

**KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE**

AGENDA

**March 15, 2017
10:30 am – noon**

The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee will meet in the Kathy Rupp Room located in the Curtis State Office Building at 1000 SW Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka, Kansas, 66612.

- | | | | |
|-------------|---|--|--|
| I. | Call To Order | Regent Van Etten, Chair | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. <i>Approve Minutes</i>
February 28, 2017 Meeting | | <i>p. 2</i> |
| II. | Discussion | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. <i>History and Options for Scaling Performance Funding</i> B. <i>Academic Calendars</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jean Redeker, KBOR Jean Redeker, KBOR | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>p. 4</i> <i>p. 8</i> |
| III. | Other Matters | | |
| IV. | Adjournment | | |

**Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee
Meeting Schedule**

AGENDA MATERIALS DUE	MEETING DATES		TIME
February 22, 2017	March 15, 2017	Face to Face	10:30 am
March 20, 2017	April 4, 2017	Conference Call	11:00 am
April 17, 2017	May 2, 2017	Conference Call	11:00 am
April 26, 2017	May 17, 2017	Face to Face	10:30 am
May 1, 2017	May 30, 2017	Conference Call	11:00 am
May 24, 2017	June 14, 2017	Face to Face	10:30 am

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

**Tuesday February 28, 2017
MINUTES**

The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee of the Kansas Board of Regents met by conference call at 11:00 a.m. on Tuesday, February 28, 2017.

In Attendance:

Members:	Regent Helen Van Etten Regent Shane Bangerter	Regent Zoe Newton Regent Daniel Thomas	
Staff:	Jean Redeker Karla Wiscombe	Jacqueline Johnson April Henry	Renee Burlingham Julene Miller
Institutions Represented:	WSU PSU Seward County CC Barton CC Neosho County CC	FHSU KU Washburn Cloud County CC	KSU KUMC Garden City CC Dodge City CC

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

I. Approve February 15, 2017 Minutes

Regent Newton moved, with the second of Regent Bangerter, that the February 15, 2017 minutes as written be approved. The motion carried.

II. Agenda Planning

A. Consent Agenda

Request for Approval for Accreditation of FHSU Program

Jean Redeker requested approval for FHSU to seek accreditation for its Industrial Technology and Construction Management program from the Association of Technology, Management, and Applied Engineering (ATMAE).

After discussion, Regent Bangerter moved, with the second of Regent Thomas, to place this program on the Board's March 2017 agenda. The motion carried.

B. Discussion Agenda

Receive 2016 Accreditation Report

Jean Redeker presented the 2016 Accreditation Report for the state universities and various programs within each that have specialized accreditation.

After discussion, Regent Newton moved, with the second of Regent Thomas, to place the 2016 Accreditation Report on the Board's March 2017 agenda.

Request for Approval of Performance Reports for Academic Year 2015

The AY 2015 Performance Reports for the institutions below were presented by Jean Redeker and Karla Wiscombe.

Butler Community College
Cloud County Community College
Coffeyville Community College
Colby Community College
Cowley Community College
Dodge City Community College
Fort Scott Community College
Garden City Community College
Hutchinson Community College
Johnson County Community College
Kansas City Kansas Community College
Neosho County Community College
Pratt Community College
Seward County Community College

After discussion, Regent Newton moved to approve the Performance Reports for Academic Year 2015 for the 14 above colleges to receive 100% of any new funding. Regent Bangerter seconded, and the motion carried.

After discussing Washburn University and Allen Community College's reports, Regent Newton moved, and Regent Thomas seconded the motion, to approve the colleges to receive 90% of any new funding. The motion passed with three votes in favor and one opposed.

After discussing Independence Community College report, Regent Newton moved to approve the college to receive 90% of any new funding. Regent Bangerter seconded, and the motion carried.

Regent Newton asked that the committee be provided a review of the funding levels, including a review of BAASC's Dec 2015/Jan 2016 discussion on this topic. That review will be on the March 15 BAASC agenda.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned by unanimous consent at 11:41a.m.



