

Council of Chief Academic Officers

Wednesday, October 20, 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

	Page
1. Approve Minutes of September 15, 2010 [Attachment 1]	2
2. <i>Foresight 2020</i> Activities	
a. Assessment of Student Learning	
b. Distance Education	
3. Draft Guidelines for Academic Program Review [Attachment 2]	7
4. New Program Requests	
a. KU – Request for a Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Computing (CIP 11.0101) (SECOND READING) [Attachment 3]	26
b. PSU – Request for a Bachelor of Science in Exercise Science (CIP 31.0505) (FIRST READING) [Attachment 4]	32
c. KUMC – Request Approval to Organize the Preventive Medicine, Biostatistics and Health Policy and Management Programs into a School of Public Health (SECOND READING) [Attachment 5]	36
5. Informational Items	
WSU – Center for Innovation and Enterprise Engagement [Attachment 6]	40
6. 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

Council of Chief Academic Officers

Wednesday, September 15, 2010
9:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
Room 530
Curtis State Office Building
Reconvene at
12:00 – 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, September 15, 2010 in Room 530 of the Curtis State Office Building, Topeka, Kansas at 9:30 a.m. and reconvened in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room of the Kansas Board of Regents Office, Suite 520, 1000 SW Jackson, Topeka, Kansas at 12:00 p.m.

Members Present:

Larry Gould, Provost, FHSU	Tes Mehring, Provost, ESU
Jeff Vitter, Provost, KU	Gary Miller, Provost, WSU
April Mason, Provost, KSU	Nancy Tate, Interim VPAA, WU
Lynette Olson, Provost, PSU	Gary Alexander, KBOR
Allen Rawitch, VCAA, KU Med Center	April Mason, Provost, KSU

Staff Present

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

Approve Minutes of June 23, 2010

Lynette Olson asked for a revision to the June 23, 2010 Minutes as follows:

Amended June 23, 2010 Minutes

Informational Items

- a. *PSU – Elimination of the Bachelor of Arts Sociology degree (CIP 45.1101)*
- b. *PSU – Elimination of the Second Teaching Option (13.1302), K-12 Art Teaching Certification*
- c. *PSU – Elimination of the Computational Physics and Pre-medical Emphasis in Physics (45.1101) and adding the Astrophysics and Engineering Technology Emphasis*
- d. *PSU – Public Health – A New ~~Concentration~~ Interdisciplinary Minor in the Bachelor of Science in Chemistry (CIP 40.0501)*
- e. *PSU – International Teaching – A New Minor within the Early Childhood/Late Childhood K-6 and Early Childhood Unified Program (13.1202)*

f. PSU – Urban and Suburban Experience – A New Minor within the Early Childhood/Late Childhood K-6 and Early Childhood Unified Program (13.1202)

Items a-f from Pittsburg State University are informational items and no action is required.

Allen Rawitch moved and Gary Miller seconded the motion to approve the Minutes of June 23, 2010 as amended. The motion carried.

Learning Outcomes Update

Gary Alexander presented information about Foresight 2020, Strategic Goal #4 Learning Outcomes. Fundamental skills, such as oral and written communication, technical and numerical literacy, critical thinking and problem-solving, need to be identified along with measurements of these skills.

The Council discussed the need to identify and measure fundamental skills. COCAO expressed its desire to determine the fundamental skills to be measured and asked that this issue be placed on the October 2010 COCAO agenda.

Review New Program Approval Process

Gary Alexander discussed the process for approving new programs with Council members. Board staff asked that new programs be submitted on or before the due dates provided on the agenda each month because new program proposals require time for review and communication with the universities.

COCAO asked for a few clarifications to the new program proposal check list. The check list is an internal document used by Board staff.

COCAO went on to discuss what the private postsecondary institutions' new program proposal process is. Several points were covered:

- Kansas Private Postsecondary Education staff give these proposals rigorous review for new degree granting authority which includes course review, campus visits and review of faculty qualifications
- National discussion regarding employment of students and its potential affect on private institutions

New Program Requests

KU – Request Approval for a Master of Arts and Ph.D. in Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies (CIP 05.0207) – University of Kansas (SECOND READING)

Gary Miller moved and Tes Mehring seconded the motion to recommend placing the Master of Arts and Ph.D. in Women, Gender and sexuality Studies (CIP 05.0207) on the October 2010 Council of Presidents agenda recommending approval.

No discussion. Motion carried.

