

KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE
AGENDA

December 16, 2015
11:00 a.m.

	Page
1. Approve November 3, 2015 Minutes [Attachment 1]	2
2. Discussion	
a. Performance Funding [Attachment 2] – Gary Alexander and Jean Redeker	7
b. Qualified Admissions [Attachment 3] – Gary Alexander	9
3. Updates	
Transfer and Articulation Council – Karla Wiscombe	
4. Other Business	

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

**Tuesday, November 3, 2015
Conference Call
MINUTES**

The Academic Affairs Standing Committee of the Kansas Board of Regents met by Conference Call at 11:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 3, 2015.

In Attendance:

Members: Regent Van Etten
Regent Zoe Newton
Regent Daniel Thomas

Staff: Gary Alexander, Karla Wiscombe, Jean Redeker, and Renee Burlingham

Others: Sara Rosen, University of Kansas; Ruth Dyer, Kansas State University; Brian Niehoff, Kansas State University; Graham Glynn, Fort Hays State University; Brett Zollinger, Fort Hays State University; Rick Muma, Wichita State University; Robert Klein, University of Kansas Medical Center; Lynette Olson, Pittsburg State University; Alysia Johnston, Fort Scott Community College; Regena Lance, Fort Scott Community College; Nancy Tate, Washburn University; Bill Backlin, Cloud County Community College; Joe Burke, Labette Community College; Linda Fund, Kansas Association of Community College Trustees; and Aron Potter, Coffeyville Community College

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

Approve September 29, 2015 Minutes

Regent Thomas moved, and Regent Newton seconded the motion to approve the September 29, 2015 minutes as written. The motion carried.

Consent Agenda

Request Approval for a Bachelor of Science in Sociology – FHSU

Graham Glynn and Brett Zollinger from Fort Hays State University briefly explained the nature of the proposed Bachelor of Science in Sociology and that no additional funding is required.

Regent Newton moved, and Regent Thomas seconded the motion, to recommend placing the Request Approval for a Bachelor of Science in Sociology on the Board's November agenda. Motion carried.

Discussion Agenda

Fort Hays State University: Reorganization

Graham Glynn presented the Fort Hays State University's request for a College of Science, Technology and Mathematics. The goal is to more equitably distribute the supervision/management of multiple departments.

Regent Thomas moved, and Regent Newton seconded the motion to recommend approval of Fort Hays State University's request to establish the College of Science, Technology and Mathematics.

Fort Hays State University also requested approval to relocate a number of departments and create one new department. The following actions are requested:

- Move the Department of Applied Technology from the College of Education to the College of Science, Technology and Mathematics
- Move the Departments of Chemistry; Computer Science and Information Systems Engineering; Geosciences; Mathematics; and Physics from the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences to the College of Science, Technology and Mathematics
- Move the Department of Agriculture and Department of Biological Sciences from the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences to the College of Science, Technology and Mathematics
- Move the Department of Psychology from the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences to the College of Health and Behavioral Sciences
- Create a new Department of Applied Business Studies, to be housed in the College of Business and Entrepreneurship.

It was noted the relocation of departments is not a physical relocation but a change in the reporting structure.

Regent Newton moved, and Regent Thomas seconded the motion to place Fort Hays State University's request to establish the College of Science, Technology and Mathematics and its request to relocate the above listed departments and create a new department on the Board's November 2015 agenda. Motion carried.

Other Business

Review Performance Agreement Reports AY2014

Karla Wiscombe provided background information on the funding model for the performance agreements and gave brief overviews of the performance agreement reports that are the basis for awarding any new funds in July 2016.

The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee reviewed the following:

1. Barton Community College (Barton CC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview Barton Community College's performance agreement report. Barton CC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution reported directional improvement in five of six goals. Consistent with the Board's performance agreement funding guidelines, staff recommended Barton CC be awarded 100% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

2. Butler Community College (Butler CC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of Butler Community College's performance agreement report. Butler CC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution reported directional improvement in six of seven goals. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, staff recommended Butler CC be awarded 100% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

3. Cloud County Community College (Cloud County CC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of Cloud County Community College's performance agreement report. Cloud County CC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution reported directional improvement in five of six goals. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, staff recommended Cloud County CC be awarded 100% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

4. Cowley Community College (Cowley CC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of Cowley Community College's performance agreement report. Cowley CC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution reported directional improvement in four of six goals. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, staff recommended Cowley CC be awarded 100% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

5. Dodge City Community College (Dodge City CC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of Dodge City Community College's performance agreement report. Dodge City CC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution achieved directional improvement in four of six goals. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, staff recommended Dodge City CC be awarded 100% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

6. Garden City Community College (Garden City CC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of Garden City Community College's performance agreement report. Garden City CC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution achieved directional improvement in four of six goals. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, staff recommended Garden City CC be awarded 100% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

7. Highland Community College (Highland CC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of Highland Community College's performance agreement report. Highland CC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution achieved directional improvement in four of six goals. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, staff recommended Highland CC be awarded 100% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