TO: Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee
FROM: Jean Redeker
DATE: February 28, 2017
RE: History of Performance Funding

In 2002, the Legislature enacted K.S.A. 74-3202d which 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 and funding guidelines with nine-eighteen indicators and three levels of funding (100%, 60% or 80%, 0%). In April 2011, a fourth funding level (80% or 100%) was incorporated into those guidelines. In AY 2013, the Board adopted the current performance agreement model with six indicators and revised the funding guidelines to incorporate four levels of funding (100%, 90% or 100%, 90%, 0%). All three funding models are on page 6.

REVIEW BY BAASC or BOARD

Since adopting the first performance agreement model and funding guidelines in October of 2003, the Board has studied revising the model and/or funding guidelines five times, and made substantial revisions in AY 2013. Below is a history of each review and the outcome.

1. AY 2008 and AY 2009: (NO CHANGES MADE)
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*).
2. April 2011: (MINOR CHANGE TO FUNDING GUIDELINES)
The Board revised the funding levels for the Performance Agreement Model by allowing institutions that meet exactly 50% of its goals to be eligible for 80% or 100% of new funding (instead of just 80%), but made no other changes.
3. AY 2013: (CURRENT MODEL AND FUNDING GUIDELIENS ADOPTED)
The Board pursued changes to the original performance agreement model to better align it with *Foresight 2020*, and adopted the current performance agreement model and funding guidelines that year. (See pg 6 for the funding and pg 7 for the indicators.)
4. September 2014: (NO CHANGES MADE)
The Board adopts its goals for the year, which includes a study of performance-based funding models, as requested by legislators who attended the Board retreat. At its December meeting, the

Board accepted the study, and directed staff to forward the recommendations, along with the six guidelines identified at the retreat, to those legislators who attended the Board’s retreat. The Board included a statement that if there is not going to be any new funding, the study of the proposal should be deferred.

5. December 2015/January 2016: (NO CHANGES MADE)

After reviewing AY 2014 Performance Reports at its October and November 2015 meetings, BAASC asked staff to “provide the history and options for scaling performance funding.” At its December 2015 meeting, the committee reviewed the history of performance funding and were presented with three options for scaling the funding:

- 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.

BAASC asked staff to combine the first two options, which it reviewed at its January 2016 meeting. (See below.) BAASC discussed the various indicators within the model and potential implications of future funding. The Committee also heard comments from the audience. BAASC agreed the present model was sufficient.

Draft Performance Funding Model (Option 1+2)

	Six Indicators
<i>Compliance Level</i> 100%	The institution maintained/improved from the baseline in at least 51% of the indicators (i.e. four or more).
<i>Compliance Level</i> 90%	The institution maintained/improved from the baseline in in 50% of the indicators (i.e. three) and has specific plans for improvement.
<i>Compliance Level</i> 75%	The institution maintained/improved from the baseline in two indicators and has specific plans for improvement.
<i>Compliance Level</i> 0%	The institution lacked an agreement, failed to submit a report, or maintained/improved from the baseline in only one indicator.

REVIEW BY SCOPS

At its October 2016 meeting, the System Council of Presidents (SCOPS) voted to form the Performance Agreement Working Group, with recommendations due by February 15, 2017. SCOPs received the Performance Agreement Working Group recommendations last month.

The Group was charged to consider ways to streamline the performance agreement process, consider how the agreements can be better aligned with the Board’s *Foresight 2020* goals while at the same time allowing the institutions to set unique goals, and consider ways in which data already collected by the Board office can be better utilized in the process. The group conducted a survey on all the campuses and concluded there was no clear mandate to propose specific changes to the overall structure of the current process. The Working Group determined that the current process aligns with *Foresight 2020* and allows for institutional flexibility. Dr. Krull reported to the Board the current process seems to be working well.