KU – Request for a Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Computing (CIP 11.0101) (FIRST READING)

The University of Kansas requests approval for a Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Computing (CIP 11.0101) for first reading. Any comments, suggestions or questions should be sent to Jeff Vitter prior to the October 20, 2010 Council of Chief Academic Officers' meeting. This request will be placed on the COCAO October 20, 2010 agenda for second reading.

Program Requests

- a. **KUMC – Request Approval to Organize the Preventive Medicine, Biostatistics and Health Policy and Management Programs into a School of Public Health**
- b. **KSU – Request Approval to Merge the Elementary Education (40070) and Secondary Education (40080) Departments into Curriculum and Instruction (40040)**
- c. **KSU – Request Approval to Change the Name of the K-State Olathe Innovation Campus (50060) to K-State Olathe (53010)**
- d. **ESU – Request Approval to Change the Name of the Master of Science in Psychology from General Psychology to Experimental Psychology**

The University of Kansas Medical Center requests approval to organize the Preventive Medicine Biostatistics and Health Policy and Management Programs into a new School of Public Health. This is a first reading and this item will be placed on the October COCAO agenda for further review.

Larry Gould moved and Gary Miller seconded the motion to approve program request items b, c, and d as listed above. Motion carried.

Informational Items

PSU – Discontinuing the Harley Davidson BAS Program

Pittsburg State University discontinued its Harley Davidson BAS program. This is informational and no action is required.

The meeting recessed until noon.

The Council of Chief Academic Officers reconvened at noon in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room

Other Business

Learning Outcomes

COCAO discussed how it will identify fundamental skills and the measurement of those skills.

- The Council of Chief Academic Officers will identify the foundational skills
- Assessment plans will be developed by each university
- Board staff will develop a draft report format for review by COCAO members prior to its October 20, 2010 meeting

The Council acknowledged the group that worked on learning outcomes over the last few months. It was noted there were positive dynamics between the members collaborating, sharing information, and supporting the work on learning outcomes. As a group they recognized the value in coming together and would support some in-service activities statewide (workshops, live chat, etc.).

It was also noted that the Core Competencies Project may be adapted to deal with Learning Outcomes and Articulation and Transfer issues.

Council of Student Affairs Officers (COSAO)

This council is in the Board policy manual as follows:

(c) Council of Student Affairs Officers

(i) The Council of Student Affairs Officers (COSAO), established in 1983, consists of the chief student affairs officer of each Regents institution or his or her appointee. COSAO reports directly to the Council of Presidents. The chairperson is from the same institution as the chair of the Council of Presidents. The President and Chief Executive Officer shall designate a member of the Board staff to serve as an ex officio member. The chief student affairs officer of the University of Kansas Medical Center is authorized to participate as a non-voting member when agenda items affecting that institution are to be considered.

(ii) The function of the Council is to consider the welfare and development of students and institutional services to meet their needs. (10-19-95)

This Council is in the process of reconstituting and would like suggestions from the Council of Chief Academic Officers regarding how COSAO could assist it.

It was noted that for the last few years the Tilford Conference dates have conflicted with the National Student Affairs Officers meeting. They ask if they could have input in setting the date for the Tilford Conference as many of them would like to attend both the Tilford Conference and the Student Affairs Officers National Conference.

Fort Hays State University Proposal to Conduct a Political Poll of Kansas Regents University Students

Larry Gould presented the proposal to the Council. The Fort Hays State University and the Docking Institute, in pursuit of the public affairs mission of the university, propose to conduct a poll of Kansas college students at Regents universities to measure political participation and attitudes toward political candidates for dissemination to the general public.

The surveys have been approved and conducted in the past. The question for COCAO was: May Fort Hays State University and the Docking Institute contact institutions to proceed with the survey? COCAO agreed to allow Fort Hays State University staff to contact Regents universities to conduct the survey by consensus.

Policy Manual Regarding Eligible Retirement

COCAO members were directed to ask the Board of Regents General Counsel for an opinion on the policy regarding when faculty are eligible for retirement.

University Press of Kansas Anecdote

Larry Gould shared that Fred Woodward, Director of the University Press of Kansas, went above and beyond his duty when historian and author, Craig Miner (age 65), was nearing death while his last book was being published. Mr. Woodward had one copy of Mr. Miner's book published, and Fred delivered it to him a few days prior to his death.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned by consensus.

