

NOVEMBER 20, 2019

Kansas Board of Regents
Pittsburg State University
Overman Student Center
302 E. Cleveland
Pittsburg, KS 66762

2019-2020
Shane Bangerter, Chair
Bill Feuerborn, Vice Chair

KANSAS BOARD OF REGENT MEMBERS:

Shane Bangerter	Ann Brandau-Murguia	Bill Feuerborn
Cheryl Harrison-Lee	Mark Hutton	Shelly Kiblinger
Jon Rolph	Allen Schmidt	Helen Van Etten

FORESIGHT 2020

A Strategic Agenda for the State's Public Higher Education System

1. Increase higher education attainment among Kansas citizens
2. Improve alignment of the state's higher education system with the needs of the economy
3. Ensure state university excellence

FORESIGHT 2020

A 10-Year Strategic Agenda for the State's Public Higher Education System



Foresight 2020 is a 10-year strategic agenda for the state's public higher education system. Originally adopted by the Kansas Board of Regents in 2010, updated in 2012, and modified in 2015, the plan sets long-range achievement goals that are measurable, reportable, and ensure the state's higher education system meets Kansans' expectations.

Find each year's progress report at: kansasregents.org/foresight2020.

INCREASE HIGHER EDUCATION ATTAINMENT

Aspirations

- ★ Increase to 60 percent the number of Kansas adults who have earned a certificate, associate or bachelor's degree by 2020.
- ★ Achieve a ten percentage point increase in retention and graduation rates by 2020.

Measures

- ★ Number of certificates and degrees awarded by universities, community and technical colleges
- ★ Attainment Model progress
- ★ Graduation rates: 4/5/6-year rates for universities and 2/3/4-year rates for community and technical colleges
- ★ First to second year retention rates at universities, community and technical colleges
- ★ Student Success Index rates
- ★ Comparison of state demographics with higher education participation levels, including race/ethnicity, Pell Grant eligibility, and age
- ★ Comparison of postsecondary attainment in Kansas to the nation, by age groups
- ★ Adult Education: participation, percent served among working-age adults in Kansas without a high school diploma or its equivalent, and percent transitioning to postsecondary within 3 years of enrollment
- ★ Number of adults with college credit but no certificate or degree who are returning to complete a certificate, associate/bachelor degree
- ★ Seamless Transition: total number of courses approved for guaranteed transfer and number of Reverse Transfer degrees awarded systemwide

IMPROVE ECONOMIC ALIGNMENT

Aspirations

- ★ Respond to business and industry expectations for graduates and ensure all technical programs meet expectations of quality.
- ★ Reduce workforce shortages in select high-demand fields by increasing the number of certificates and degrees awarded, including in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields.

Measures

- ★ Percent of graduates employed and average wages in Kansas, by award level
- ★ Number of certificates and degrees awarded in selected high-demand fields, and progress made on special state initiatives
- ★ Summary findings from latest K-TIP Report, providing systemwide analysis of all approved postsecondary CTE programs, by program
- ★ Percent of certificates/degrees awarded in STEM fields

ENSURE STATE UNIVERSITY EXCELLENCE

Aspiration

- ★ Improve regional and national reputations of state universities.

Measures

- ★ Comparison to peers for each of the six state universities on established metrics
- ★ Private giving to universities
- ★ Total research dollars awarded, highlighting federal research dollars (as percent of total) and specific industry support secured
- ★ University Excellence Profile: select rankings, Composite Financial Index, and assessment of economic impact

BOARD GOALS 2019-2020



1. The Board will hire a new president at Wichita State University.
2. The Board will finalize a new strategic plan for the public higher education system.
3. The Board will develop a strategy for addressing deferred maintenance at state universities.
4. The Board will explore positive pathways to help students who do not meet Qualified Admissions standards achieve success beyond high school.
5. The Board will review the university CEO assessment process.
6. The Board will continue to implement a unified communications and advocacy plan for all sectors of the higher education system.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Item	Page
Meeting Information and Schedule	1
Board Agenda	4
Minutes of Previous Meetings	7
Wednesday Consent Agenda	29
Wednesday Discussion Agenda	68
Other Agendas	
Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee	125
Board Fiscal Affairs and Audit Standing Committee	129
System Council of Presidents	130
Council of Presidents	132
System Council of Chief Academic Officers	135
Council of Chief Academic Officers	139
Resources	
Board Meeting Schedule	143
Deadlines for Agenda Item Submission	143
Board of Regents Committee Listing	144

MEETING INFORMATION AND SCHEDULE

Unless noted, all meetings take place at the Overman Student Center at 302 E. Cleveland, Pittsburg, Kansas, 66762 in the meeting room indicated. Addresses for offsite meetings can be obtained by contacting the Kansas Board of Regents office at 785-296-3421.

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Time	Committee/Activity	Location
8:30 am - 9:15 am	System Council of Chief Academic Officers	Governors (Room 206)
9:15 am or Adjournment	Council of Chief Academic Officers	Governors (Room 206)
10:15 am - Noon	Fiscal Affairs & Audit Standing Committee	Meadowlark (Room 220)
10:15 am - Noon	Academic Affairs Standing Committee	Governors (Room 206)
10:15 am - 10:45 am	System Council of Presidents	Sunflower (Room 221)
10:45 am or Adjournment	Council of Presidents	Sunflower (Room 221)
Noon - 1:15 pm	Council of Faculty Senate Presidents	Sunset A (Room 215)
Noon - 1:00 pm	Students' Advisory Committee	Sunset B (Room 215)
Noon - 1:15 pm	Lunch <i>Council of Chief Academic Officers</i>	Kansas 1 (Room 214)
Noon - 1:00 pm	Lunch <i>Board of Regents & President Flanders</i>	Kansas 3 (Room 212)
1:00 pm	Board of Regents Meeting <i>Executive Session</i>	Kansas 3 (Room 212)
1:30 pm	Board of Regents Meeting	Ballroom C
6:00 pm	Dinner <i>Board of Regents and President Flanders</i>	Block22 (402 N. Broadway)

MEETING AGENDA

The Kansas Board of Regents will meet in Room 212 for an Executive Session then move to Ballroom C for the remainder of the meeting. Both rooms are located in the PSU Overman Student Center at 302 E. Cleveland, Pittsburg, Kansas.

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

- I. Call To Order** Regent Bangerter, Chair
- II. Executive Session - Kansas 3 (Room 212)**
Board of Regents – Matters deemed Confidential in the Attorney-Client Relationship
- III. Approve Minutes** Regent Bangerter, Chair
- | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| A. | September 18-19, 2019 Regular Meeting | <i>p. 7</i> |
| B. | October 11, 2019 Special Meeting | <i>p. 24</i> |
| C. | October 20-21, 2019 Special Meeting | <i>p. 25</i> |
| D. | October 31, 2019 Special Meeting | <i>p. 27</i> |
- IV. Introductions and Reports**
- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| A. | <i>Introductions</i> | |
| B. | <i>Report from the Chair</i> | Regent Bangerter, Chair |
| C. | <i>Report from the President & CEO</i> | Blake Flanders, President & CEO |
| D. | <i>Report from the System Council of Presidents</i> | President Trzaska |
| E. | <i>Report from Council of Presidents</i> | President Garrett |
| F. | <i>Report from Council of Faculty Senate Presidents</i> | Greg Schneider |
| G. | <i>Report from Students' Advisory Committee</i> | Paul Frost |
| H. | <i>Report from the Community Colleges</i> | President Trzaska |
| I. | <i>Report from the Technical Colleges</i> | President Genandt |
| J. | <i>Report from the University CEOs</i> | President Scott, PSU and
President Mason, FHSU |
- V. Standing Committee Reports**
- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|----------------|
| A. | <i>Academic Affairs</i> | Regent Schmidt |
| B. | <i>Fiscal Affairs & Audit</i> | Regent Hutton |
- VI. Approval of Consent Agenda**
- | | | | |
|----|--|--|--------------|
| A. | <i>Academic Affairs</i> | | |
| | 1. Act on Request for a New Certificate of Approval for University of Missouri-Kansas City | Daniel Archer,
VP, Academic Affairs | <i>p. 29</i> |
| | 2. Act on Request to Approve Doctor of Philosophy in Biomedical Engineering – WSU | | <i>p. 31</i> |
| | 3. Act on Request to Approve Doctorate in Clinical Nutrition – KUMC | | <i>p. 47</i> |

B. Fiscal Affairs & Audit

- | | | |
|---|--|--------------|
| 1. Act on Proposed Amended Memorandum of Agreement between Wichita State University and the American Federation of Teachers Local 6405 Representing Service and Maintenance Employees | Natalie Yoza,
Associate General Counsel | <i>p. 60</i> |
| 2. Act on Request to Raze the Facilities Administration Building – KU | Nelda Henning,
Director of Facilities | <i>p. 64</i> |
| 3. Act on Request to Raze the Pharmaceutical Chemistry Lab Building – KU | | <i>p. 64</i> |
| 4. Act on Request to Amend Capital Improvement Plan for Renovation of Spencer Museum of Art – KU | | <i>p. 64</i> |

C. Retirement Plan

- | | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| 1. Act on Appointment to the Retirement Plan Committee | Natalie Yoza,
Associate General Counsel | <i>p. 65</i> |
|--|--|--------------|

D. Other Matters

- | | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| 1. Act on Appointments to the Joint Coordinating Council with the Kansas Board of Education | Regent Bangerter | <i>p. 66</i> |
| 2. Act on Request for Execution Authority for Two Related Contracts having Terms Greater Than Three Years that are Required to Fulfill Federal Data Reporting Requirements | Natalie Yoza,
Associate General Counsel | <i>p. 67</i> |

VII. Consideration of Discussion Agenda

A. Academic Affairs

- | | | |
|---|--|--------------|
| 1. Act on Private Postsecondary Education Institution Certificate of Approval | Regent Schmidt
Natalie Yoza,
Associate General Counsel | <i>p. 68</i> |
|---|--|--------------|

B. Fiscal Affairs & Audit

- | | | |
|--|---|---------------|
| 1. Receive FY 2021 Housing and Food Service Rate Adjustment Proposals Submitted by State Universities (First Read) | Regent Hutton
Elaine Frisbie
VP, Finance & Administration | <i>p. 71</i> |
| 2. Act on Request to Revise Tuition Rate – KU | | <i>p. 100</i> |
| 3. Act on Recommendation to Adopt Board Policy on Financial Reserves | | <i>p. 101</i> |
| 4. Act on Recommendation to Adopt Board Policy on University Occupancy Leases | Julene Miller,
General Counsel | <i>p. 103</i> |

- C. *Governance*
 - 1. Act on Proposed Changes to CEO Assessment Policy and Process
Regent Bangerter
Julene Miller,
General Counsel *p. 106*

- D. *Other Matters*
 - 1. Receive the Non-Budgetary Legislative Proposals (First Read)
Matt Casey,
Director, Government
Relations *p. 115*

 - 2. Receive Report from Kansas Postsecondary Technical Education Authority
Ray Frederick,
Chair, TEA *p. 120*

 - 3. Act on Building Naming – FHSU
President Mason *p. 124*

 - 4. Act on Request to Name the KU School of Law’s Center for Diversity
Chancellor Girod *p. 124*

VIII. Adjournment

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

I. Call To Order

Regent Bangerter, Chair

A. Approve Minutes

KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

MINUTES

September 18-19, 2019

The September 18, 2019, meeting of the Kansas Board of Regents was called to order by Chair Shane Bangerter at 1:30 p.m. The meeting was held in the Board Office located in the Curtis State Office Building, 1000 S.W. Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka. Proper notice was given according to law.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Shane Bangerter, Chair
- Bill Feuerborn, Vice Chair
- Ann Brandau-Murguia
- Cheryl Harrison-Lee
- Mark Hutton
- Shelly Kiblinger
- Jon Rolph
- Allen Schmidt
- Helen Van Etten

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regent Feuerborn moved that the minutes of the June 19-20, 2019 meeting and the August 8-10, 2019 Budget Workshop and Retreat meeting be approved. Following the second of Regent Rolph, the motion carried.

INTRODUCTIONS

President Scott introduced the following individuals: Seth George, President of the Student Government Association; Terry Pierce, President of the University Support Staff Senate; Brad Stefanoni, President of the Unclassified Professional Staff Senate; and Kevin Bracker, President of the Faculty Senate. He also introduced the University’s new Provost, Howard Smith. President Garrett introduced Emporia State University’s new Diversity Officer, Dr. Aswad Allen; Student Body President, Paul Frost; University Support Staff President, Douglas Cushenbery; and Unclassified Professional President, Joel Ewy. President Mason introduced Fort Hays State University’s new General Counsel, Joe Bain. Interim President Tompkins introduced Wichita State University’s new Dean of the Graduate School, Dr. Coleen Pugh; and the new Dean of the W. Frank Barton School of Business, Dr. Larissa Genin.

GENERAL REPORTS

REPORT FROM CHAIR

Chair Bangerter reported this year’s Board Retreat was held at the Kansas State Polytechnic Campus. He thanked President Myers and his staff for hosting the Board. At the Retreat the Board discussed the unified budget request, legislative messaging, positive pathways to help students access higher education, and potential goals for the year. Chair Bangerter noted the Board will continue its discussion on the unified budget request and Board goals later in the agenda. Additionally, he stated the Board is looking forward to having breakfast with the Students’ Advisory Committee.

REPORT FROM PRESIDENT AND CEO

President Flanders reported he participated in the Students' Advisory Committee's retreat last week. The discussion at the retreat focused on college affordability, legislative advocacy, and the continued implementation of Open Educational Resources (OERs). He thanked the students for inviting him to their retreat.

REPORT FROM SYSTEM COUNCIL OF PRESIDENTS

President Trzaska presented the System Council of Presidents' report. The Council received an update from the System Council of Chief Academic Officers on the systemwide transfer course inventory, performance agreements, and the Apply Kansas initiative. The System Council of Presidents then discussed the proposed changes to the qualified admissions standards for the state universities, which are on today's Board agenda for consideration. The Council also discussed program to program articulation, and it was noted that more information is needed on the current agreements between individual institutions. Additionally, an update on the Board's new strategic plan was presented by President Flanders.

REPORT FROM COUNCIL OF PRESIDENTS

President Garrett presented the Council of Presidents' report. The Council received reports from the Council of Chief Academic Officers, Council of Business Officers, Council of Government Relations Officers, the University Support Staff (USS) Council, and the Council of Student Affairs Officers. The Academic Officers reviewed new program requests and received an update on the upcoming Tilford Conference that will be hosted by the University of Kansas on October 3-4. It was also reported that all undergraduate degree programs that have not been exempted by the Board are at 120 credit hours. The Business Officers discussed the unified budget request and the deferred maintenance proposal. The Government Relations Officers reported on activities leading up to the legislative session, and the University Support Staff provided an overview of the staff morale survey that was conducted on five of the university campuses. A few of the key findings in the survey results include concerns centered around healthcare costs, not receiving regular pay increases, and taking on more workload. The Student Affairs Officers received information on the growing national criminal enterprise of human trafficking and discussed ways to inform the campus communities about this trend. Additionally, President Garrett reported that the Council of Presidents approved Wichita State University's Doctor of Philosophy in Biomedical Engineering and the University of Kansas Medical Center's Doctorate in Clinical Nutrition. These programs will be forwarded to the Board for consideration at a future meeting.

REPORT FROM COUNCIL OF FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENTS

The Council of Faculty Senate Presidents discussed its priorities for the year, which include working on expanding Open Educational Resources and looking at freedom of expression resolutions.