**Current Performance Funding Model
Approved March 2013**

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

**Performance Funding Model
Approved April 2011,
Retired March 2013**

	Three to Six Goals, 9-18 Indicators
<i>100% of New Funding</i>	Continuous directional improvement in the majority of System Goals AND the majority of other goals.
<i>80% or 100% of New Funding</i>	The institution achieved continuous directional improvement in exactly half of its Goals. The Board has the option of awarding 80% or 100% of new funding.
<i>60% or 80% of New Funding</i>	60%: Continuous directional improvement in only one goal. 80%: Continuous directional improvement in less than the majority of System Goals OR less than the majority of other goals and there were specific plans for improvement.
<i>0% of New Funding</i>	The institution failed to make a good faith effort and efforts to meet goals have been unsatisfactory, the institution lacked an approved agreement, or failed to submit a report.

**Performance Funding Model
Approved October 2003,
Retired April 2011**

	Three to Six Goals, 9-18 Indicators
<i>100% of New Funding</i>	Continuous directional improvement in the majority of System Goals AND the majority of other goals.
<i>60% or 80% of New Funding</i>	60%: Continuous directional improvement in only one goal. 80%: Continuous directional improvement in less than the majority of System Goals OR less than the majority of other goals and there were specific plans for improvement.
<i>0% of New Funding</i>	The institution failed to make a good faith effort and efforts to meet goals have been unsatisfactory, the institution lacked an approved agreement, or failed to submit a report.

Performance Agreement Model

	Sectors		
Indicators	<i>Universities Research Universities</i>	<i>Universities Comprehensive Universities</i>	<i>Community Colleges Technical Colleges</i>
<i>Sector-Specific Indicators</i>	<p>Research universities must include in the performance agreements at least three indicators from the <i>Foresight 2020</i> goals noted below. One of those indicators must include the Goal Three.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing Higher Education Attainment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> First to second year retention rates Number of certificates and degrees awarded Six-year graduation rates Meeting the Needs of the Kansas Economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance of students on institutional assessments Percent of certificates and degrees awarded in STEM fields Ensuring State University Excellence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selected regional and national rankings 	<p>Comprehensive universities must include in the performance agreements at least three indicators from the <i>Foresight 2020</i> goals noted below. One of those indicators must include Goal Three.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing Higher Education Attainment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> First to second year retention rates Number of certificates and degrees awarded Six-year graduation rates Meeting the Needs of the Kansas Economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance of students on institutional assessments Percent of certificates and degrees awarded in STEM fields Ensuring State University Excellence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance on quality measures compared to peers 	<p>Community and technical colleges must include in the performance agreements at least three indicators from the <i>Foresight 2020</i> goals noted below. Institutions must include at least one indicator from each Goal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing Higher Education Attainment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> First to second year retention rates of college ready cohort Three-year graduation rates of college ready cohort Number of certificates and degrees awarded Student Success Index Meeting the Needs of the Kansas Economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance of students on institutional quality measures¹ Percent of students employed or transferred Wages of students hired² Third party technical credentials and WorkKeys, if applicable
<i>Institution-Specific Indicators³</i>	Universities must also include three indicators specific to the institution which support <i>Foresight 2020</i> .	Universities must also include three indicators specific to the institution which support <i>Foresight 2020</i> .	Community and technical colleges must also include three indicators specific to the institution which support <i>Foresight 2020</i> or institution-specific indicators, one of which measures a non-college ready student population.

¹ e.g. the National Community College Benchmarking Project and/or Noel-Levitz Benchmarking Surveys.

² As provided by the Kansas Department of Labor.

³ For all institution-specific indicators involving students, institutions may disaggregate by sub-population (i.e. underrepresented populations, underprepared students, etc.). Institutions may disaggregate other institution-specific indicators, as appropriate.