Sincerely,

Jeff Vitter
Provost for Academic Affairs,
University of Kansas

GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

October 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
 - Information on assessment of learning outcomes
 - Placement of graduates, e.g., types of positions, starting salary
 - Sources of external support
 - Conclusions and recommendations
3. A one-page institutional estimate of the fiscal implications of any recommended program changes.

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

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW IN THE KANSAS REGENTS SYSTEM

I. Academic Program Review and Institutional Mission Development.

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

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

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

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

II. Purposes and Goals for Academic Program Review.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. The Program Review Process

A. A Common Program Data Base

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

later than March 16 of each year beginning in 1998. Board of Regents staff will work with the Council of Chief Academic Officers to ensure that the database is consistent across universities and is updated annually.

B. The Program Review Schedule

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

C. The Program Review Process and Criteria

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

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

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

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

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

Institutional reviews of programs will not be limited to the statistical information outlined in Attachment 1 but may include student learning assessment data, evaluations and recommendations from accreditation reports, data on student post-collegiate experiences, data gathered from the core and institution-specific performance indicators, and/or information in national or disciplinary rankings of program quality. Specific and/or additional information that relate to these criteria and that are meaningful and appropriate for the institution can be developed by each Regents university. The universities may consider and implement separate review processes for graduate and undergraduate education. Examples of appropriate indicators for graduate programs might include the value and quality indicators listed in the policy statement on Academic Review of Graduate Programs, adopted by the Council on Graduate Schools.

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

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

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

IV. Report and Recommendations to the Kansas Board of Regents

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

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

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

Attachment 1

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW - APPROVED TIMELINE - 1997 -2000

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

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

1998 PROGRAM REVIEW

Institution: Self Explanatory.

Department: List the Department Name.

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

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

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

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

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

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

	FY 93	FY 94	FY 95	FY96	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 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

Part E: Department Faculty:

N

%

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| 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. Three-year Growth Trend in Headcount | | |
| 6. Total Instructional Faculty FTE in Department
<i>(Definitions and Accounting Period as was used
in the DBTF Report)</i> | | |

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: 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 B: 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 C: 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.

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

Summary and Recommendation

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

09/03/10

Background

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

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

**CURRICULUM OUTLINE
NEW DEGREE PROPOSALS
Kansas Board of Regents**

I. Identify the new degree:

Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Computing

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

	Course Name & Number	Credit Hours
Core Courses		
	MATH 121 Calculus I	5
	MATH 122 Calculus II	5
	MATH 223 Vector Calculus	3
	MATH 290 Elementary Linear Algebra	2
	MATH 526 Applied Mathematical Statistics I	3
	ENGL 101 Composition Composition	3
	ENGL 102 Creative Reading and Writing	3
	ENGL 362 Foundations of Technical Writing	3
	COMS 130 Speaker-Audience Communications	3
	PHIL 375 Moral Issues in Computer Technology	3
	EECS 140 Introduction to Digital Logic Design	4
	EECS 168 Programming I	4
	EECS 210 Discrete Structures	4
	EECS 268 Programming II	4
	EECS 368 Programming Language Paradigms	3
	EECS 388 Computer Systems & Assembly Language	4
	EECS 448 Software Engineering I	4
	EECS 560 Data Structures	4
	EECS 678 Introduction to Operating Systems	4
Electives		
	2 Courses Humanities	6
	2 Courses Social Sciences	6
	4 Courses EECS Senior Electives	12

Astronomy 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
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

Fiscal Summary for the Proposed Academic Program

Institution: University of Kansas - Lawrence

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: _____

The full proposal is available online

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

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.

10/06/10

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/Local 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

NEW DEGREE PROPOSALS 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: _____



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.

Wichita State University Center for Innovation and Enterprise Engagement

In 2007, Composites Kansas (10-county Wichita labor basin) was awarded a Department of Labor (DOL) Workforce Innovation in Regional Economic Development (WIRED) grant. The region's transformational focus was placed on increasing the competency of workforce and expanding education and training in science, technology, engineering and math. Resources from Composites Kansas supported the emerging composite and advanced materials industry, as the use of composites dramatically accelerated in the aviation and medical device industries, and encouraged migration of a new generation of composite and advanced materials technology to other commercial applications in the region. Composites Kansas had three operational strategies: a) education and training, b) R&D and entrepreneurship, and c) regional economic growth. The region received \$5 million over three years to support regional economic transformation through the integration of education, research, workforce and economic development systems.