REPORT FROM STUDENTS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Paul Frost presented the report for the Students' Advisory Committee. The Committee held its annual retreat at Emporia State University last week. The members discussed the Committee's action plan for the year and how students can build relationships with legislators.

STANDING COMMITTEE AND OTHER REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Regent Schmidt presented the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee report. The Committee directed Board staff to send a show cause letter to a private postsecondary institution regarding the potential revocation of its Certificate of Approval and discussed the academic items on the Board's agenda. Additionally, Regent Schmidt reported that this year the Committee will be discussing the Kansas high school-to-college going rate and reviewing academic advising web-based resources. He noted the state universities will present on advising practices at future meetings.

FISCAL AFFAIRS AND AUDIT

Regent Feuerborn reported the Fiscal Affairs and Audit Standing Committee reviewed the Board policies that are relevant to the Committee and discussed the fiscal items on the Board’s agenda. President Trzaska presented information on the Excel in CTE program and discussed the community colleges’ proposed funding request. Scott Smathers, Vice President of Workforce Development, discussed how the Technical Education Authority arrived at its budget request recommendations that the Board will consider later in the agenda. The Committee reviewed the budget request proposals and approved the following recommendations for the Board to consider:

Priorities and Proposals – by Sector	Amount
State Universities	
Base Funding for Operations	\$50,000,000
Washburn University	
Base Funding for Operations – mirror the state universities	\$1,000,000
Postsecondary Technical Education Authority for Two-Year Colleges	
Excel in CTE Initiative – future enrollment growth	\$8,500,000
Address the postsecondary tiered technical state aid “gap”	\$5,000,000
System Total Request	\$64,485,000

The Committee also discussed the external management review process. Wichita State University and Pittsburg State University are scheduled for reviews this year. Consistent with Board policy, the Committee agreed that the review of Pittsburg State will cover one year rather than an entire five-year cycle.

GOVERNANCE

Regent Bangerter presented the Governance Committee report. The members reviewed the Committee’s Charter and agenda topics for this year. The Committee discussed the CEO assessment process and reviewed proposed amendments to the assessment tool, which will be presented to the Board at a future meeting. Additionally, the Committee reviewed the Board member conflict of interest disclosures and the proposed Board goals for this year. It also acted on recommendations for CEO salary amounts for Fiscal Year 2020. Regent Bangerter noted the Board will act on these three items later in the agenda.

RETIREMENT PLAN

Regent Bangerter reported the Retirement Plan Committee met on Tuesday. The Committee is working to obtain the same oversight structure for the Voluntary Retirement Plan that it has for the Mandatory Retirement Plan, including amending the Mandatory Plan investment consultant’s contract to include services for the Voluntary Plan. Regent Bangerter reported that as of June 30th the Mandatory Plan assets eclipsed the \$4 billion mark. He also noted how important it is for plan participants to be active in their retirement planning and stated there are many resources available to help participants make investment and funding choices.

AMEND AGENDA

Regent Schmidt moved to amend the agenda to remove the Qualified Admissions item from consent and place it on the Discussion Agenda under the Academic Affairs section. Regent Feuerborn seconded, and the motion carried.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Regent Kiblinger moved, with the second of Regent Van Etten, that the Consent Agenda, as amended, be approved. The motion carried.

Academic Affairs

ACADEMIC CALENDAR AMENDMENTS – ESU AND KSU

Kansas State University received approval to change its 2021 and 2022 Spring Break dates to March 15-21, 2021 and March 14-20, 2022, respectively. Emporia State University received approval to change its 2020 Fall Break to October 8-9, 2020.

CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP APPROVAL FOR THE KANSAS HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER

The Kansas Health Science Center (KHSC) was granted a Certificate of Approval from the Board on May 16, 2019. On May 20, 2019, KHSC entered into a transaction to change ownership to TCS Education Systems (TCS). The change of ownership application was submitted to the Board office on August 6, 2019 for review. The application meets the minimum requirements established by statute and regulation and was approved.

Fiscal Affairs & Audit

AMENDMENT TO FY 2020 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT REQUEST AND APPROVAL OF ARCHITECTURAL PROGRAM DOCUMENT FOR BILL SNYDER FAMILY STADIUM SOUTH END ZONE – KSU

Kansas State University was authorized to amend its FY 2020 capital improvement project plan to include the Bill Snyder Family Stadium South End Zone project. The estimated cost of the project is \$49,936,162, which will be funded with private gifts. The Architectural Program Document for the project was also approved.

AMENDMENT TO FY 2020 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT REQUEST AND APPROVAL OF ARCHITECTURAL PROGRAM DOCUMENT FOR CHILLER REPLACEMENT IN HAWORTH HALL – KU

The University of Kansas received approval to amend its FY 2020 capital improvement plan to include the chiller replacement project for Haworth Hall. The estimated cost of the project is \$3 million, which will be funded with reallocated rehabilitation and repair (EBF) funds. The Architectural Program Document for the project was also approved.

AMENDMENT TO GROUND LEASE – KUMC

The University of Kansas received approval to amend the Master Ground Lease between the Board of Regents, the University of Kansas, and the University of Kansas Hospital Authority. In the amendment, KU Medical Center will lease a portion of the Total Parcel designated as Vault 1, and if necessary, the portion of the Total Parcel designated as Vault 2. The Health System agreed to pay KUMC an amount equal to \$70.6334 per square foot, and the Health System will make the final payment to the University within thirty days from execution of the amendment to the Master Ground Lease. The land will be used by the Health System to build its new proton therapy center, and the University will use the proceeds to fund campus enhancements. The following is the legal description of the total parcel (including the Vault 1 Parcel and Vault 2 Parcel):

All that part of the Northwest Quarter of Section 35, Township 11 South, Range 25 East, in Kansas City, Wyandotte County, Kansas, COMMENCING at the point of intersection of the West line of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 35-T11S-R25E and the centerline of 39th

Avenue, as it now exists; Thence South 02 degrees 03 minutes 56 seconds East, along the West line of said Northwest Quarter, a distance of 903.29 feet; Thence North 87 degrees 56 minutes 04 seconds East, departing the West line of said Northwest Quarter, a distance of 40.26 feet, to a point on the East Right-of-Way line of Rainbow Boulevard, as established in Book 3372 at Page 66; Thence North 18 degrees 02 minutes 17 seconds West, along said East Right-of-Way line, a distance of 0.96 feet; Thence North 02 degrees 03 minutes 56 seconds West, continuing along said East Right-of-Way line, a distance of 65.00 feet; Thence North 01 degrees 52 minutes 10 seconds West, continuing along said East Right-of-Way line, a distance of 177.35 feet, to the POINT OF BEGINNING; Thence North 01 degrees 52 minutes 10 seconds West, continuing along said East Right-of-Way line, a distance of 11.75 feet, to a point on the Westerly prolongation of the Southerly face of an existing building; Thence North 88 degrees 02 minutes 40 seconds East, departing said East Right-of-Way line, and along the Westerly prolongation of the Southerly face of said existing building, and along the Southerly face of said existing building, a distance of 124.40 feet; Thence South 02 degrees 34 minutes 16 seconds East, continuing along the Southerly face of said existing building, a distance of 1.49 feet; Thence North 87 degrees 48 minutes 48 seconds East, continuing along the Southerly face of said existing building, and along its Easterly prolongation, a distance of 65.91 feet; Thence South 02 degrees 06 minutes 40 seconds East, departing said Easterly prolongation, a distance of 76.90 feet; Thence North 89 degrees 10 minutes 40 seconds East, a distance of 6.04 feet, to a point on the Westerly face of an existing building; Thence South 02 degrees 32 minutes 02 seconds East, along the Westerly face of said existing building, a distance of 11.20 feet; Thence South 87 degrees 55 minutes 57 seconds West, continuing along the Westerly face of said existing building, a distance of 3.90 feet; Thence South 02 degrees 04 minutes 03 seconds East, continuing along the Westerly face of said existing building, a distance of 23.10 feet; Thence South 87 degrees 50 minutes 36 seconds West, departing the Westerly face of said existing building, a distance of 16.46 feet; Thence South 01 degrees 54 minutes 14 seconds East, a distance of 6.96 feet, to a point on the Northerly face of an existing building; Thence South 87 degrees 55 minutes 57 seconds West, along the Northerly face of said existing building, a distance of 39.87 feet; Thence North 01 degrees 30 minutes 28 seconds West, departing the Northerly face of said existing building, a distance of 7.06 feet; Thence South 88 degrees 03 minutes 46 seconds West, a distance of 74.48 feet; Thence North 02 degrees 03 minutes 22 seconds West, a distance of 48.60 feet; Thence South 87 degrees 34 minutes 06 seconds West, a distance of 33.76 feet, to a point on a non-tangent curve; Thence Northerly, and Northwesterly, along a curve to the left, whose initial tangent bearing is North 00 degrees 09 minutes 22 seconds West, having a radius of 58.48 feet, and through a central angle of 53 degrees 57 minutes 24 seconds, an arc distance of 55.07 feet, to a point on a non-tangent line; Thence North 53 degrees 39 minutes 28 seconds West, a distance of 7.22 feet, to the POINT OF BEGINNING, containing 17,697 square feet, or 0.4063 acres, more or less.

AMENDMENTS TO MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT WITH PSU/KNEA

The amended Memorandum of Agreement between Pittsburg State University, the Kansas Board of Regents, and the PSU Chapter of the Kansas National Education Association was approved. The amendments went through the meet and confer process and include salary increases for qualifying faculty members and making the Board's Paid Parental Leave Policy applicable to unit faculty. The Chair of the Board is authorized to execute the amended Agreement on behalf of the Board.

AMENDMENTS TO MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT WITH FHSU/AAUP

The amended Memorandum of Agreement between Fort Hays State University, the Kansas Board of Regents, and the FHSU Chapter of the American Association of University Professors was

approved. The amendments went through the meet and confer process and include changes to the Salary and Contract Term Articles. The Chair of the Board is authorized to execute the amended Agreement on behalf of the Board.

ANNUAL BUDGET FOR MILL LEVY – WSU

The Wichita State University FY 2020 mill levy budget proposed by the WSU Board of Trustees was approved. Property tax revenues are estimated at \$8.45 million and the budget includes expenditures totaling \$8,471,225, which is \$160,220 more than FY 2019. The budget is as follows:

**Wichita State University
City of Wichita/Sedgwick County Mill Levy Budget
Fiscal Year 2020 Budget**

	FY 2019	FY 2020	Amount of
Revenues	Budget	Budget	Change
Mill levy Revenue	\$8,011,005	\$8,171,225	\$160,220
Contingent Revenue	300,000	300,000	--
Total Revenue	\$8,311,005	\$8,471,225	\$160,220
Expenditures			
Capital Improvements			
National Center for Aviation Support	\$--	\$--	\$--
WSU Innovation Campus	2,474,140	2,634,360	\$160,220
Building Insurance	20,396	20,396	--
Total Capital Improvements	\$2,494,536	\$2,654,756	\$160,220
Student Support			
WSU Tech Support	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$--
Undergraduate Support	3,796,333	3,796,333	--
Graduate Support	417,136	417,136	--
Total Student Support	\$5,013,469	\$5,013,469	\$--
Economic and Community Development			
Interns – City/County	\$136,000	\$136,000	\$-
Business and Economic Research	150,000	150,000	-
City Government Services	80,000	80,000	-
County Government Services	80,000	80,000	-
Total Economic and Community Development	\$446,000	\$446,000	\$-
University Research and Support Services			
Organization and Development	\$57,000	\$57,000	\$-
Total Research and Support Services	\$57,000	\$57,000	\$-
Contingency			
Contingency	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$-
Total Contingency	\$300,000	\$300,000	\$-
Total Expenditures	\$8,311,005	\$8,471,225	\$160,220

Technical Education Authority

SALINA AREA TECHNICAL COLLEGE DENTAL HYGIENE ASSOCIATE OF APPLIED SCIENCE DEGREE

Salina Area Technical College received approval to offer an Associate of Applied Science degree (80 credit hours) in Dental Hygiene. The program will be offered in the Fall of 2021 and it is estimated that the delivery of the program will cost \$94,320. The program will be funded with student tuition and fees, capital outlay appropriations, and internal funds.

Other Matters

UPDATED RESOLUTION TRANSFERRING BOARD’S AUTHORITY TO EXERCISE MANAGEMENT CONTROL OVER CERTAIN KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY RELATED CLASSIFIED INFORMATION TO A SECURITY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – KSU

The updated Resolution transferring the Board’s authority to exercise management control over security of certain classified information to a Security Executive Committee at Kansas State University was approved. The Resolution added new University staff and the Board President and CEO to the Committee and updated the members of the Board.

(Resolution filed with Official Minutes)

UPDATED RESOLUTION TRANSFERRING BOARD’S AUTHORITY TO EXERCISE MANAGEMENT CONTROL OVER CERTAIN UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS RELATED CLASSIFIED INFORMATION TO A SECURITY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – KU

The updated Resolution transferring the Board’s authority to exercise management control over security of certain classified information to a Security Executive Committee at the University of Kansas was approved. The Resolution added new University staff and the Board President and CEO to the Committee and updated the members of the Board.

(Resolution filed with Official Minutes)

APPOINTMENT TO EPSCoR REVIEW COMMITTEE

Dr. Bikram Gill was appointed to serve on the EPSCoR Review Committee for a two-year term.

APPOINTMENTS TO VARIOUS BOARD COMMITTEES AND THE WASHBURN BOARD OF REGENTS

The following appointments were approved:

Standing Committees

<u>Academic Affairs</u>	<u>Fiscal Affairs and Audit</u>	<u>Governance</u>
Allen Schmidt – Chair	Mark Hutton – Chair	Shane Bangerter – Chair
Shelly Kiblinger	Ann Brandau-Murguia	Mark Hutton
Cheryl Harrison-Lee	Bill Feuerborn	Allen Schmidt
Helen Van Etten	Jon Rolph	Bill Feuerborn

Regents Retirement Plan

Shane Bangerter – Chair

Board Representatives and Liaisons

Education Commission of the States	Ann Brandau-Murguia
Postsecondary Technical Education Authority	Mark Hess Mike Johnson Rita Johnson
Midwest Higher Education Compact (MHEC)	Helen Van Etten Blake Flanders
Washburn University Board of Regents	Helen Van Etten
Transfer and Articulation Advisory Council	Shane Bangerter
Governor’s Education Council	Allen Schmidt Helen Van Etten

University Subcommittees 3 Regents per committee

Kansas State University	University of Kansas	Wichita State University
<u>Emporia State University</u>	<u>Fort Hays State University</u>	<u>Pittsburg State University</u>
Mark Hutton – KSU Chair	Shane Bangerter – KU Chair	Allen Schmidt – WSU Chair
Helen Van Etten – ESU Chair	Ann Murguia – FHSU Chair	Bill Feuerborn – PSU Chair
Cheryl Harrison-Lee	Shelly Kiblinger	Jon Rolph

CONSIDERATION OF DISCUSSION AGENDA

Fiscal Affairs and Audit

BOARD’S UNIFIED STATE APPROPRIATIONS REQUEST

Vice President Frisbie stated the Kansas Higher Education Coordination Act requires the Board of Regents to develop and present to the Governor and Legislature each year a unified budget request for the public higher education system. The Board’s request must be submitted by October 1. She noted at the June meeting, the institutions submitted proposed items for the Board’s FY 2021 unified budget request, and the Board reviewed these items at its August retreat. Vice President Frisbie reported that the public higher education system is a \$3.7 billion enterprise and the key categories of revenue sources include state appropriations, student tuition, local support, and federal and private grants. She noted state appropriations are critical for the system because the funds help keep the institutions financially accessible to students.