8. Hutchinson Community College (Hutchinson CC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of Hutchinson Community College's performance agreement report. Hutchinson CC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution achieved directional improvement in five of six goals. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, staff recommended Hutchinson CC be awarded 100% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

9. Johnson County Community College (JCCC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of Johnson County Community College's performance agreement report. JCCC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution achieved directional improvement in four of six goals. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, staff recommended JCCC be awarded 100% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

10. Kansas City Kansas Community College (KCKCC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview Kansas City Kansas Community College's performance agreement report. KCKCC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution achieved directional improvement in four goals and maintained the base line on one of the six indicators. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, staff recommended KCKCC be awarded 100% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

11. Labette Community College (Labette CC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of Labette Community College's performance agreement report. Labette CC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution achieved directional improvement in four of six goals. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, staff recommended Labette CC be awarded 100% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

12. Neosho County Community College (Neosho County CC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of Neosho County Community College's performance agreement report. Neosho County CC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution achieved directional improvement in three goals and maintained the base line on one of the six goals. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, staff recommended Neosho County CC be awarded 100% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

13. Pratt Community College (Pratt CC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of Pratt Community College's performance agreement report. Pratt CC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution achieved directional improvement in three goals and maintained the base line on one of the six goals. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, staff recommended Pratt CC be awarded 100% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

Regent Newton moved, and Regent Thomas seconded the motion, to approve the recommendations for the above listed two-year institutions as presented by staff for the performance agreements reports. Motion carried.

14. Colby Community College (Colby CC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of Colby CC's performance agreement report. Colby Community College is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution achieved directional improvement in two of six goals. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, staff recommended Colby CC be awarded 90% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

15. Coffeyville Community College (Coffeyville CC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of Coffeyville Community College's performance agreement report. Coffeyville CC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution achieved directional improvement in three of six goals. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, staff recommended Coffeyville CC be awarded 90% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

16. Fort Scott Community College (Fort Scott CC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of Fort Scott Community College's performance agreement report. Fort Scott CC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution achieved directional improvement in three of six goals. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, staff recommended Fort Scott CC be awarded 90% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

17. Independence Community College (Independence CC)

Karla Wiscombe gave a brief overview of Independence Community College's performance agreement report. Independence CC is reporting on the first year of a three-year performance agreement. The institution achieved directional improvement in two of six goals. Consistent with the Board's performance funding guidelines, Independence CC qualifies for 90% of any new funding for which it is eligible.

It was reiterated that in determining whether to award 90% or 100% of new funding, the Board may consider such factors as: 1) the quality of the indicators, 2) the scope of the agreement and amount of effort, and 3) any extenuating circumstances not under the control of the institution.

Regent Thomas moved, and Regent Newton seconded the motion, to approve the recommendations for Colby Community College, Coffeyville Community College, Fort Scott Community College, and Independence Community College for 90% funding of any new funds. Motion carried.

There being no other business, Regent Newton moved, and Regent Thomas seconded the motion to adjourn. Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.



KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

MEMO

TO: Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee

FROM: Jean Redeker

DATE: December 4, 2015

RE: History and Options for Scaling Performance Funding

After reviewing AY 2014 Performance Reports at its October and November 2015 meetings, the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee asked staff to “provide the history and options for scaling performance funding.”

As background, in 2002, the adoption of K.S.A. 74-3202d gave the Board authority to 1) approve performance agreements and 2) determine the amount of new state funds awarded. The statute requires agreements be developed in consultation with institutions.

The Board subsequently established a Performance Agreement Task Force to make recommendations and in October 2003, the Board adopted a performance agreement model consisting of six goals and 9-18 indicators, along with a funding model. The funding model is found on page 2. In AY 2008 and AY 2009, BAASC expressed concern with the funding model and discussed revisions. However, the Board did not pursue changes as it was focused on first finalizing its Strategic Plan (now known as *Foresight 2020*).

In AY 2012 and AY 2013, the Board pursued changes to the original performance agreement model to better align it with *Foresight 2020*, adopting the current performance agreement model in February 2013. The Board subsequently approved changes to the original funding model by adopting the current funding model in March 2013. The current funding model is found on page 2.

Options for Scaling Performance Funding Decisions

Below are three options for scaling performance funding which are compatible with the current performance agreement model.

- Keep current funding model of 100%, 90% and 0%.
- Return to the original funding model of 100%, 80%, 60% and 0%.
- Assign funding on a per indicator basis. As an example, an institution with six indicators earns one-sixth of its available increase in funding by demonstrating success on one indicator, two-sixths by demonstrating success in two indicators, etc. An institution would receive 100% of its available increase in funding by demonstrating success in all six indicators. Success is measured by increasing from an established baseline or sustained performance when compared to a baseline.

