself on the measurement of endowment per full-time equivalent student. Other indicators target growth in distance education and the enrollment of students transferring in Kansas community and technical colleges. Indicator 1 through 4 proposed by Washburn University are in *Foresight 2020*, while Indicator 5 is a focus of the Board. Staff recommended Indicator 6 measure enrolling a population that *Foresight 2020* directly targets. For Indicator 6, Washburn University chose to focus on enrollment of transfer students because it is an institutional goal. Staff recommends approval.

Regent Edwards moved, and Regent Emert seconded the motion, to recommend placing Washburn University’s Performance Agreement on the Kansas Board of Regents January 2014 agenda for approval. Motion carried unanimously.

5. **Washburn Institute of Technology** – Randy Pembrook, Clark Coco and Gillian Gablemann were present representing Washburn Institute of Technology. Indicator 1 focuses on attainment of certificates and degrees while Indicator 3 measures third-party credential attainment. Indicator 2 is the student success index which measures students who completed or were retained at Washburn Tech or who completed or were retained anywhere in the system, or at institutions that submit data to the National Clearinghouse. Indicator 4 is the developmental education indicator. Indicator 5 aims to increase enrollment at the institution and indicator 6 looks at completion rates. All indicators proposed by Washburn Institute of Technology are in *Foresight 2020*, in the performance agreement model or a focus of the Board (i.e., remedial education). Staff recommends approval.

Regent Edwards moved, and Regent Van Etten seconded the motion, to recommend placing Washburn Institute of Technology’s Performance Agreement on the Kansas Board of Regents January 2014 agenda for approval. Motion carried unanimously.

6. **North Central Kansas Technical College** – Eric Burks and Jennifer Brown were present representing North Central Kansas Technical College. Indicators 1 and 2 look at increasing retention and graduation rates, while indicator 3 seeks to increase the number of third party credentials awarded. Indicator 4 deals with developmental education. Other indicators look at increasing adult enrollment and increasing distance education. All indicators proposed by North Central Kansas Technical College are in *Foresight 2020*, in the performance agreement model or are a focus of the Board (i.e., distance education, remedial education). Staff recommends approval.

Regent Van Etten moved, and Regent Emert seconded the motion, to recommend placing North Central Kansas Technical College’s Performance Agreement on the Kansas Board of Regents January 2014 agenda for approval. Motion carried unanimously.
7. **Manhattan Area Technical College** – Richard Fogg was present representing Manhattan Area Technical College. Indicator 1 looks at increasing the number of certificates and degrees awarded, while indicator 3 seeks to increase the number of third party credentials awarded. Indicator 2 looks at employment of students after program completion. Indicator 4 deals with developmental education. Other indicators focus on increasing student learning outcomes and increasing enrollment of traditional age students. All indicators proposed by Manhattan Area Technical College are in *Foresight 2020* and/or the performance agreement model. Staff recommends approval.

Regent Emert moved, and Regent Van Etten seconded the motion, to recommend placing Manhattan Area Technical College’s Performance Agreement on the Kansas Board of Regents January 2014 agenda for approval. Motion carried unanimously.

8. **Salina Area Technical College** – Pedro Leite was present representing Salina Area Technical College. Indicator 1 looks increasing the number of certificates and degrees awarded, while indicator 2 seeks to improve retention. Indicator 3 looks at employment of students after program completion while indicator 4 seeks to increase the number of Work Keys credentials awarded. Other indicators focus on increasing student learning outcomes and increasing enrollment of traditional age students. All indicators proposed by Salina Area Technical College are in *Foresight 2020* or in the performance agreement model. Staff recommends approval.

Regent Van Etten moved, and Regent Edwards seconded the motion, to recommend placing Salina Area Technical College’s Performance Agreement on the Kansas Board of Regents January 2014 agenda for approval. Motion carried unanimously.

9. **Wichita Area Technical College** – Scott Lucas was present representing Wichita Area Technical College. Indicator 1 focuses on increasing the number of certificates and degrees earned, while indicator 3 seeks to increase the number of third party credentials awarded. Indicator 2 is ratio measuring the number of award seeking students to credentials conferred. WATC seeks to lower this ratio. The ideal ratio is 1 to 1 which means that each student that seeks an award receives an award. The current baseline is 2.39. This means that for every 2.39 students that seek an award, only one award is given. This leaves 1.39 students not receiving an award. Indicator 4 is the developmental education indicator. Indicator 5 seeks to increase the number of Hispanic and Latino students enrolled. Indicator 6 looks at high school students completing courses. Indicators 1, 2, 3 and 5 proposed by Wichita Area Technical College are in *Foresight 2020*. Indicator 4 is a focus of the Board and Indicator 6 speaks to the Governor’s technical education initiative. Staff recommends approval.

Regent Edwards moved, and Regent Emert seconded the motion, to recommend placing Wichita Area Technical College’s Performance Agreement on the Kansas Board of Regents January 2014 agenda for approval. Motion carried unanimously.

10. **Northwest Kansas Technical College** – Brenda Chatfield and Diane Stiles were present representing Northwest Kansas Technical College. Indicator 1 looks at increasing retention rates while indicator 6 looks at graduation rates. Indicator 2 seeks to increase the number of credentials awarded by third parties, while indicator 3 measures the number of certificates and degrees awarded. Indicator 4 is the required developmental student indicator. Indicator 5 measures employment of students after program completion.
All indicators proposed by Northwest Kansas Technical College are in Foresight2020 and/or the performance agreement model. Staff recommends approval.

Regent Edwards moved, and Regent Van Etten seconded the motion, to recommend placing Northwest Kansas Technical College’s Performance Agreement on the Kansas Board of Regents January 2014 agenda for approval. Motion carried unanimously.

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of the following performance agreement:

11. Seward County Community College – Duane Dunn and Todd Carter were present representing Seward County Community College. Indicators 1, 3 and 6 focus on student completion of various levels including courses, credentials, certificates, and degrees. Indicators 2 and 4 target success rates of students in College Algebra and English Composition I. Indicator 5 targets first to second year retention of college ready students. Staff recommends approval.

Regent Emert moved, and Regent Van Etten seconded the motion, to recommend placing Seward County Community College’s Performance Agreement on the Kansas Board of Regents January 2014 agenda for approval. Motion carried unanimously.

Other Business
The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee meets at 10:00 a.m. on November 20, 2013, in the Varnes Board Room at the School of Nursing, the University of Kansas Medical Center, 3901 Rainbow, Kansas City, Kansas.

The agenda includes Teacher Preparation Presentations by Emporia State University Education Dean – Ken Weaver and Washburn University Education – Donna Lalonde and BAASC will discuss the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA).

Regent Emert moved, and Regent Edwards seconded the motion, to adjourn. Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.