With WIRED funding, the region was able to serve more than 200 firms and more than 2,900 employees. Composites Kansas trained more than 325 educators, developed more than 50 curricula, and equipped two state-of-the-art laboratories – composites lab and non-destructive testing lab. However, the types of technical assistance available to regional firms were limited with the DOL funds as they could not be used for *firm specific* commercialization of existing R&D or technology transfer/migration counseling. Regional firms, that have completed strategic planning, indicate that the missing link is technical assistance. These firms have requested technical expertise and business expertise to support and inform their transition to next generation materials and processes and expand their capacity to manufacture improved and new products.

In response to the need for technical assistance, the Wichita State University (WSU) College of Engineering will establish a Center for Innovation and Enterprise Engagement (hereafter called the Center) to strengthen and develop the local manufacturing industries' innovation competencies in manufacturing processes and product capabilities. The Center will expand the south central Kansas cluster's ability to conceive, develop, and produce new technologies, to deploy new manufacturing processes, and to improve on the processes that already exist within the private industry sector. **The goal of the Center will be to escalate the development and predominance of the south central Kansas² advanced manufacturing cluster in the global economy.**

The Center will employ an interdisciplinary approach with collaborative partners to promote industry diversification, new industry formation, and process and product improvements within existing firms. The proposed Center will extend and expand the training elements of WIRED that focused on entrepreneurship and small business development and provide additional technical assistance and economic development support to business enterprises.

The Center for Innovation and Enterprise Engagement will:

- Convene a *business and industry roundtable* to offer guidance and input for regional economic and workforce development strategies, leverage resources to support the region's globally recognized center of composite knowledge, science, processes, technology and production, and increase economic diversification within the region.
- Advocate and connect business with *applied research and technical assistance* to aid in the development of new and innovative products and services (technology transition/migration and entrepreneurship). Applied research will include technical advice and support to assist small and medium size firms to add or expand manufacturing processes and product capabilities (i.e. next generation materials, processes and techniques).

²South central Kansas is the founding geographic region that includes Butler, Cowley, Harper, Harvey, Kingman, Marion, McPherson, Reno, Sedgwick and Sumner Counties.

- Encourage national and international industries to fully *utilize the expertise and resources available in south central Kansas*, including the educated workforce, using a composites database. The composites database outreach is intended to:
 - Increase employment due to additional orders for existing laboratory facilities and industrial infrastructure (direct orders and contracts, business collaboration/ partnership),
 - Attract additional complementary businesses and industries to the region,
 - Expand inquiries for technical advice (business-research, business-workforce development relationships).

- *Facilitate skills and knowledge development* for the current and future workforce through:
 - Updating of training and academic curricula informed by research and development in collaboration with business and industry, the National Institute for Aviation Research (NIAR) and College of Engineering (customized training for industry, formal education in composites through a certificate, technical, bachelor's, master's or a concentration in a Ph.D. program).
 - Partnering to develop the required workforce through a continuing education program (K- 16 pipeline, emergent worker/apprenticeship programs, on-the-job training, dislocated worker, professional development).

The business and industry roundtable will connect small business with the technical expertise and business expertise available through the Center's collaborative partners. Business and industries' strategic needs will inform and guide the Center's Technical Advisory Panel and will steer curriculum development and the applied research agenda. The roundtable will serve as a primary communication forum to promote customized services for small businesses, provided by the collaborative partners. To access customized technical expertise and business services, small business enterprises will contact the Center to apply for technical assistance. Firms will have the flexibility to engage expertise that best fits their strategic business focus or business challenge. The Center will assist the firms in selecting a *technical assistance mentor* to aid firms in development of their technical assistance plans and provide recommendations for potential vendors, if needed.

Interdisciplinary/interagency enterprise development services will be encouraged to provide comprehensive support for the firm's strategic transformation. These services will produce a world-class workforce and equip entrepreneurs and business owners with skills, tools and resources to commercialize processes for new technology and products.

The applications for technical assistance will be reviewed by the Technical Advisory Panel, which will make a recommendation to the Board of Directors regarding the feasibility of the plan and a recommendation for subsidizing the technical assistance. Once a technical assistance plan is approved, staff will coordinate with collaborative partners to engage the selected vendor's services. The region's technical experts, in conjunction with the laboratory capabilities, will provide small business with the technology transfer/transition counseling, commercialization of existing R&D counseling and mentoring support to enable the small businesses to conceive, develop and produce new and improved products and processes. Outcomes will be measured by increased productivity and profitability, number of new business starts and expansions, number of additional jobs, and number of new manufacturing processes and technologies implemented.