The Board discussed the Excel in CTE initiative. It was noted that the initiative offers state-financed college tuition for high school students in postsecondary technical education courses resulting in an industry-recognized credential in high demand occupations. The reimbursement to the colleges includes instructor costs, extraordinary costs, instructional support costs, and institutional support costs. Vice President Frisbie stated the initiative has been successful with more high school students participating each year. The biggest concern of the initiative is the funding cycle. Excel in CTE is funded based on actual enrollments and the funding is distributed to the colleges after each enrollment period in the fall and spring. Vice President Frisbie explained that the Board makes a funding request for the upcoming fiscal year that is based on anticipated enrollments for the program. In some years the funding has come up short because enrollment growth exceeded expectations. When this has occurred, the Board has requested supplemental funding because the colleges should be reimbursed for the services they already provided to these students. She noted for FY 2020 the colleges are asking the Board to seek supplemental funding because they believe the current level of funding will be short when the final distribution is made in June 2020. Vice President Frisbie stated the FY 2021 funding requests from the community colleges, technical colleges, and the Technical Education Authority are based on the current year’s enrollment data and what the

colleges believe the anticipated enrollment growth will be next year. The Board discussed the issues with the funding cycle but decided not to pursue changes to the cycle at this time. Regent Hutton stated the Board could request contingency funds for this program that could be distributed if enrollments are greater than expected, which would eliminate the need for a supplemental request. Regent Kiblinger requested information on how many high school students are eligible for the Excel in CTE program and what is the capacity for the colleges to offer these courses to meet the demands.

Vice President Frisbie reviewed the other budget proposals that were submitted by the sectors and the Board office including, base funding for the universities, funding for facility deferred maintenance at the state universities, funding for tiered and non-tiered state aid to fill the gap between actual funding and calculated funding per the formula, and funding for a new need-based aid program for Kansas students. Regent Bangerter believes it is in the best interest of the system for the Board to submit one number to the Governor and the Legislature. That number should represent the funding needs of the entire higher education system. He spoke about the importance of base funding for the state universities that will allow the Board to hold tuition flat for Kansas undergraduate students. Other Regents agreed that the request should be one number for the entire system. The Board also discussed the different funding streams for the different types of institutions. Regent Harrison-Lee asked for more information on the mill levies for the community colleges and the cost model for funding the two-year colleges. Following discussion, Regent Hutton moved to approve a systemwide budget request of \$95.3 million. This number includes the amounts listed in the below chart with an additional \$5 million added for contingency funding for the Excel in CTE program. Regent Murguia seconded, and the motion carried.

FY 2021 Higher Education Unified Appropriation Request

Priorities and Proposals – by Sector	Amount
State Universities	
Base Funding for Operations	\$50,000,000
Deferred Maintenance of State Buildings on University Campuses	\$10,000,000
Washburn University	
Mirror the State Universities’ Increase	\$1,000,000
Postsecondary Technical Education Authority	
Excel in CTE Initiative – future enrollment growth	\$8,500,000
Address the postsecondary tiered technical state aid “gap”	\$5,000,000
Kansas Board of Regents Office	
Need Based Aid for Kansas Students – Kansas Access Partnership	\$10,000,000
Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Pilot Project	\$5,610,000
Outreach to Promote Board of Regents’ Strategic Plan, DegreeStats, Military Articulation Portal	\$50,000
Finance Colleges’ Participation in the National Community College Cost & Productivity Project	\$25,000
KBOR-Based Coordinator for Apply Kansas	\$85,000

BREAK

The Chair called for a break at 2:52 p.m. and resumed the meeting at 3:13 p.m.

Governance

BOARD GOALS FOR 2019-2020

Regent Murguia moved to approve the Board goals for 2019-2020. Regent Kiblinger seconded, and the motion carried. The following goals were approved:

Board Goals 2019-2020

1. The Board will hire a new president at Wichita State University.
2. The Board will finalize a new strategic plan for the public higher education system.
3. The Board will develop a strategy for addressing deferred maintenance at state universities.
4. The Board will explore positive pathways to help students who do not meet Qualified Admissions standards achieve success beyond high school.
5. The Board will review the university CEO assessment process.
6. The Board will continue to implement a unified communications and advocacy plan for all sectors of the higher education system.

Academic Affairs

UPDATE ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT BOARD THEME: RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES

Daniel Archer, Vice President for Academic Affairs, provided an update on the faculty development theme that was adopted by the Board at its September 2017 meeting. He noted throughout 2018 and 2019, the state universities reviewed their reward structures and presented to the Board an overview of the number and type of faculty, teaching loads, the tenure and promotion path, and other resources for faculty development. From these presentations, the focus shifted to the University of Kansas, Kansas State University, and Wichita State University because of their faculty research component. Vice President Archer stated at the June 2019 meeting the Board approved the following core research outcomes for the research universities:

- Total Research Expenditures¹ – Higher Education Research and Development (HERD) Report, and broken out by:
 - Total Federal Research Expenditures
 - Total Non-Federal Research Expenditures (includes state/local government, business, nonprofit organizations, and all other sources, but excludes institutional funds & unrecovered indirect costs)
- National Academy Memberships – Academic Analytics or institutions self-report
- Research Doctorates Awarded – Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS)
- Postdoctoral Appointees – National Science Foundation
- Fall Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty – IPEDS
- Number of Research Faculty/Staff – IPEDS

¹ Combined data for all KU campuses, including Medical Center campuses, will be reported. WSU will be separated out by WSU-Main Campus and WSU NIAR.

He also reported that over the summer the research universities identified additional outcomes, which are detailed below:

- Additional Subset of the Total Research Expenditures Outcome (KU, K-State, & WSU)
 - Total Industry Research Expenditures
- Institution-Specific Research Outcomes
 - KU: Faculty Honorific Awards – Academic Analytics
 - K-State: Patents/Plant Varietal Protections Issued in a Given Year – self reported
 - WSU: Fall Headcount – total student enrollment (master’s and doctoral students reported separately) – IPEDS

Board members noted the importance of faculty and their impact on the universities. The Board had no objections to the additional outcomes.

CHANGES TO QUALIFIED ADMISSIONS

Vice President Archer presented the proposed changes to qualified admissions. In 2018, a working group of institutional representatives was asked to explore additional options to admit otherwise qualified students who may not meet the ACT requirement for qualified admissions. The group met several times throughout 2019 and recommended the following changes:

Current Freshmen Criteria – Under 21 <i>Requirements for Accredited High School Graduate</i>	Proposed Changes <i>Accredited High School Graduate</i>	
ESU, PSU, FHSU, KSU, and WSU	ESU, PSU, FHSU, and WSU	K-State
ACT: 21+ <u>or</u> Rank in top third of class	ACT: 21+ <u>or</u> Cumulative GPA of 2.25	ACT: 21+ <u>or</u> Cumulative GPA of 3.25
Complete Precollege Curriculum with a 2.0 GPA (Resident)/2.5 GPA (Nonresident). Curriculum consists of: -English (4 units) -Math (3 units with ACT benchmark of 22 or 4 units with one taken in senior year), -Natural Science (3 units with one unit in chemistry or physics), -Social Science (3 units) -Electives (3 units) <i>Note: As part of the admission application, students list each high school course taken along with the grade.</i>	Units (but not specific courses) are recommended; units are not required.	Units (but not specific courses) are recommended; units are not required.
2.0 cumulative GPA on any college courses taken while in high school	2.0 cumulative GPA on any college courses taken while in high school	2.0 cumulative GPA on any college courses taken while in high school

Current Freshmen Criteria – Under 21 <i>Requirements for Accredited High School Graduate</i>	Proposed Changes <i>Accredited High School Graduate</i>
<p style="text-align: center;">KU</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">KU</p>
<p>Cumulative GPA of 3.25 and ACT 21+ <u>or</u> Cumulative GPA of 3.0 and ACT 24+</p>	<p>Cumulative GPA of 3.25 and ACT 21+ <u>or</u> Cumulative GPA of 3.0 and ACT 24+</p>
<p>Complete the Precollege Curriculum as described above</p>	<p>Units (but not specific courses) are recommended; units are not required.</p>
<p>2.0 cumulative GPA on any college courses taken while in high school</p>	<p>2.0 cumulative GPA on any college courses taken while in high school</p>

Vice President Archer stated moving to a cumulative GPA rather than class rank is a more standardized measure and because the cumulative GPA is proposed, requiring and tracking certain units for the precollege curriculum is considered duplicative. Following discussion, Regent Rolph moved to approve the changes and authorized staff to begin the regulatory amendment process. Regent Van Etten seconded, and the motion carried.

AMENDMENTS TO THE BOARD REGULATION TO MIRROR STATUTORY ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN FEES CHARGE TO PRIVATE AND OUT-OF-STATE POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS FOR RENEWAL OF CERTIFICATES OF AUTHORITY TO OPERATE IN KANSAS (ROLL CALL VOTE)

General Counsel Julene Miller presented the proposed amendments to the Private and Out-of-State Institution fee regulation, K.A.R. 88-28-6. She noted in 2018 the Board requested a statutory amendment to eliminate six fees from the Private and Out-of-State Postsecondary Educational Institution Act, which was passed and enacted. The proposed amendments bring the fee regulation in line with the statutory changes. Regent Kiblinger moved, and Regent Feuerborn seconded, that the proposed amended permanent regulation be adopted. On a roll call vote, the following Regents voted affirmatively on the motion: Regent Bangerter, Regent Feuerborn, Regent Murguia, Regent Harrison-Lee, Regent Hutton, Regent Kiblinger, Regent Rolph, Regent Schmidt, and Regent Van Etten. The motion carried.

(Amended Regulation filed with Official Minutes)

Other Matters

NAME A PORTION OF THE INDOOR FOOTBALL PRACTICE FACILITY – KU

Chancellor Girod requested approval to name the ancillary portion of the indoor football practice facility in honor of the Beatty family. He noted that while the request is not for the entire building, the University will display the name on the exterior of the building if approved. Regent Murguia moved to approve, and Regent Rolph seconded. The motion carried. The portion will be named the Beatty Family Pavilion.

NAME A NEW CENTER IN THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION – KSU

President Myers requested approval to name the new center for community college leadership in the College of Education in honor of Dr. John Roueche. Regent Murguia moved to approve. Following the second of Regent Harrison-Lee, the motion carried. The following naming was approved: John E. Roueche Center for Community College Leadership.

GRANTING OF HONORARY DEGREE – KSU

President Myers presented a request to bestow an honorary degree on Wendell Christopher King. Dr. King had a long and successful military career and served for ten years as the first civilian Dean of Academics at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College in Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. Regent Rolph moved to approve, and Regent Harrison-Lee seconded. The motion carried. The honorary degree will be conferred at Kansas State’s Graduate School Commencement on December 13, 2019.

GRANTING OF HONORARY DEGREE – WSU

Dr. Tompkins presented a request to bestow an honorary degree on Mark Parkinson. Mr. Parkinson is a Kansas native and a Wichita State University alumnus who had an exemplary career in elder health care. He and his wife founded ten assisted-living centers. He also served in the Kansas Legislature before being selected by Governor Sebelius as her lieutenant governor. Regent Harrison-Lee moved to approve, and Regent Rolph seconded. The motion carried. The honorary degree will be conferred at Wichita State's December 2019 commencement.

BOARD MEMBER CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS

General Counsel Miller presented a summary of reported items from the Board Member Conflict of Interest Disclosure Statements. The following disclosures were made:

1. One Regent will serve on the *governing* board of an institution that is *coordinated* by the Board:
 - Regent Van Etten will serve as the Kansas Board of Regents appointee to the Board of Regents of Washburn University pursuant to statutory requirement.

K.S.A. 13-13a04(a)(4) provides that one member of the Washburn University Board of Regents shall be a member of the Kansas Board of Regents. As this is a statutorily required appointment, it is not considered a conflict for purposes of the Board's policy.

2. One Regent has reported service on the *governing* board of a non-controlled *affiliated corporation* of an institution that is *governed* by the Board:
 - Regent Hutton serves as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Kansas State University Foundation, a non-controlled affiliated corporation of Kansas State University.

The Trustees of the Kansas State University Foundation elect members of the Board of Directors for the Foundation, and the Board of Directors serves as the governing body of the Foundation. Technically, service on the Board of Trustees is not subject to the Board's conflict of interest policy. Additionally, service on the board of an affiliated corporation that exists to raise and manage funds for its respective educational institution is generally in line with the Board's mission and goals and would be unlikely to constitute an actual conflict of interest for the Regent involved.

3. One Regent has reported service on an *advisory* board of an *institution* that is *regulated* by the Board.
 - Regent Murguia serves as a member on the Board of Trustees of the University of Missouri-Kansas City, an out-of-state public institution that has a certificate of approval from the Board to operate within the State of Kansas.

Because the Board of Trustees for UMKC is an advisory board rather than the governing board for the university, service on this board is not subject to the Board of Regents' conflict of interest policy. This position was disclosed by Regent Murguia solely for the sake of transparency, not because it was considered to be an actual or apparent conflict under the Board's policy.

4. One Regent serves on a national committee that has no direct affiliation with any institution governed, coordinated or regulated by the Board.
 - Regent Van Etten serves on the National Committee on Foreign Medical Education & Accreditation (NCFMEA), which was most recently authorized by the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 and is authorized to evaluate the standards of accreditation applied to foreign medical schools and to determine the comparability of those standards to standards applied to medical schools in the United States. A determination of comparability of accreditation standards by the NCFMEA is an eligibility requirement for foreign medical schools to participate in the William D. Ford Federal Direct Student Loan Program [20 U.S.C. §§ 1087a et seq.].

Members of the National Committee on Foreign Medical Education & Accreditation are considered federal employees and are therefore subject to many of the federal ethics laws and regulations, one of which disqualifies its members from participating in their official capacity as NCFMEA members in any matter that has a direct and predictable effect on the Board of Regents' financial interests or any matter in which the Board or any institution governed by the Board is a party or represents a party. This may include investigations, audits, comparability determinations, and policy making. Neither federal nor state law precludes a Regent from serving on both the Board and NCFMEA, but a Regent who serves on both is disqualified from acting as a NCFMEA member in the listed circumstances.

5. One Regent has reported an interest in an entity that has entered one or more contracts or transactions with one or more *institutions* that are *governed* by the Board:
 - Regent Hutton has an ownership interest and is CEO Emeritus and Director of a company (Hutton Construction) that has one or more construction contracts with Wichita State University, the University of Kansas, and Kansas State University, or their affiliated corporations. Projects that have been reported are the addition to Koch Arena, a potential project in Salina for the KU School of Nursing, and the fire restoration of Hale Library.

6. One Regent has reported membership on an entity that may have transactions with *institutions* that are *governed, coordinated or regulated* by the Board:
 - Regent Van Etten will serve on the National Committee on Foreign Medical Education & Accreditation (NCFMEA), which is authorized to evaluate the standards of accreditation applied to foreign medical schools and to determine the comparability of those standards to standards applied to medical schools in the United States. A determination of comparability of accreditation standards by the NCFMEA is an eligibility requirement for foreign medical schools to participate in the William D. Ford Federal Direct Student Loan Program [20 U.S.C. §§ 1087a et seq.].

Regent Feuerborn moved to approve the continued service of Board members serving on the boards listed above, conditioned on each member's recognition that their duty is first to the Board of Regents, and for the Regents named in 5 and 6 above, they are to excuse themselves from participating on behalf of the Board in matters involving or related to the contract or transaction. Regent Schmidt seconded. The motion carried.