7

**Current Performance Funding Model
Approved March 2013**

	Six Indicators
<i>Compliance Level 100%</i>	The institution maintained/ improved from the baseline in at least 51% of the indicators (i.e. four or more indicators).
<i>Compliance Level 90%</i>	The institution maintained/ improved from the baseline in in less than 51% of the indicators (i.e. improved/ maintained in two or three indicators) and has specific plans for improvement.
<i>Compliance Level 90% or 100%</i>	If the institution maintained/ improved from the baseline in 50% of its indicators (i.e. three indicators), the Board awards either 90% or 100%.
<i>Compliance Level 0%</i>	The institution lacked an agreement, failed to submit a report, or maintained/ improved from the baseline in only one indicator.

**Original Performance Funding Model
Approved October 2003, Modified April 2011**

	Three to Six Goals, 9-18 Indicators	April 2011 Modifications
<i>Compliance Level 100%</i>	Continuous directional improvement in the majority of System Goals AND the majority of other goals.	Same
<i>Compliance Level 60% or 80%</i>	-80%: Continuous directional improvement in less than the majority of System Goals <u>OR</u> less than the majority of other goals and there were specific plans for improvement. -60%: Continuous directional improvement in only one goal.	Same
<i>Compliance Level 80% or 100%</i>		If the institution met exactly half of its goals, Board awarded either 80% or 100%.
<i>Compliance Level 0%</i>	The institution failed to make a good faith effort and efforts to meets goals have been unsatisfactory, the institution lacked an approved agreement or failed to submit a report.	Same



KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

MEMO

TO: Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee

FROM: Gary Alexander

DATE: December 4, 2015

RE: State University Admissions Requirements

In November, staff were asked to respond to an individual's proposal that KBOR "allow all high school level work completed in middle school or junior high to be used to fulfill the Qualified Admissions (QA) and Kansas Scholars Curriculum requirements regardless of whether it is on a high school or junior high/middle school transcript."

The following is a slightly edited version of the staff response:

The Board has only the authority to determine university admission requirements, which include a precollege curriculum. It has determined that all precollege curriculum courses must be listed on a high school transcript for admission purposes since it is the only transcript sent to the universities to evaluate. It is important to note the Board has no authority regarding what is placed on the high school transcript. That authority lies with each school district. Certainly a math course completed in middle school could be placed on the high school transcript and thus count toward QA, but that is not the decision of KBOR.

Since 2007, the Board has twice considered allowing math courses taken in 7th or 8th grade to count toward fulfilling the Qualified Admissions Curriculum math requirement. This was done as part of an Admissions Task Force the Board formed in 2007 and reconstituted in 2009. The Task Force was charged with reviewing and recommending changes to Qualified Admissions, which includes the QA curriculum.

In both 2007 and 2009, the Task Force considered allowing Algebra I taken in the seventh or eighth grade to count toward fulfilling the math requirement for the QA curriculum. And each time the Board chose not to change the regulations to allow math courses taken in middle school to fulfill Qualified Admissions Math requirements. The types of concerns expressed by individual Board members and the general public included:

- This change makes it possible for a student to complete three years of mathematics over a six year time span. This would make it possible, for example for a student who took QA math courses in the 7th and 8th grades to opt out of math in the 10th-12th grades. Arguments were made that these students will be less prepared for the ACT, which negatively impacts the college admission process and also greatly increases the likelihood they will be placed directly in remedial courses in college.*

The Kansas Scholars Curriculum was not originally intended to be used for admissions purposes. It was adopted by the Board about 30 years ago for the purpose of providing a basis for awarding state scholarships. Students completing the Kansas Scholars Curriculum are high achievers. The group has an average ACT score of 30 and an average high school GPA of 3.9. When the Board required a precollege curriculum for admission to a state university, it included completion of the Kansas Scholars curriculum as one option for fulfilling this requirement. Clearly, the Board wishes to keep resident students in Kansas, and it makes sense to allow the Kansas Scholars Curriculum to fulfill a requirement for admission. It is also clear that allowing one math course taken in middle school to fulfill a Kansas Scholars math requirement does not place these students in remedial math courses in college.

The individual bringing this request properly notes this response focuses on mathematics courses, ignoring his request that all such work be recognized. This focus reflects only that fact that mathematics was the Board's focus in its earlier decision-making process. Other courses taken in middle or junior high school were not considered in the earlier discussions, but there is no reason they cannot be considered for admission purposes.

Despite the individual's assumption of staff bias in this matter, I can assure you none exists. The statement above reflects the positions taken by an earlier Board, and staff have no preference in this matter. It is the Board's prerogative to adopt changes to the Qualified Admissions or Kansas Scholars curriculum at any time.

The question for BAASC is whether KBOR should "accept all HS level work that is completed in middle school." The basic argument for this position is that a high school level course is just that, no matter when it is taken. It would be the student's responsibility to fill in any gaps such as those that might occur in the available sequence of math courses.

One technical problem is that, as noted above, authority over what is placed on the high school transcript resides with individual school districts. Any KBOR decision will have impact only if school districts agree to place high school work completed prior to high school on the high school transcript.