Discuss Academic Calendars

Summary

In 1984, the Board adopted common elements for the academic calendars of state universities, including having a common Spring Break, but never incorporated this element into the Policy Manual. There appears to be an inherent tension surrounding imposition of a common Spring Break while also trying to avoid having Spring Break the week the Board meets and managing enrollment for some institutions. The Board has managed this tension on an ad hoc basis for years, and now it seems appropriate to revisit these issues to determine whether these tensions can be more effectively managed.

Background

Board policy on academic calendars was adopted in 1970 in response to the student activism of the late 1960s and early 1970s. However, a review of Board minutes and academic affairs files reveals the Board has been concerned with a variety of issues pertaining to academic calendars since the early 1960s. Consequently, the Board has made additional statements or imposed additional requirements on calendars -- some of which were incorporated into the Policy Manual, and some of which were not.

Although current Board policy permits diversity among the universities in the construction of academic calendars, the adoption of common elements by the Board in 1984 and 1990 has forced considerable consistency in the number of instructional days, exam days and vacation days. The crux of this discussion stems from the Board's December 1984 meeting in which it adopted the five common elements below for academic calendars, but only incorporated the first three elements into the Policy Manual.

1. File a three-year calendar with the Board of Regents office
2. Adhere to a semester calendar with a minimum of two sixteen week semesters
3. Have a minimum of 80 academic days per semester (though this was later modified to the current policy of "no fewer than 146 instructional days")
4. *End the fall semester before December 31 and begin the Spring semester no earlier than the beginning of the calendar year*
5. *Have a common Thanksgiving and Spring Break*

Since 1984, item 4 has become common practice for postsecondary institutions and thus it is unnecessary to include in Board policy. In terms of the fifth element, the State of Kansas declares the fourth Thursday and Friday of November as the Thanksgiving Day holiday so institutions already have a common Thanksgiving Break, although some institutions also schedule their Fall Break that week which makes it a week-long break for some students.

This leaves the Spring Break portion of the fifth element as the basis for the current discussion. Various documents indicate the Board asked state universities to share a common Spring Break because families with students at two or more state universities were unable to plan vacations when each campus set its own Spring Break.

Critical to this discussion is the Board's Bylaws, which state "the regular meeting date of the Board shall be the third Thursday of each month and the Wednesday preceding it. With adequate notice and with good cause, the Chair shall have the authority to change the date of or cancel any particular meeting." While Board policy does not expressly prohibit Spring Break being held the third week in March, it makes sense to avoid having Spring Break coincide with a Board meeting because university CEOs, provosts, faculty, students, and staff are integral components of such meetings.

In checking records for the 16-year period of AY 2002 through AY 2017, state universities have shared a common Spring Break. However, on eight separate occasions the Board moved its March meeting so it would not meet the third week of that month to work around Spring Break schedules. This allowed universities to have a common Spring Break the third week in March. On one occasion the Board approved a Spring Break that coincided with its March Board meeting. On seven occasions the Board maintained its regular meeting schedule and universities shared a common Spring Break that was held either before or after the regularly-scheduled March Board meeting.

There appears to be an inherent tension surrounding having a common Spring Break so families can plan vacations, avoiding having Spring Break the week of the March Board meeting, and the management of enrollment for some institutions. The Board has managed this tension on an ad hoc basis for years, and now it seems appropriate to revisit these issues to determine whether these tensions can be more effectively managed.

Kansas Board of Regents Policy on Academic Calendars

CHILA.1. ACADEMIC CALENDAR

- a. The Academic Calendar of each state university shall provide for an academic year minimally consisting of two sixteen week semesters totaling no fewer than 146 instructional days plus five final exam days each semester.
- b. Each state university shall file a three-year Academic Calendar adhering to holidays and breaks approved by the Board. Each state university shall follow the calendar as approved by the Board. Any deviation for reasons other than natural disasters or national emergencies must have prior approval of the Board.
- c. The President and Chief Executive Officer of the Board shall have the authority to approve or deny non-substantive revisions to Board-approved three-year calendars and shall periodically report these changes to the Board.