UNIVERSITY CEO AND BOARD PRESIDENT SALARIES FOR FY 2020

Regent Feuerborn stated for the last two years, the only university CEO salary increase was for the one president who met the less-than-five-year service criteria established by the state employee salary appropriation in Fiscal Year 2018. For Fiscal Year 2020, the state has provided for a 2.5 percent merit increase for all university employees. Accordingly, and because their present salaries are within the range of their current peers and the market level, Regent Feuerborn moved to increase by 2.5 percent the base salaries of Presidents Garrett, Mason, Myers and Scott. He noted Interim President Tompkins is not considered eligible for the state's FY 2020 2.5 percent increase. For Chancellor Girod, Regent Feuerborn moved to increase his base salary by \$50,000, which includes both the 2.5 percent merit and an additional market increase. For Board President and CEO Flanders, Regent Feuerborn moved to increase his base by \$20,000, which includes the 2.5 percent plus a market adjustment. He noted these adjustments are for FY 2020. Regent Harrison-Lee seconded, and the motions carried.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Bangerter adjourned the meeting at 3:43 p.m.

RECONVENE

Chair Bangerter called the joint meeting between the Kansas Board of Regents and the Kansas Board of Education to order at 10:04 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Shane Bangerter, Chair

Bill Feuerborn, Vice Chair
Cheryl Harrison-Lee
Mark Hutton
Shelly Kiblinger
Allen Schmidt
Helen Van Etten

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ann Brandau-Murguia
Jon Rolph

INTRODUCTIONS

Regent Bangert welcomed and thanked the Board of Education members for joining this meeting. He stated that he and several other Regents have wanted to have a joint meeting to look at initiatives on which the two Boards could collaborate to help Kansas students. Each of the following Board of Education members introduced themselves: Ann Mah, District 4; Jean Clifford, District 5; Steve Roberts, District 2; Kathy Busch, District 8 and Board Chair; Janet Waugh, District 1; Deena Horst, District 6; Ben Jones, District 7; Jim Porter, District 9; Jim McNiece, District 10, and Randy Watson, Commissioner of Education. Each of the Regents also introduced themselves.

REPORTS

REPORT FROM THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

President Trzaska presented the report for the community colleges. The community colleges have been discussing funding for the Excel in CTE initiative and the tiered and nontiered state aid. The colleges want to participate in the discussions centered around identifying high wage and high demand jobs and want to look at program to program articulation agreements, which were discussed at the System Council of Presidents’ meeting. President Trzaska also highlighted positive activities happening on the different community college campuses.

REPORT FROM THE TECHNICAL COLLEGES

The technical college report was presented by President Genandt. President Genandt reported the technical colleges do not have local taxing authority and are only funded by student tuition and state appropriations. He noted to stay engaged with business and industry leaders on workforce needs of the state, each technical college has formed an advisory committee. The memberships on these committee are a mix of college representatives and business and industry leaders. President Genandt highlighted a recent report from the National Science Board on The Skilled Technical Workforce that stated by 2022 there will be more than 3.4 million unfilled skilled technical jobs in the United States. This report along with the Georgetown study show the importance of students pursuing education beyond high school. President Genandt also reported *The Chronicle of Higher Education* recently published the top two-year colleges with the highest graduation rates. Of the 25 two-year public institutions with the best three-year graduation rates, five were Kansas technical colleges: Salina Area Technical College, North Central Kansas Technical College, Northwest Kansas Technical College, Flint Hills Technical College, and Manhattan Area Technical College.

CONSIDERATION OF DISCUSSION AGENDA

UPDATE ON KANSAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION’S KANSANS CAN VISION

Randy Watson, Kansas Commissioner of Education, presented an update on the Kansas State Board of Education’s *Kansans Can* vision. The vision of the Board is for Kansas to lead the world in the success of each student. Commissioner Watson stated the Board is defining and measuring “success” by how well students perform after high school. The Department of Education collects data on students who enter a higher education institution. This data allows KSDE and school districts to capture how many students are entering higher education, how many are retained through the years, how many return after leaving for a period of time, how

many leave and do not return, and how many graduate with a degree. KSDE then uses this data to determine the “effective rate” for each high school graduating class. Effective rate is defined as the percent of students in a graduating high school class who went on to be “successful.” Success is defined as students who meet one of the following four outcomes within two years of high school graduation: 1) earned an industry recognized certification while in high school, 2) earned a postsecondary certificate, 3) earned a postsecondary degree, or 4) enrolled in a postsecondary institution in both the first and second year following high school. The State Board’s goal is to have an overall effective rate between 70-75 percent for the state.

(PowerPoint filed with Official Minutes)

UPDATE ON NEW HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM STRATEGIC PLAN

President Flanders reported over the last two years the Board has been in the process of developing a new strategic plan for the public higher education system. During this time, Board staff has gathered feedback from Kansans, representatives from the different sectors of higher education, the System Council of Presidents, the Governance Committee, and the Board. Based on this feedback, three messaging pillars were identified: 1) Kansas families, 2) Kansas businesses, and 3) Kansas economic prosperity. Under the family and business pillars, the following areas of focus were identified:

- Access, or navigating the application system and overcoming barriers, real and perceived, to entry and attendance.
- Affordability, or paying for education beyond high school without incurring debt loads that they found worrisome.
- Success, or leveraging education after high school to earn desirable wages and build good careers.
- Talent Pipeline, or finding enough workers with the right type of education.

The structure of the plan includes dashboard metrics (lagging indicators), progress metrics (leading indicators), and high impact practices. President Flanders noted that this year there will be continued discussion surrounding the metrics and that the Board will adopt a new plan by the end of the fiscal year.

(PowerPoint filed with Official Minutes)

BREAK

Chair Bangerter called for a break at 11:05 a.m. and resumed the meeting at 11:18 a.m.

IMPROVING POSTSECONDARY EFFECTIVENESS STRATEGIES

The Board members discussed barriers that students face as they move through the K-12 system into higher education system and how the two Boards may be able to partner to address some of the issues. One major barrier for many students is affordability. The members discussed increasing need-based aid for Kansas students, which is one of the budgetary requests of the Board of Regents. It was also noted that time to degree in college can also increase the cost of attendance. It is hoped that the implementation of the Individual Plans of Study (IPS) will help students develop a career roadmap based on each student’s interest and talents. The tool includes graduation requirements and a coursework planner for the student’s educational and career goals. The tool is designed to get students and parents to explore pathways beyond high school. Members discussed if there are ways to use the IPS to give high school students information on need-based aid opportunities and whether the Board of Regents’ KSDegreeStats website can be incorporated into the IPS. It was noted that the KSDegreeStats website is an interactive online tool that allows students and parents to reviews cost and earnings data from actual graduates for each undergraduate degree program offered at a public university or college in Kansas. The members believe this information would be valuable as high school students explore career pathways.

Another barrier that was discussed was access to the higher education system. It was noted that many K-12 students have never been on a college campus. The group discussed the importance of exposing students and families to the college atmosphere because it will allow students to see themselves in that environment after graduating high school. The members also discussed how concurrent enrollment opportunities can increase the percentage of students who enroll in college after high school. One of the recommendations that came out of the 2018 Concurrent Enrollment Taskforce was to run a pilot program in which the state funds one concurrent enrollment course for each eligible high school student. The Taskforce wanted to start with one course so all the details and issues could be worked out before additional courses were added. It was noted that the Board of Regents is requesting funds to begin the concurrent enrollment pilot project.

Kathy Busch, Chair of the Board of Education, stated it is important for the two Boards to continue to work together on issues that overlap between the two systems. She would like to see the two Boards hold a joint meeting every year and she recommended bringing back the coordinating council. If formed, the council could work on issues throughout the year and bring recommendations to the Boards during the joint meeting. The members concurred and directed President Flanders and Commissioner Watson to work on forming the coordinating council. It was noted that the council should have members from the Board of Education, Board of Regents, and the Kansas Chamber.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Bangerter thanked the Board of Education members and adjourned the meeting at 12:04 p.m.

Blake Flanders, President and CEO

Shane Bangerter, Chair

**KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS
MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING
October 11, 2019**

The Kansas Board of Regents met by conference call on Friday, October 11, 2019. Chair Bangerter called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Proper notice was given according to law.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Shane Bangerter, Chair
Bill Feuerborn, Vice Chair
Ann Brandau-Murguia
Cheryl Harrison-Lee
Shelly Kiblinger
Jon Rolph
Allen Schmidt
Helen Van Etten

MEMBER ABSENT: Mark Hutton

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 1:02 p.m., Regent Feuerborn moved, followed by the second of Regent Harrison-Lee, to recess into executive session for one hour to discuss personnel matters of non-elected personnel. The subject of this executive session was personnel matters and the purpose was to protect the privacy of the individual Board employee involved. Participating in the executive session were members of the Board, President Flanders, Chancellor Girod, Vice Chancellor Reggie Robinson, and KU General Counsel Brian White. At 2:02 p.m., the meeting returned to open session.

ADJOURNMENT

Regent Bangerter adjourned at 2:03 p.m.

Blake Flanders, President and CEO

Shane Bangerter, Chair

**KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS
MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING
October 20-21, 2019**

The October 20, 2019, meeting of the Kansas Board of Regents was called to order by Chair Shane Bangerter at 4:43 p.m. The meeting was held in the Liberty room at the Kansas City Airport Marriott (775 Brasilia Avenue, Kansas City, MO, 64153). Proper notice was given according to law.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Shane Bangerter, Chair
Bill Feuerborn, Vice Chair
Ann Brandau-Murguia
Cheryl Harrison-Lee
Mark Hutton
Shelly Kiblinger
Jon Rolph
Allen Schmidt
Helen Van Etten

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH PROCESS

The Board reviewed the format for the interviews including the interview questions.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 4:45 p.m., Regent Feuerborn moved, followed by the second of Regent Hutton, to recess into executive session for 105 minutes to discuss personnel matters of non-elected personnel. The subject and purpose of this executive session was to interview and discuss one or more applicants for employment with the Board and to protect the privacy interests of the applicants. Participating in the executive session were members of the Board, President Flanders, and Candidates for the position of President of Wichita State University (each for a portion). At 6:30 p.m., the meeting returned to open session. Regent Feuerborn moved to extend for 25 minutes. Regent Hutton seconded, and the motion carried. At 6:55 p.m. the meeting returned to open session.

ADJOURNMENT

Regent Bangerter adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

The October 21, 2019 meeting of the Kansas Board of Regents was called to order by Chair Bangerter at 8:00 a.m. The meeting was held in the Liberty room at the Kansas City Airport Marriott (775 Brasilia Avenue, Kansas City, MO, 64153). Proper notice was given according to law.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Shane Bangerter, Chair
Bill Feuerborn, Vice Chair
Cheryl Harrison-Lee
Mark Hutton
Shelly Kiblinger
Jon Rolph
Allen Schmidt
Helen Van Etten

MEMBER ABSENT: Ann Brandau-Murguia

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 8:00 a.m., Regent Feuerborn moved, followed by the second of Regent Hutton, to recess into executive session for 90 minutes to discuss personnel matters of non-elected personnel. The subject and purpose of this executive session was to interview and discuss one or more applicants for employment with the Board and to protect the privacy interests of the applicants. Participating in the executive session were members of the Board, President Flanders, and Candidates for the position of President of Wichita State University (each for a portion). At 9:30 a.m., the meeting returned to open session. Regent Feuerborn moved to extend for 90 minutes. Regent Hutton seconded, and the motion carried. At 11:00 a.m. the meeting returned to open session. Regent Feuerborn moved to extend for two hours. Regent Hutton seconded, and the motion carried. At 1:00 p.m., the meeting returned to open session.

ADJOURNMENT

Regent Bangerter adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

Blake Flanders, President and CEO

Shane Bangerter, Chair

**KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS
MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING
October 31, 2019**

The October 31, 2019, meeting of the Kansas Board of Regents was called to order by Chair Shane Bangerter at 2:00 p.m. The meeting was held in the Santa Fe Trail Room located in the Wichita State University Rhatigan Student Center (1845 Fairmount Street, Wichita, Kansas). Proper notice was given according to law.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Shane Bangerter, Chair
Bill Feuerborn, Vice Chair
Cheryl Harrison-Lee
Mark Hutton
Shelly Kiblinger
Jon Rolph
Allen Schmidt
Helen Van Etten

MEMBER ABSENT: Ann Brandau-Murguia

NAMING THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY 14TH PRESIDENT

Chair Bangerter welcomed everyone to the Wichita State University campus and stated that naming a university CEO is one of the most important responsibilities the Board undertakes. The selection of a new president is also an important moment in the history of the University and the community it serves. He noted the Board was seeking a leader who would be able to carry out the goals of the Regents' strategic plan for higher education in Kansas and who would be capable of advancing Wichita State's commitment to providing applied learning opportunities. To help with this process the Board created the Presidential Search Committee, and Chair Bangerter recognized and thanked, Regent Mark Hutton, a member of the Committee.

Regent Hutton thanked Interim President, Andy Tompkins, for the remarkable job he has done during this transition time at Wichita State. He also thanked the chair of the Presidential Search Committee, Steve Clark, for his leadership. Regent Hutton stated the Search Committee was comprised of individuals representing alumni, foundation, students, faculty, administration, staff, and the wider Wichita community. This Committee was committed to helping the Board find the best candidates for consideration as the next president of Wichita State. He recognized the Committee members and thanked them for the many hours they dedicated to this process.

Regent Hutton then moved to appoint Dr. Jay Golden as the 14th President of Wichita State University. He stated Dr. Golden currently serves as the Vice Chancellor of Research, Economic Development and Engagement at East Carolina University. Dr. Golden has had a distinguished career in higher education as an administrator, researcher and faculty member, and is also a business leader and entrepreneur. Regent Hutton also moved that the Board direct the Chair and the Board President and CEO to negotiate the compensation package and authorize the Chair to sign the letter of appointment. Regent Rolph seconded, and the motions carried.

Chair Bangerter introduced Dr. Jay Golden and his wife, Dina. Dr. Golden thanked the Board and the Search Committee members. He shared his initial vision and priorities for Wichita State. He spoke about the importance of finding ways to keep college affordable for all students and working with faculty and staff to develop a well-trained pipeline for future leaders. He announced the launching of the Presidents Leadership Fellows, which is a program that allows faculty and staff who are interested in taking on administrative roles the opportunity to be exposed to the offices and challenges facing leaders at Wichita State and other universities, industry and government. Dr. Golden also spoke about his commitment to partnering with business and industry to build and diversify the economy and the importance of continuing the growth of the Innovation Campus. He stated he is

looking forward to working closely with the University's students, faculty, staff, alumni, and the Wichita community.

ADJOURNMENT

Regent Bangerter adjourned the meeting at 2:21 p.m.

Blake Flanders, President and CEO

Shane Bangerter, Chair

REPORTS AND CONSENT AGENDA

IV. Introductions and Reports

- A. *Introductions*
- B. *Report from the Chair* Regent Bangerter, Chair
- C. *Report from the President & CEO* Blake Flanders, President & CEO
- D. *Report from the System Council of Presidents* President Trzaska
- E. *Report from Council of Presidents* President Garrett
- F. *Report from Council of Faculty Senate Presidents* Greg Schneider
- G. *Report from Students' Advisory Committee* Paul Frost
- H. *Report from the Community Colleges* President Trzaska
- I. *Report from the Technical Colleges* President Genandt
- J. *Report from the University CEOs* President Scott, PSU and
Chancellor Girod, KU

V. Standing Committee Reports

- A. *Academic Affairs* Regent Schmidt
- B. *Fiscal Affairs & Audit* Regent Hutton

VI. Approval of Consent Agenda

- A. *Academic Affairs*
 - 1. **Act on Request for a New Certificate of Approval for University of Missouri-Kansas City** **Daniel Archer,**
VP, Academic Affairs

Summary

The University of Missouri-Kansas City has applied for a Certificate of Approval to offer the institution's high school college partnership program at Kansas high schools. After a thorough review of staff qualifications, record keeping systems, coursework, and supporting materials, the institution demonstrates it meets and complies with all statutorily imposed requirements. Staff recommends the institution be issued a Certificate of Approval.

Summary of Institution Requirements

The Private and Out-of-State Postsecondary Educational Institution Act (Act) requires private and out-of-state postsecondary educational institutions to obtain Certificates of Approval from the Kansas Board of Regents (Board) to lawfully operate in Kansas. This Act not only covers “brick and mortar” schools having a physical presence within Kansas but also schools that offer or provide online distance education to Kansans who remain in Kansas while receiving that education.

To qualify for a Certificate of Approval, an institution operating in Kansas subject to the Act must meet the standards established by the Act. In reviewing institutions to determine if they meet the statutory standards, Board staff requires and reviews substantial documentation and evidence presented to demonstrate compliance of the schools to ensure proper facilities (with site reviews for facilities when applicable), equipment, materials, and adequate space are available to meet the needs of the students. A recent financial statement, proof of accreditation, evidence of compliance with local, county, state and national safety codes, enrollment agreements, copies of advertisements, schedules of tuitions and fees, and refund policies are reviewed by Board staff. Institutions are also required to provide descriptions of their programs and courses, clinical or externship contracts, instructor credentials, a statement of the objectives of the programs, and qualifications of administrators and owner information.

University of Missouri-Kansas City

The University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC) began as the University of Kansas City, a private institution founded in 1933. The institution became a part of the University of Missouri System in 1963. Through UMKC’s College of Arts and Sciences, the High School College Partnership (HSCP) program offers dual credit to high school students. The program is designed to facilitate the transition from high school to college by shortening the time required to earn an undergraduate degree and to better prepare college-bound students.

The HSCP program is a non-degree program offering high school students the ability to earn college credit while taking classes at their schools. Courses are 3-5 semester credit hours in the areas of art, biology, chemistry, computer science, and English language and literature. Each HSCP course is a duplicate of the content offered in the on-campus course, including the textbook, syllabi, and examinations. All dual credit courses are taught in person by high school instructors having a minimum of a master’s degree that includes a minimum of 18 graduate-level semester hours appropriate to the academic field in which they are teaching, or through video-based courses taught by UMKC faculty members and facilitated by the high school teacher.

UMKC is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission, a regional accreditation agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. The HSCP program is accredited by the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends issuance of a Certificate of Approval to the University of Missouri-Kansas City.

2. Act on Request to Approve Doctor of Philosophy in Biomedical Engineering – WSU

Summary

Universities may apply for approval of new academic programs following the guidelines in the Kansas Board of Regents Policy Manual. Wichita State University has submitted an application for approval and the proposing academic unit has responded to all of the requirements of the program approval process. Board staff concurs with the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee, the Council of Presidents, and the Council of Chief Academic Officers in recommending approval.

Program Approval

I. General Information

A. Institution

Wichita State University

B. Program Identification

Degree Level: Doctoral Program (Ph.D.)
 Program Title: Graduate Biomedical Engineering Program
 Degree to be Offered: Doctor of Philosophy in Biomedical Engineering
 Responsible Department or Unit: Department of Biomedical Engineering
 CIP Code: 14.0501
 Proposed Implementation Date: Fall 2019

Total Number of Semester Credit Hours for the Degree: 72

II. Justification

Wichita State University proposes the development of a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree in Biomedical Engineering (BME); this offering is to be housed in the Biomedical Engineering Department. The proposed Ph.D. program seeks to provide students with a fundamental understanding of the application of engineering principles to biomedical research with an emphasis on translational research.

Biomedical engineers apply modern approaches of engineering and design concepts to biology and medicine for use in healthcare (Study.com). Individuals who obtain a Ph.D. will use their broad knowledge of engineering and medical biological sciences, in conjunction with theoretical and computational methods from the disciplines of mathematics and computer science, to make improvements in healthcare therapy, diagnosis, and monitoring. Biomedical engineers apply life sciences to finding solutions to biomedical problems. WSU’s Ph.D. in BME will provide unique curriculum concentration areas of bio-computational modeling and devices, innovation and translational BME, along with the unique research emphasis of wearable biosensors.

There are many career disciplines related to biomedical engineering. Some of the typical ones include many of the engineering disciplines (e.g., bioengineering, chemical, mechanical, electrical, aerospace, materials, etc.), science disciplines (e.g., biology, chemistry), and academia.

This plan of study contains a minimum of 72 semester credit hours (sch), including coursework and dissertation. This program will admit students directly from a bachelor’s degree; these students would need the full 72 sch for the Ph.D. degree. A maximum of 24 sch may be transferred from a graduate program into this doctoral program.

III. Program Demand: Market Analysis

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, employment of biomedical engineers is expected to grow seven percent from 2016 to 2026, with growth coming from new technologies and applications to medical devices. WSU is well placed to serve the needs of the region, as outlined in the Blueprint for Regional Economic Growth (Blueprint) of South Central Kansas regarding opportunities for growth in healthcare.

The proposed Ph.D. in BME program will be unique at Wichita State University; no other program combines engineering, science and health, and innovation with interdisciplinary, translational research. Among the Kansas Regents institutions, Kansas State University has a Ph.D. program in Biological and Agricultural Engineering. However, the emphasis area in this program is different from the concentration areas proposed in the WSU BME Ph.D. program. The Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering at KSU offers a Ph.D. in Engineering where students may specialize in environmental engineering, information and electrical technology, bioprocessing engineering, machinery systems, natural resource engineering, or structure and environment. Contrastingly, WSU’s proposed Ph.D. in BME emphasizes utilization of engineering principles and expertise to analyze and solve problems in biology and medicine, thereby providing overall enhancements of health care; program emphasis areas do not overlap in agricultural applications, as evidenced in KSU’s doctoral program. The emphases of WSU’s program include:

- Biomaterials and Tissue Engineering;
- Molecular and Cell Bioengineering;
- Biomechanics and Rehabilitation Engineering;
- Biocomputational Modeling and Devices; and
- Innovation and Translational Biomedical Engineering, as it relates to improving health care.

The University of Kansas has an existing Bioengineering graduate program, with similar emphasis areas of Biomaterials and Tissue Engineering, Biomolecular Engineering, and Biomechanics. However, the proposed WSU Ph.D. in biomedical engineering program has unique concentration areas and research emphases such as bio-computational modeling and devices, innovation and translational biomedical engineering, and wearable biosensors.

Several regional institutions have Ph.D. programs with similar names, including The University of Nebraska, the University of Missouri, and the University of Arkansas. Although these institutions have some similarity to this proposed program, WSU’s concentration areas set this program apart from the others.

To ascertain interest in this program, an online survey was conducted of WSU undergraduate students in Engineering (BME, Industrial, Mechanical, Electrical, Aerospace), Chemistry, Biology and Exercise Science. When asked if they would be interested in a BME master’s or Ph.D. Program, 48% (N=165) responded as being interested in both master’s and Ph.D. program and 9% (N=165) were interested in the Ph.D. program only. Thus, it is very likely that the Ph.D. program would attain the minimum 5 students within three years after the inception of the program.

IV. Projected Enrollment for the Initial Three Years of the Program

Year	Headcount		Semester Credit*	
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time
Implementation	1	0	18	0
Year 2	3	0	72	0
Year 3	6	0	180	0

* Based on 9 semester credit hours per semester (18 per year) for three years

V. Employment

There has been a steady increase in employment of Biomedical Engineers and demand is expected to increase regionally and nationally. The U.S. Department of Labor’s Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Outlook Handbook indicates Biomedical Engineering employment will experience 7% job growth from 2016 to 2026 (BOL). Bioengineering has been named the #1 best job in America (CNN). The Kansas City Area Life Science Institute found that 70% of medical device firms and 36% of companies in drugs and pharmaceutical and biotechnology research and testing reported employment increases in the previous three years. Students who graduate from WSU’s Ph.D. program may pursue careers in healthcare and as consultants to government, non-

profits, and industrial agencies; researchers; and faculty and professional staff in academic institutions. WSU has the advantage of providing experiential learning collaborations with manufacturing and healthcare, which are Wichita's #1 and #2 employment industry sectors.

VI. Admission and Curriculum

A. Admission Criteria

The minimum requirements for admission to the Ph.D. in Biomedical Engineering program include:

- A masters or bachelor's degree in a discipline relevant to biomedical engineering
 - A student entering the Ph.D. program directly from a bachelor's degree must have a cumulative GPA of 3.5.
 - A student entering the program after completing a master's degree must have a cumulative GPA of 3.25 for their master's degree coursework.

Additionally, students must submit:

- a statement of purpose,
- GRE scores,
- three letters of recommendation, and
- transcripts with documented completion of prerequisite courses.*

* Prerequisite coursework includes: Biology I, Anatomy and Physiology, General Chemistry I, General Chemistry II, Physics I, Math (Calculus I, Calculus II, and Differential Equations), Circuits, Thermodynamics, Statics, Statistics, and a programming language.

B. Curriculum

Two plans of study are shown.

- The first is a full 72 semester credit hour program for students entering this program with a baccalaureate degree but no master's level courses to transfer into the program.
- The second shows the program for students who are able to transfer in the maximum number of semester credit hours from their master's degree program. (Note: 24 semester credit hours is the maximum number allowed. Hence, 24 semester credit hours transferred in plus 48 semester credit hours in this program = 72 semester credit hours for Doctor of Philosophy in Biomedical Engineering.)

Admitted Directly from Bachelor's Degree 72 Semester Credit Hours (SCH)

Semester 1	SCH
BME 722 Introduction to Biorobotics	3
BME 752 Applied Human Biomechanics	3
IME 724 Statistical Methods for Engr's	3
BME XXX BME Seminar	0
Semester Total	9

Semester 2	SCH
BME 757 Clinical Biomechanics Instrumentation	3
IME 549 Industrial Ergonomics	3
BIOL 773 Statistical Methods in Biology	3
Semester Total	9

Semester 3	SCH
IME 877 Foundations of Neural Networks	3
IME 754 Reliability and Maintainability Engr	3
IME 755 Design of Experiments	3

Semester 4	SCH
ME 709 Injury Biomechanics	3
EE 782 Digital Signal Processing	3
BME 738 Biomedical Imaging	3

Semester Total	9
-----------------------	----------

Semester Total	9
-----------------------	----------

Semester 5

IME 854 Quality Engineering	3
IME 767 Lean Manufacturing	3
ENTR 805 Technology Entrepreneurship	3
Semester Total	9

Semester 6

ENTR 806 New Product Development	3
BME 976 PhD Dissertation	6
Semester Total	9

Semester 7

BME 976 PhD Dissertation	9
Semester Total	9

Semester 8

BME 976 PhD Dissertation	9
Semester Total	9

Admitted with Maximum Number of SCH Transferred from Master’s Program 48 SCH

Semester 1

SCH

BME 722 Introduction to Biorobotics	3
BME 752 Applied Human Biomechanics	3
IME 724 Statistical Methods for Engineers	3
BME XXX BME Seminar	0
Semester Total	9

Semester 2

SCH

BME 757 Clinical Biomechanics Instrumentation	3
BME 738 Biomedical Imaging	3
EE 782 Digital Signal Processing	3
Semester Total	9

Semester 3

IME 877 Foundations of Neural Networks	3
IME 754 Reliability and Maintainability Engr	3
BME 976 PhD Dissertation	3
Semester Total	9

Semester 4

BME 976 Ph.D. Dissertation	9
Semester Total	9

Semester 5

ME 976 PhD Dissertation	9
Semester Total	9

Semester 6

BME 976 PhD Dissertation	3
Semester Total	3

VII. Core Faculty

The Council of Chief Academic Officers has reviewed and approved the list of faculty who will teach in this program. No graduate assistants will teach in this program.

VIII. Expenditure and Funding Sources

	First FY	Second FY	Third FY
A. EXPENDITURES			
Personnel – Reassigned or Existing Positions			
Faculty	\$ 572,396	\$ 572,396	\$ 572,396
Administrators (<i>other than instruction time</i>)			
Graduate Assistants			
Support Staff for Administration (<i>e.g., secretarial</i>)			
Fringe Benefits (<i>total for all groups</i>)	\$ 146,638	\$ 146,638	\$ 146,638
Other Personnel Costs			
Total Existing Personnel Costs – Reassigned or Existing	\$ 719,034	\$ 719,034	\$ 719,034
Personnel – New Positions			
Faculty	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000
Administrators (<i>other than instruction time</i>)			
Graduate Assistants	\$ 48,000	\$ 48,000	\$ 48,000
Support Staff for Administration (<i>e.g., secretarial</i>)			
Fringe Benefits (<i>total for all groups</i>)	\$ 27,200	\$ 27,200	\$ 27,200
Other Personnel Costs			
Total Existing Personnel Costs – New Positions	\$ 160,200	\$ 160,200	\$ 160,200
Start-up Costs – One-Time Expenses			
Personnel Expenses Prior to FY I: Administration			
Personnel Expenses Prior to FY I: Faculty			
Personnel Expenses Prior to FY I: Support Staff			
Library/learning resources			
Equipment/Technology			
Physical Facilities: Construction or Renovation			
Other	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 0
Total Start-up Costs	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 0
Operating Costs – Recurring Expenses			
Supplies/Expenses	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
Library/learning resources			
Equipment/Technology			
Travel			
Other			
Total Operating Costs	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000
GRAND TOTAL COSTS	\$ 1,049,234	\$ 1,049,234	\$ 899,234
B. FUNDING SOURCES (<i>projected as appropriate</i>)	First FY (New)	Second FY (New)	Third FY (New)
Tuition / State Funds	\$ 5,435	\$ 21,739.68	\$ 54,349
Student Fees	\$ 2,369	\$ 8,148	\$ 18,374

Other Sources	\$ 105,000	\$ 105,000	\$ 30,000
GRAND TOTAL FUNDING	\$ 112,804	\$ 134,888	\$ 102,723
C. Projected Surplus/Deficit (+/-) (Grand Total Funding <i>minus</i> Grand Total Costs)	-936,430	-914,346	-796,511

IX. Expenditures and Funding Sources Explanations

A. Expenditures

Expenditures Overview

The Ph.D. in Biomedical Engineering program will add one tenure-track faculty line at a cost of \$85,000/year and fringe of \$27,000, five new graduate assistant positions at \$48,000 annually, and an additional \$20,000 in operating expenses. A start-up package of approximately \$150,000 over two years will be provided to the new tenure-track faculty. Existing facilities are adequate to support the program, including library, advising, academic computing, and administrative support.

Personnel – Reassigned or Existing Positions

The current BME department faculty consist of 7 core faculty members. The core faculty currently teach and support both the undergraduate and MS BME program and will teach and support the proposed Ph.D. graduate program. The additional advising load will be shared among faculty.

Personnel – New Positions

The College of Engineering will fund a new tenure-track faculty line starting by Year 3, at a budgeted salary of \$85,000 plus \$27,200 in fringe benefits. One additional tenure-track faculty position would bring the total to 8 faculty to support the Ph.D. BME program (in addition to the baccalaureate and master’s programs). Five new graduate assistants would be funded at a cost of \$48,000 annually, which will be funded through Sedgwick Country Mill Levy funds and the College of Engineering.

The Department of Biomedical Engineering receives approximately \$30,000 in funding from the Graduate School for graduate assistants (\$18,000 of which comes from Mill Levy funds). The College of Engineering provides funding for start-up packages from the Engineering Expansion Grant (EEG) (estimated \$150,000 total over two years for the new faculty hire). The EEG grant is available through Fiscal Year 22 (ends June 2022).

Start-up Costs – One-time Expenses

No initial additional equipment or library resources will be needed. Start-up costs of approximately \$75,000 for two years (\$150,000 total) will be provided from internal sources to add one additional tenure-track faculty line.

Operating Costs - Recurring Expenses

Operating costs of \$20,000 annually are budgeted to support the doctoral program administrative needs. There are no anticipated additional advising, library, audio-visual, or academic computing resource needs or costs, and the current administrative support for the BME Department will be sufficient for the addition of the Ph.D. BME program to the BME Department.

B. Funding Sources

Tuition

Tuition for graduate Kansas residents is \$301.94 per credit hour.

Fees

WSU student activity fees for graduate Kansas residents are \$664.93 for full-time students and \$443.30 for part-time students per semester. Per credit mandatory fees for all courses are \$7.75. The College of Engineering

has a \$50 per credit fee for all credits taken. Funding will come from funds in the College of Engineering made available through Engineering College course fees to provide funding for the program.

X. References

- BOL. Bureau of Labor Statistics & U.S. Department of Labor (2015). Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2016-17 Edition, Biomedical Engineer. Retrieved from: <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/architecture-and-engineering/biomedical-engineers.htm>.
- Blueprint for Regional Economic Growth. (2016). Healthcare. Retrieved from: https://greaterwichtapartnership.org/living_working/healthcare
- CNN Money. (2013). Best jobs in America. Retrieved from: https://money.cnn.com/pf/best-jobs/2013/full_list/index.html
- Goudreau, J. (2012, May 12). The 15 most valuable college majors. *Forbes*. Retrieved from: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jennagoudreau/2012/05/15/best-top-most-valuable-college-majors-degrees/#379e8da74dcc>
- Kansas City Area Life Sciences Institute, Inc. (2016). Kansas City Regional Life Sciences Industry Census – 2012. Retrieved from: <http://www.kclifesciences.org/news/industry-census/>
- Study.com. (2018, July). Is a Ph.D. in biomedical engineering worth it? Retrieved from: https://study.com/articles/is_a_phd_in_biomedical_engineering_worth_it.html

SITE VISIT REPORT WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING Ph.D. PROGRAM PROPOSAL

Brian Davis, Professor and Chair of Mechanical Engineering, Cleveland State University
Michael Detamore, Professor and Chair of Biomedical Engineering, University of Oklahoma
Shalini Prasad, Professor and Interim Chair of Biomedical Engineering, UT-Dallas
July 15-17, 2019

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

There is an urgent and compelling need for a PhD program in Biomedical Engineering (BME) at Wichita State University (WSU). The BME PhD program will elevate the research productivity and quality in not only in Biomedical Engineering, but across Engineering and across campus. This BME PhD program will synergize with regional strengths in Wichita possibly including NIAR, the VA, the local biomedical industry and entrepreneurial environment, and the KU medical school.

It is essential that the leadership of Wichita State University lay the groundwork for long-term success for a PhD program in BME. National metrics from BME departments across the country must be infused into investments for a solid launch to the program. These investments include several faculty hires, additional teaching assistant positions, space, competitive stipends, support staff, and tuition assistance commensurate with national standards. In addition, a one-time infusion of funds to purchase equipment that can be shared between departments is recommended.

Additional faculty hires are essential for many reasons, including sharing undergraduate teaching load to free individual faculty bandwidth for proposal writing, PhD student research mentoring, and expanding the graduate course curriculum. Additional teaching assistant positions at the BME PhD stipend level are an essential startup investment to support not only the undergraduate enrollment growth, but more importantly to enable a successful start to support the demand for a strong first cohort of BME PhD students. Space is currently fragmented, with faculty and graduate students, creating a barrier to collaboration. It is recommended that the WSU leadership create contiguous space for BME collaborative research. Moreover, a mechanism for shared space with NIAR and BME is a strategic opportunity for investment in BME faculty with research at the interface with these two disciplines.

(1) Program Justification

The justification for the PhD BME program at Wichita State University and in the BME Department is appropriately defined. Wichita State University is Kansas' only major research university in a metropolitan area (not including the KU Medical Center campus). The team in their meetings with the Dean of Engineering, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies in CoE, The BME Department Chair, and with the Provost highlighted WSU's experiential learning collaborations with manufacturing and healthcare, which are Wichita's #1 and #2 employment industry sectors, respectively. The Provost emphasized that BME PhD would be able to lead the interdisciplinary translational research education in WSU. PhD in BME would bring together several internal public/ private constituents from local industry and NIAR to accelerate the discovery of new knowledge.

There was concern on the rationale for the PhD program in BME based on the Kansas City Area Life Science Institute 2012 census. The areas listed in the census, which were highlighted in the report were, drugs and pharmaceuticals, biotechnology research and testing, and medical devices. The team recommends the department focus on their core strengths in Biomechanics, Biosensors, Biomaterials and Devices to build out the PhD program and appropriately recruit faculty to support their research enterprise.

The proposed PhD BME program aims to train "industry ready" PhD students to serve as a key economic driver in workforce, technology and innovation development supporting the healthcare industry in the Wichita, KS region.

WSU has clearly articulated their differentiation aspect in the regional peer and aspirational peer institutions; however, factors such as PhD student stipend amounts, tuition support and institutional support in terms of engineering educators and teaching load reduction for research active faculty must be considered for the growth, sustainability and the reputation of the program.

The majority of the core faculty have breadth of research and teaching experience already in place to support the majority of this proposed program, in addition to several BME Affiliated Faculty.

In discussion with the Dean of Engineering and the Department Chair of BME it was emphasized that the majority of WSU students and 70% of BME undergraduate students at WSU are from or within 30 miles of Wichita. Thus, locating a PhD in BME program in the BME Department at WSU provides additional educational opportunities for some students who want an advanced degree from a program with an interface to top industry sectors.

The proposed PhD in BME program will be unique at WSU as there are no other similar PhD programs at Wichita State University, especially ones that combine engineering, science and health, and innovation as part of the curriculum as well as enhancing interdisciplinary translational research. Among the Kansas Regents institutions, the University of Kansas and Kansas State University have graduate programs with similar names to the proposed PhD BME program at WSU but their emphases are in areas that are congruent to WSU's strengths.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: Leverage the current department strengths in Biomechanics, Biosensors, Biomaterials and Devices toward building a strong PhD program. In order to sustain the PhD program, competitive stipends and resources must be offered comparable to University of Kansas and Kansas State University, both of whom have graduate programs in Bioengineering and Biological & Agricultural Engineering, respectively. Teaching load reduction for research active faculty must be considered for the sustainability of the PhD program and for ensuring retention of faculty.

(2) Curriculum

The required curricula for the Ph.D. program was reviewed by the team. The Department has developed a graduate curriculum that is sufficiently rigorous in both breadth and depth and by all appearances the graduates of the Ph.D. programs are well educated in Biomedical Engineering. The Ph.D. program graduates will have breadth of knowledge in the areas of (1) Biomaterials and Tissue Engineering, (2) Molecular and Cell Bioengineering, (3)

Biomechanics and Rehabilitation Engineering, (4) Bio- computational Modeling and Devices, and (5) Innovation and Translational Biomedical Engineering, and (6) Wearable Biosensors. A specific challenge noted by the Team with regards to the curriculum is that there needs to be a more formal structure for entering graduate students who do not have an engineering background. There needs to be a rigorous curriculum to ensure that these students understand engineering fundamentals. Likewise, for engineers without biology backgrounds, there needs to be a structured curriculum to enhance their biological knowledge. However, this is a challenge to nearly all biomedical engineering graduate programs as the nature of biomedical engineering attracts students from many disparate disciplines.

The team also would like to point out that while the BME Program has a particular and unique strength in biomechanics and human factors, a broadening of course offerings in areas such as biomechanics, bio- imaging, and biosensors would significantly enhance the curriculum and the Program. This point was also noted by the students and faculty in the Department.

Course offerings in regulatory issues and quality engineering can be developed to benefit the multi- disciplinary approach among the Ph.D. graduate students and faculty. Advanced course offerings in core areas of research need to be developed such as robotics, biomaterials, and mechanobiology. There is a sense among the graduate students that the Ph.D. degree would prepare them for industry opportunities. These areas of engineering are definitely engineering specialties and key areas of employment for biomedical engineers. Both of these engineering sub-disciplines play an essential role in the biomedical arena and many MS and PhD level biomedical engineers fill industry roles in these areas. While there was some discussion tying regulatory and quality engineering to entrepreneurship, these sub-disciplines are much more than that in biomedical engineering. They play a magnified role in all aspects of product design and development and all biomedical engineers need to be aware of them. With Wichita State University's strength in materials science, aviation research with a focus on regulatory aspects, this would be a good opportunity to leverage these strengths for the Ph.D. program in Biomedical Engineering.

The Ph.D. program in Biomedical Engineering has the unique opportunity for partnering with the local medical institutions towards offering internships and other training opportunities. Leveraging NIAR and the public private partnerships in Engineering at Wichita presents a significant opportunity for the Biomedical Engineering Department and the University as a whole in terms of shared curricula and joint offerings.

The teaching load of the faculty is excessive for research-active faculty. For junior faculty (first 3 years of appointment) the course load is 1:1, 2:1 and then 2:2 typically split between one undergraduate course and 1/2 graduate course(s) per year. For more senior faculty the split is 2:2. It is important to enable research active faculty sufficient research time to mentor their PhD students and grow the research program.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: The department will need to define a formal curriculum structure for non-engineering incoming PhD students and for engineering students without sufficient human factors/biology knowledge. The research concentrations can be consolidated to streamline the curriculum. The teaching load of research active faculty needs to be adjusted to enable them time to devote to PhD student mentoring. Inception of regulatory and quality courses would leverage the interdisciplinary opportunities afforded by NIAR.

(3) Program Faculty

The faculty of the Biomedical Engineering department are a major strength of the proposed PhD program. The faculty are qualified to offer the proposed program. There are currently a total of 8 core faculty, including the Dean of Engineering. Not including the Dean of Engineering, there are 4 Associate Professors and 3 Assistant Professors (7 total, 6.5 FTE). One of the Associate Professors serves as the Graduate Coordinator. There are 7 total affiliated faculty from departments such as biological sciences, chemistry, human factors, and human performance.

Faculty expertise is highly multidisciplinary, including areas such as biomechanics, wearable sensors, cellular and molecular bioengineering, human/brain-machine interfaces, neural engineering, biomedical instrumentation, biomaterials, drug delivery, and robotics. These areas of faculty expertise synergize nicely with other departments at WSU as well as regional resources such as the Veterans Affairs (VA). Moreover, there is a strong aerospace research presence within the faculty, with at least one current NASA-funded project and another NASA project pending, with relevance to the NIAR mission. These excellent current and potential connections may be leveraged strategically with support and vision from upper administration including the Provost and Vice President for Research.

The primary concern is the ability to meet the requirement of 8 total Ph.D.-level faculty within 3 years of inception. Technically, including the Dean of Engineering, there are exactly 8 Biomedical Engineering faculty currently. However, there are significant potential concerns with the retention of the current faculty for three primary reasons: 1) lack of a PhD program, 2) teaching load, 3) service load. The current degree program proposal addresses point #1, and lends a sense of urgency to the implementation of the PhD program. The solution to addressing points #2 and #3 is hiring additional faculty. With an already-productive faculty, freeing up the service and teaching load will create time to more aggressively pursue external research funding (and teach graduate courses), a key mission of the institution that in turn finances and supports the PhD program.

Among faculty hires, two specific considerations are advised. One is to hire at least one an assistant professor of practice ('engineering educator'), which is urgently needed to lift the teaching load. Aspirational peer BME departments may range from two to ten such faculty. The absence of a professor of practice is a glaring omission in the BME profession. The second consideration is the need for full professors in the department, currently there are zero. It is difficult to recruit senior faculty without a PhD program, so careful consideration of timeline is advised to raise the necessary startup and endowment funds in addition to implementing the PhD program. For a tenure-track assistant professor, a starting salary for 9 months is listed as \$85,000 in the proposal, but is far too low, and must be 10-20% higher to be competitive in the current market.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Hire new faculty as soon as possible. A phased hiring plan is advised, with two tenure-track assistant professors and an assistant professor of practice ('engineering educator'), i.e., 3 total positions, in the next hiring cycle. In addition, a phased hiring plan (with commensurate financial business plan) that includes at least one full professor is strongly advised.

Graduate Assistants

The accomplishments of the current Masters students have been impressive, including one National Science Foundation (NSF) Fellow. Unfortunately, that student is being lost to another university because a BME PhD program does not yet exist at WSU. A straw poll of WSU BME faculty reveals a total of approximately 6 to 10 current Masters students who would be exceptional candidates to retain in a PhD program, conveying a sense of urgency for program implementation.

There is a significant concern with the funding model for the PhD program, particularly for recruiting. Launching a new PhD program is analogous to starting a new company, with a significant investment needed up front to get things moving before a big payoff is attained. In this case, the investment is in teaching assistant (TA) funds and graduate recruiting fellowships, and the payoff is in research expenditures. Currently there is a catch-22 in that PhD students produce the data that lead to research grants being funded, which finance the PhD students and the cycle continues. Like a chicken-and-egg scenario, which comes first? The funds for the PhD students, or the data produced by the PhD students that enables securing of grant funds? The answer is an investment in TA funds that allows the department to recruit a strong class of PhD students.

There is an excellent opportunity for the Dean of the Graduate School, the Dean of Engineering, the Provost, and the Vice President for Research to work together as a team to invest in this program, with quantifiable metrics including PhD to Masters student ratio (directly tied to research productivity), research proposals funded, and

research grants awarded, to evaluate the return on investment. According to the Assistant Dean of the Graduate School, the PhD:Masters ratio is not currently tracked, and perhaps should be to be in alignment with the Provost, VPR, and Dean of Engineering goals to increase research productivity.

A competitive stipend for PhD students is essential to compete with regional BME PhD programs. The current market rate in the region is \$25,000, and likely to increase. Moreover, faculty must budget for tuition and fees in grant proposals (except as expressly forbidden by a funding agency). Students in the program should not be expected to pay for their own tuition or fees, at the risk of losing PhD student recruits to competitor BME PhD programs.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Fund 5-6 TA positions per year (with tuition and fees covered) dedicated exclusively to the PhD program (at the stipend rate recommended below), and offer at least one recruiting fellowship supplement per year (~\$5,000) to support the launch and sustainability of this program, in a joint investment from the Graduate School, VPR, Dean of Engineering, and Provost.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Set a minimum BME PhD student stipend of \$25,000/year contingent on satisfactory progress. Cover fees and tuition by remission, TA funding, research grants, or otherwise.

(4) Academic Support

The department currently includes one full time administrative assistant and one full time laboratory technician, and one part-time student advisor, which is on the low end compared to staff support for BME departments nationwide (most recent survey across BME departments nationwide shows an average of four administrative staff and one full-time technical staff member). There are no concerns with general resources, with the exception that one faculty member mentioned an excessive reliance on interlibrary loan to obtain journal articles, which can be remedied by increasing electronic journal subscriptions by WSU, a key investment in the new BME PhD program.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Hire an additional staff person dedicated to Biomedical Engineering, in particular a Student Programs Coordinator to support both the undergraduate program (e.g., ABET accreditation) and the burgeoning graduate programs.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Invest in an external consultant to review grant applications prior to them being submitted to a funding agency.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Dean of University Libraries review electronic journal subscriptions and add new journals based on a prioritized list of journal subscriptions provided by Chair of BME.

(5) Facilities and Equipment

The proposal coupled with a walk-through of each laboratory in Biomedical Engineering showed well- equipped facilities for conducting research. The gait analysis lab, mechanobiology and biomaterials labs, two sensor/imaging labs and a robotics research area were impressive in terms of (i) utilization of current technology, (ii) obvious signs of student-engagement (through numerous wall-mounted research posters), (iii) breadth and depth of resources and (iv) the fact that almost all the labs had been created within the past 2 years.

Overall, the provisions for facilities and equipment for the short-term initiation of a doctoral program in biomedical engineering are met. However, the provisions for long-term success of a doctoral BME program are diminished by some key limitations:

- Faculty offices and labs are in different buildings. The result of this is a disconnect between graduate students and their advisors.
- BME faculty are located in three different buildings. This hampers collaboration. Of particular concern is that

two labs dealing with wearable sensors are in different buildings and the faculty seem to have little interactions with each other.

- Labs are used for both research and teaching. The issues with this included (i) costs of maintaining teaching equipment should be covered by central resources, whereas research equipment should be the responsibility of the faculty person overseeing the research lab, and (ii) in the future, sensitive tissue engineering or mechanobiology research projects could be jeopardized by contamination caused by undergraduates using a lab for their classes.

While there is sufficient equipment in each lab for establishing a new doctoral BME program, in the longer term, the research productivity would be enhanced by an infusion of up-front costs to cover items such as; reactive ion etcher, metal deposition chamber, high frequency oscilloscopes (6 to 10 GHz), high frequency generator and benchtop power supply, vector network analyzer, spectrum analyzer, micro fabrication capabilities for printed circuit board design. Note that almost all of these pieces of equipment could be shared with other departments at Wichita State University.

With regard to co-locating faculty there seem to be ample opportunities for achieving this close to labs occupied by BME faculty who conduct research in the areas of human movement, mechanobiology and sensors imaging (in the new Engineering Building). Some spaces in the new engineering building at close vicinity to the current BME labs seem underutilized. For instance, rooms 209, 323 and 335 appear to be unused and/or not used for research during the past 12 months.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Co-locate BME faculty in contiguous space within the same building to promote collaboration, joint projects and student interactions.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Use a one-time infusion of funds to purchase equipment that can be shared between departments.

(6) Program Review, Assessment and Accreditation

The proposal builds upon a successful MS program in biomedical engineering that was launched in 2016. This MS program currently has about 20 students in it, some of whom are interested in enrolling in a PhD at Wichita State. Across departments, internal reviews are conducted every 4 years, with the most recent review being completed in 2018. Every 8 years, Wichita State University sends program reviews to the Kansas Board of Regents. In the case of a new doctoral BME program, the next review would be in 2022. If meaningful input is to be incorporated from doctoral students in the program at that time, the BME department will need to have a critical mass of students, most likely between 12 and 18 students spread between 8 faculty members. As mentioned in Section 2, this requires an initial cohort of about 6 students in Year 1.

It should be noted that the national Biomedical Engineering Society (BMES) does not currently have criteria for evaluating doctoral programs. Similarly, there are no Accreditation requirements for doctoral BME programs (unlike undergraduate programs that undergo ABET reviews every 6 years).

With the aforementioned observations, the proposed PhD program in Biomedical Engineering meets the standards expected for this provision.

In terms of measures of success, it is worthwhile highlighting what BME faculty consider as successful outcomes after an initial 2 year period:

- Participation in national and international BME conferences.
- Addition of one new faculty member (the committee believes that four new faculty are needed, as outlined in Section 3).
- Increase in applications to the doctoral BME program.
- Increase in grant applications (the committee believes that the key is in funding success rather than number

of applications). [Hiring an external reviewer of proposals prior to submission should help achieve a higher rate of grant funding.]

- Collaborative research projects with clinicians and residents at Kansas University Medical School.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Utilize established procedures being used by other engineering departments to evaluate the doctoral program. “Continuous improvement” should be the mantra when getting a new program established.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Build a critical mass of doctoral students over the initial 2 year period so that meaningful feedback can be obtained from the most important stakeholders – the students themselves.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Keep track of (i) number of proposal submissions from each faculty member, (ii) outcome of the application and (iii) number of joint applications (a marker of collaboration).

Wichita State University Response to KBOR Site Visit External Reviewers Recommended Actions

The Department of Biomedical Engineering thanks the PhD program review team for its thorough and positive review of the proposed PhD program in Biomedical Engineering. The review team found a compelling and urgent need for a program at Wichita State, and has offered recommendations for strengthening the program. Some recommended actions can be accomplished in the immediate future while others require long-term commitments and planning. In the response below, these actions are described.

Program Justification

- Recommended Action: Leverage current department strengths in Biomechanics, Biosensors, Biomaterials and Devices towards building a strong PhD program.
 - Response: The external review team has identified current department expertise strengths which would provide focus for future growth of the program. We agree that these areas represent a core of unique expertise that can be built upon to create a strong and vibrant program. As we plan for future faculty searches, the BME Department faculty will include these core areas as a starting point for discussions of departmental needs with respect to expertise areas that will complement and strengthen faculty research, aimed at building a strong PhD program.
- Recommended Action: Competitive stipends and resources must be offered comparable to KU and K-State.
 - Response: Based on the current allocation from various internal sources (e.g., College of Engineering, Graduate School), the BME Department has developed a plan for immediately supporting a minimum of four PhD Graduate Teaching Assistants with competitive stipends (comparable to KU and K-State). With the support of the Provost, the College of Engineering and Biomedical Engineering Department will develop a longer-term plan to support an additional 4-6 PhD students annually at competitive stipends.
- Recommended Action: Teaching load reduction for research active faculty must be considered for the sustainability of the PhD program and for ensuring retention of faculty.
 - Response: Currently, research-intensive faculty in the department teach two courses per semester. We are considering ways to reduce the teaching load for faculty who are highly engaged in research. The College of Engineering Executive Committee is currently developing a plan to address faculty workload that would adjust teaching load based in part on research productivity and grant activity. The focus will be on creating a workload structure that supports high-intensity research while also supporting the instructional needs of the undergraduate and graduate students through utilization of highly qualified teaching faculty (engineering educators).

Curriculum

- Recommended Action: Define a formal curriculum structure for non-engineering incoming PhD students and for engineering students without sufficient human factors/biology knowledge.
 - Response: The proposal as submitted indicates that “students entering the Biomedical PhD program are expected to have already completed the following courses or their equivalents: Biology I, Anatomy and Physiology, Chemistry (Chemistry I and Chemistry II), Physics I, Math (Calculus I, Calculus II, Differential Equations), Circuits, Thermodynamics, Statics, Statistics and programming. If prior coursework deficiencies exist, the student may be admitted on a conditional basis.” While the number of and specific prerequisite courses required for conditional enrollment will vary based on an applicant’s academic background, we will add to the above language that it will be expected that the prerequisite coursework be completed within one academic year of enrollment in the BME PhD program.
 - For incoming PhD students with non-engineering backgrounds, the above language would be sufficient, which identifies the necessary engineering coursework and prerequisite courses to the engineering coursework that are needed for admission. The above language of the prerequisite courses and the timeframe to complete will apply to this group of applicants.
 - For incoming PhD students with an engineering background without sufficient human factors/biology knowledge, we will add a specific section in the admission requirements specifying Biology and Anatomy and Physiology related courses are needed. The above language of the prerequisite courses and the timeframe to complete will apply to this group of applicants as well, although it will likely take less time than the incoming PhD students with non-engineering backgrounds.
- Recommended Action: Research concentrations can be consolidated to streamline the curriculum.
 - Response: This is a great recommendation recognizing the research strengths of the current faculty. The program faculty will review the proposed coursework in the curriculum to identify avenues to fit within research concentrations. New or revised Concentrations need to proceed through the university curriculum process, so these changes will be implemented through the curriculum approval process during the 2019/20 academic year.
- Recommended Action: Teaching load of research active faculty needs to be adjusted to enable them time to devote to PhD student mentoring.
 - Response: As indicated above, the College of Engineering Executive Committee is investigating a plan to address faculty workload that would adjust teaching load based in part on research productivity and grant activity.
- Recommended Action: Inception of regulatory and quality courses would leverage the interdisciplinary opportunities afforded by NIAR.
 - Response: Increasing the number and scope of collaborations between NIAR and the College of Engineering (COE) is a major priority for both. In fact, Dean Livesay from the College of Engineering and NIAR Executive Director Dr. John Tomblin meet monthly to bring the two groups closer together. One tangible outcome of this is the creation of a new NIAR/COE Liaison position that will look for mutually beneficial opportunities for both entities. Further, the BME department faculty will explore opportunities to develop regulatory-related coursework, infuse regulatory-related material into upper-level graduate coursework, or include regulatory-related material in professional development and graduate seminars. With respect to quality courses, the Industrial, Systems, and Manufacturing Engineering Department offers a graduate level Quality Engineering course (IME 854), which we listed as potential coursework in the proposed curriculum, and we will encourage the PhD students to consider including this course in their PhD coursework.

Program Faculty

- Recommended Action: Hire new faculty as soon as possible. A phased hiring plan is advised, with two tenure-track assistant professors and an assistant professor of practice (“engineering educator”), i.e., 3 total positions in the next hiring cycle.
 - Response: The current proposal called for hiring an additional tenure-track faculty member as soon as the next hiring cycle, and in place by Fall 2020, but no later than 3 years. We will submit a hiring plan proposal to the Dean and Provost this fall to accelerate the hiring time frame and hire additional faculty to support the PhD program.
- Recommended Action: A phased hiring plan (with commensurate financial business plan) that includes at least one full professor is strongly advised.
 - Response: Additional senior faculty would strengthen the research capacity of the PhD program. We will include a request for senior hires (associate or full) in the hiring proposal plan we submit to the Dean and Provost. Also, several current Associate Professors in the BME Department will be eligible for promotion to Full Professor over the next five years.

Graduate Assistants

- Recommended Action: Fund 5-6 TA positions per year (with tuition and fees covered) dedicated exclusively to the PhD program (at the stipend rate recommended below), and offer at least one recruiting fellowship supplement per year (~\$5,000) to support the launch and sustainability of this program, in a joint investment from the Graduate School, VPR, Dean of Engineering, and Provost.
 - Response: Based on the current allocation from various internal sources (e.g., College of Engineering, Graduate School), the BME Department has developed a plan for immediately supporting at least four PhD GTAs with competitive stipends. The College of Engineering and Biomedical Engineering Department will develop a long-term plan to support additional PhD students with competitive stipends. Additionally, we will develop and submit a proposal to the Provost and Vice President for Research to acquire funding to recruit 4-6 PhD students annually.
- Recommended Action: Set a minimum BME PhD student stipend of \$25,000/year contingent on satisfactory progress. Cover fees and tuition by remission, TA funding, research grants, or otherwise.
 - Response: The BME Department faculty will create a standard for research proposals that will include student stipend funding and tuition from research grant submissions to achieve competitive stipend and funding levels.

Academic Support

- Recommended Action: Hire additional staff person dedicated to Biomedical Engineering, in particular a Student Programs Coordinator to support both the undergraduate program (e.g., ABET accreditation) and the burgeoning graduate programs.
 - Response: The College of Engineering will review current staff assignments to see if current staff can be reassigned to focus on PhD program needs, and additional staff resources will be provided as necessary to address this recommendation.
- Recommended Action: Invest in an external consultant to review grant applications prior to them being submitted to a funding agency.
 - Response: The College of Engineering Associate Dean for Graduate Programs is currently engaged in the process of exploring and contracting with professional grant writers experienced with federal grant funding.
- Recommended Action: Dean of University Libraries review electronic journal subscriptions and add new journals based on a prioritized list of journal subscriptions provided by Chair of BME.
 - Response: Although the current Interlibrary Loan process works very efficiently, the BME Department Chair will survey BME faculty to obtain a prioritized list of electronic journal subscriptions not currently available through University Libraries and communicate this with the Dean of the University Libraries.

Facilities and Equipment

- Recommended Action: Co-locate BME faculty in contiguous space within the same building to promote collaboration, joint projects and student interactions.
 - Response: The new Dean of the College of Engineering is currently assessing space usage across the College, with a specific focus on research productivity and discipline cohesiveness. Reallocations of space will be done thoughtfully over time to ensure that the College's research priorities are maximally addressed.
- Recommended Action: Use a one-time infusion of funds to purchase equipment that can be shared between departments.
 - Response: The College of Engineering has an established program fee distribution model that is specifically designed for capital-intensive equipment purchases. Each department receives a portion of their program fees that should meet most equipment needs. When it does not, departments can request supplemental funding from the dean's office to assist with large purchases. Further, the College of Engineering will explore a plan for developing and submitting proposals for purchase of large equipment (e.g., NSF MRI). The College of Engineering Dean is committed to providing funding as well as finding funding opportunities to support equipment and laboratory needs.

Program Review, Assessment and Accreditation

- Recommended Action: Utilize established procedures being used by other engineering departments to evaluate the doctoral program. "Continuous improvement" should be the mantra when getting a new program established.
 - Response: The Biomedical Engineering Department's graduate committee will query the other WSU engineering departments regarding their established procedures for assessment of their PhD programs. Based on these established procedures and data sources, the BME Department will develop and institute a best practices approach for evaluation of the BME PhD program with an emphasis on continuous improvement.
- Recommended Action: Build a critical mass of doctoral students over the initial 2-year period so that meaningful feedback can be obtained from the most important stakeholders – the students themselves.
 - Response: The review team has recommended an initial cohort of six students to create a critical mass of students for assessing program quality. We have committed to providing support to 4 students in the first year and 4-6 students annually thereafter. We believe this will give us a sufficient number of students for quality assessment. In addition, a PhD graduate student survey will be developed with the objective of soliciting feedback on factors related to the student's perception of the quality of the doctoral program.
- Recommended Action: Keep track of (i) number of proposal submissions from each faculty member, (ii) outcome of the application and (iii) number of joint applications (a marker of collaboration).
 - Response: While these data are currently reported annually by faculty in their Faculty Activity Record as part of the annual review process, these data will be incorporated into the program evaluation process for the BME PhD program.

2024.³ Other health professions have already moved their requirements to a graduate level, including Physical Therapy, Audiology, and Occupational Therapy.

Lack of a DCN is a critical gap in the Dietetics and Nutrition program given the growing demand for advanced-level practitioners in clinical nutrition. Compelling reasons to be an early pioneer for the DCN are many, including:

- development of strong clinical and research skills that can be used to design and direct translational research in clinical settings;
- a gain in respect and credibility with other fields;
- increased critical thinking skills; and
- contributions to advances in the field of nutrition.

III. Program Demand:

A. Survey of Student Interest

Number of surveys administered: 33
 Number of completed surveys returned: 33
 Percentage of students interested in program: ... 45%

As formative work, the Department of Dietetics and Nutrition distributed a survey to a convenience sample of attendees at the Kansas Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (KSAND) Annual Conference in Topeka on April 15, 2016. This is the state professional meeting for dietitians. Surveys were handed to 80 dietitians who visited the KUMC exhibit booth. Respondents either filled the survey while at the booth or returned it later that day. The results (n=54) indicated a strong interest in a DCN program and a preference for an online format. The information was used to formulate the proposed program.

In 2018, a revised survey was built in an online version. A unique Quick Response Code (QR code) was established and linked so that when an individual scanned the QR code with their smartphone, the survey autopopulated in their phone. If preferred, a paper copy of the survey was also available. On April 2, 2018, the online survey was given to students currently enrolled in the Dietetics and Nutrition Master’s program (n=12) to gauge interest and test the online survey version. The convenience sample of students were graduating students enrolled in an advanced micronutrient class. Twenty-five percent of the students indicated that they would be interested in completing a DCN program. The top barriers noted were: “*I am not motivated for more school at this time*” and “*I would need to know the cost*”.

Given that the population of interest for the proposed DCN program is working dietitians, on April 6, 2018, registered dietitians (n=33) who attended the KSAND Annual Conference in Overland Park, KS were surveyed. Attendees who visited the KUMC exhibit booth were invited to scan the QR code and take the survey on their phone or complete a paper survey at that time. Forty-five percent of the dietitians expressed interest in completing a DCN.

B. Market Research

In recent years, interest in the role of food and nutrition in promoting health and wellness has increased, particularly as a part of preventative healthcare in medical settings. The importance of diet in preventing and treating illnesses is well known. More dietitians will be needed to provide care for people with these conditions. Moreover, as the baby-boom generation grows older and looks for ways to stay healthy, there will be more demand for dietetic and nutrition services.⁶

As early as 1993 in a regional survey of dietitians, 99% reported that a practice doctorate was important for dietitians and 55% expressed interest in attaining such a degree.⁷ In 1994, the American Dietetic Association identified development of practice-based doctoral programs as a priority.⁸ In 2006, a national survey of dietitians revealed strong interest in professional doctorate programs.⁹ A 2015 survey by the Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics found that “credible advanced practice credentials remain important in raising the competency level of dietitians and to address the increasing rate of chronic and complex diseases”.¹⁰

There are currently only two other Doctorate in Clinical Nutrition programs in the country (Rutgers University and University of North Florida). Both existing programs are online and there are no residential DCN programs. Offering a DCN at KUMC will fill both a national need as well as the state-level need in Kansas.

IV. Projected Enrollment for the Initial Three Years of the Program

Year	Headcount Per Year		Sem Credit Hrs Per Year*	
	New Full-Time	New Part-Time	Cumulative Full-Time	Cumulative Part-Time
Implementation	5	7	120	84
Year 2	5	7	240	168
Year 3	10	14	360	252

*Credit hours based on 24/year for full time and 12/year for part-time.

V. Employment

According to the U.S. Department of Labor website, employment of dietitians is projected to grow 15 percent from 2016 to 2026, much faster than the average for all occupations.⁴ The demand for doctoral level dietitians is estimated to far outpace the supply.⁵ Graduates of other DCN programs have become:

- advanced-level practitioners in healthcare settings (acute care and outpatient settings);
- university faculty;
- research specialists; and
- senior management professionals in federal and state programs, industry, and non-profit organizations.

The Department of Veterans Affairs hired the most dietitians in 2017,¹¹ followed by Academic Medical Centers across the U.S. Dietitians with advanced degrees or certification in a specialty area enjoy better job prospects. For example, dietitians with doctoral degrees earn \$14 more per hour than those with a bachelor’s degree.¹² The median salary for a dietitian is \$59,410, and those with clinical doctoral degrees average \$77,410 with many exceeding \$100,000 annually.¹³

VI. Admission and Curriculum

A. Admission Criteria

Admission criteria are listed below. Applicants must:

- Be a Registered Dietitian with current professional licensure (when required by their state).
- Have an earned Master’s degree and currently employed as a dietitian (either full- or part-time).
- Complete the graduate application form, including letter of intent with professional goals.
- Achieved minimum graduate GPA requirements for admission to KUMC (3.0 on a 4.0 scale).
- Submit official transcripts from all colleges and/or universities attended with degrees conferred.
- Submit three letters of recommendation from supervisors, faculty, or advisors in the field.
- International students must reside in a country that has reciprocity with Commission on Dietetic Registration; Official TOEFL exam scores for international applicants must be sent directly to KUMC.

B. Curriculum

	Course Number & Title		SCH
Summer	DN XXX*	Interprofessional Collaboration	3
	DN 8**	Clinical Nutrition Core Elective	3
		<i>Summer Subtotal</i>	6
Fall	DN XXX	Nutrition Communication for Advanced Practice	3
	DN XXX	Leadership Essentials in Clinical Nutrition	2
	PRVM 853	Responsible Conduct of Research (Ethics)	1
	DN 8**	Clinical Nutrition Core Elective	3
		<i>Fall Subtotal</i>	9
Spring	NRSG 880	Org. Found Lead Change	3
	Biostats 714	Fundamentals of Biostatistics I	3
	DN XXX	Evidence Analysis in Clinical Nutrition	3
		<i>Spring Subtotal</i>	9
Summer	DN 810	Nutritional Assessment	3
	DN XXX	Research Protocol Development in Clinical Nutrition	1
	NURS 938	Informatics and Technology Applications	2
		<i>Summer Subtotal</i>	6
Fall	NRSG 919	Fdtns. for Leading & Communicating in Organizations	3
	BIOS 717	Fundamentals of Biostatistics II	3
	DN XXX	Advanced Clinical Nutrition Residency†	3
		<i>Fall Subtotal</i>	9
Spring	DN 8**	Clinical Nutrition Core Elective	3
	DN 990	Applied Research Project	6
		<i>Spring Subtotal</i>	9
		Total	48

DN = Dietetics and Nutrition; BIOS = Biostatistics; NURS = Nursing; PVRM = Preventive Medicine

* Courses in development

** Students select from among the following electives:

- DN 829 Nutrition in Aging
- DN 838 Advanced Medical Nutrition Therapy
- DN 839 Clinical Aspects of Nutrition Support
- DN 842 U.S. Public Health Nutrition
- DN 857 Motivational Interviewing in Health Settings
- DN 862 Maternal and Child Nutrition
- DN 865 Nutrition in Sport and Exercise
- DN 870 Health Behavior Counseling
- DN 875 Pediatric Clinical Nutrition
- DN 876 Interventions for the Prevention of Obesity
- DN 880 Dietary and Herbal Supplements
- DN 881 Introduction to Dietetics and Integrative Medicine
- DN 882 A Nutrition Approach to Inflammation and Immune Regulation
- DN 884 Diet, Physical Activity and Cancer
- DN 885 Nutritional Biochemistry
- DN 895 Advanced Macronutrients and Integrated Metabolism
- DN 896 Advanced Micronutrients and Integrated Metabolism
- DN 890 Nutrigenomics and Nutrigenetics in Health and Disease

† Students will self-select the clinical sites for their Advanced Clinical Nutrition Residency based on their geographical location and career interests. Regardless of the location of the clinical site, KUMC will obtain clinical affiliation agreements with each selected site.

VII. Core Faculty

The Council of Chief Academic Officers has reviewed and approved the list of faculty who will teach in this program. No graduate assistants will teach in this program.

VIII. Expenditure and Funding Sources

A. EXPENDITURES	First FY	Second FY	Third FY
Personnel – Reassigned or Existing Positions			
Faculty	\$ 44,780	\$ 46,123	\$ 47,045
Administrators (<i>other than instruction time</i>)			
Graduate Assistants			
Support Staff for Administration (<i>e.g., secretarial</i>)	\$ 1,075	\$ 1,107	\$ 1,140
Fringe Benefits (<i>total for all groups</i>)	\$ 16,049	\$ 16,530	\$ 16,865
Other Personnel Costs			
Total Existing Personnel Costs – Reassigned or Existing	\$ 61,904	\$ 63,760	\$ 65,050
Personnel – New Positions			
Faculty	\$ 102,250	\$ 164,800	\$ 169,744
Administrators (<i>other than instruction time</i>)			
Graduate Assistants			
Support Staff for Administration (<i>e.g., secretarial</i>)			
Fringe Benefits (<i>total for all groups</i>)	\$ 29,050	\$ 57,680	\$ 59,410
Other Personnel Costs			
Total Existing Personnel Costs – New Positions	\$ 131,300	\$ 222,480	\$ 229,154
Library/learning resources			
Equipment/Technology	\$ 2,100		
Physical Facilities: Construction or Renovation			
Other	\$ 2,200		
Total Start-up Costs	\$ 4,300	\$ 0	\$ 0
Operating Costs – Recurring Expenses			
Supplies/Expenses	\$ 11,335	\$ 10,670	\$ 17,150
Library/learning resources			
Equipment/Technology			
Travel			
Other			
Total Operating Costs	\$ 11,335	\$ 10,670	\$ 17,150
GRAND TOTAL COSTS	\$ 208,839	\$ 296,910	\$ 311,354

B. FUNDING SOURCES (<i>projected as appropriate</i>)	First FY (New)	Second FY (New)	Third FY (New)
Tuition / State Funds	\$ 85,884	\$ 171,768	\$ 257,652

Student Fees	\$ 20,400	\$ 40,800	\$ 61,200
Other Sources			
GRAND TOTAL FUNDING	\$ 106,284	\$ 212,568	\$ 318,852
C. Projected Surplus/Deficit (+/-) (Grand Total Funding <i>minus</i> Grand Total Costs)	(\$ 102,555)	(\$ 84,342)	+ \$ 7,498

IX. Expenditures and Funding Sources Explanations

A. Expenditures

Personnel – Reassigned or Existing Positions

This program leverages existing classes in Dietetics and Nutrition (DN) as well as those currently being taught by faculty in the School of Nursing and School of Medicine at KUMC. The current DN faculty will continue to teach their existing classes and the new Doctorate in Clinical Nursing (DCN) students will join existing students.

Faculty experts in the KUMC School of Medicine co-mentor students when their expertise is desired. They have agreed to continue their role in this new program. Dr. Hamilton-Reeves teaches DN 884: Diet, Physical Activity and Cancer and mentors DN students who wish to pursue cancer research. Dr. Ptomey is an expert in diet and physical activity interventions for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD). She has taught several DN courses and routinely mentors MS students who are interested in IDD. Dr. Rose is a board-certified endocrinologist and also a Registered Dietitian; she mentors students interested in endocrinology areas.

The calculations for the FTE for existing faculty are listed below.

- Dr. Sullivan as Department Chair will oversee the program; this was estimated at 10%.
- Dr. Goetz teaches existing classes that will likely be taken as electives. It was assumed that she will teach one class per year where the new DCN students will enroll A 3 semester credit hour course is calculated as 10%. The current existing student enrollment is 20 students, and, at most, 10 DCN students would take the class - - thus her curricular engagement is calculated at 5%.
- Drs. Gibbs, Carbuhn, Peterson and Wagner also teach existing classes that the new DCN students will join. It is anticipated they may teach 2 classes per year that DCN students will take and thus using the calculations above, they are estimated at 10% engagement.
- Drs. Carlson and Hull will participate in the orientation session for new students and also teach courses that are optional electives for this program and two other graduate programs (Nutrigenomics and Nutrigenetics in Health and Disease and Advanced Micronutrients and Integrated Metabolism). Using the calculations above, they are estimated at less than 10% engagement.

Personnel – New Positions

According to the KBOR manual, KUMC should hire two new faculty to support the new graduate program. The institution is committed to supporting the DCN and has committed to support two new faculty positions. KUMC plans to hire:

- one new Ph.D. level faculty as a Clinical Associate Professor (\$83,000) in the fourth quarter of 2019 (so that this hire can begin developing the program).
- one new Ph.D. level Clinical Assistant Professor (\$77,000) in 2020.

These individuals will be doctorly prepared, Registered Dietitians who also have clinical experience. They will be fully committed to the DCN program and will develop and teach new classes. They will oversee the clinical residencies and outcomes research projects.

Start-up Costs – One-Time Expenses

Year 1: Purchase a new computer and office furniture for new faculty.

Operating Costs – Recurring Expenses

The DCN is modeled after the successful KUMC School of Nursing Doctorate of Nursing Practice. The students will attend an orientation program where they undergo experiential training in required skills and then

return for a follow up visit to evaluate the skills after being in the program. The costs estimates are listed in the table below.

Expenses	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Orientation visit (meals & materials estimated at \$100/student)*	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,220	\$ 2,400
Nutrition focused physical exam training (\$65/student)*	\$ 780	\$ 780	\$ 1,560
Body composition training (\$50/student)*	\$ 600	\$ 600	\$ 1,200
Simulation space use, standardized patients, and staff (\$200/student)*	\$ 2,400	\$ 2,400	\$ 4,800
Nutrition Data System for Research (\$5,925 initial license + \$3,850 annual renewal in years 2 and 3).	\$ 5,925	\$ 3,850	\$ 3,850
Online Diet Manuals (adult, pediatric and sports @ \$175, \$175, and \$80 for initial license and then \$135, \$135, and \$70 for annual renewals.	\$ 430	\$ 340	\$ 340
Publication costs to defer student cost of publishing their research**		\$ 1,500	\$ 3,000
Total	\$ 11,335	\$ 10,670	\$ 17,150

*Students receive these trainings in their first year and there are 12 new students in Years 1 and 2 and 24 new students in Year 3.

** In the Evidence Analysis in Clinical Nutrition class, students will be expected to conduct an evidence analysis review and publish the results. The cost is estimated at \$1,500 per publication with one publication in year 2 and two in year 3.

B. Revenue: Funding Sources

Revenue will come from tuition and student fees as listed in Table VIII Section B. A fee of \$100/semester credit hour is included to

- provide unique experiential learning opportunities for students (simulation, nutrition focused physical exam, and advanced body composition);
- access to specialized software; and
- defray the publication costs for manuscripts that result from their evidence analysis class.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Tuition (\$421/credit hr)			
Full time	\$ 50,520	\$ 101,040	\$ 151,560
Part-time	<u>\$ 35,364</u>	<u>\$ 70,728</u>	<u>\$ 106,092</u>
Total	\$ 85,884	\$ 171,768	\$ 257,652
Student fees (\$100/hr)			
Full time	\$ 12,000	\$ 24,000	\$ 36,000
Part-time	<u>\$ 8,400</u>	<u>\$ 16,800</u>	<u>\$ 25,200</u>
Total	\$ 20,400	\$ 40,800	\$ 61,200
Total Revenue	\$ 106,284	\$ 212,568	\$ 318,852

Full time students take 24 credit hours/year and part time students take 12 credit hours/year.

Year 1 has 5 full time and 7 part-time students.

Year 2 has 10 full time (5 new; 5 returning) and 14 part-time students (7 new; 7 returning).

Year 3 has 15 full time (10 new; 5 returning) and 21 part-time students (14 new; 7 returning).

C. Projected Surplus/Deficit

The program will be in the deficit in Years 1 and 2, but then has a surplus in Year 3 and thereafter.

X. References

1. Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (2018). *Registered Dietitians and Medical Nutrition Therapy Services*. Retrieved from <https://www.eatright.org/food/resources/learn-more-about-rdns/rdns-and-medical-nutrition-therapy-services>
2. Riddle, J. (2015, October). Today's Dietitian. Editor's spot: Advanced-level practice dietitians. (v.17, no.10). Retrieved from: <https://www.todaysdietitian.com/newarchives/1015p4.shtml>
3. Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics: Commission on Dietetic Registration. (2019). *Entry-level registration eligibility requirements update*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdrnet.org/Entry-Level>
4. U.S. Department of Labor. (2019). *Occupational Outlook Handbook*. Retrieved from: <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/healthcare/dietitians-and-nutritionists.htm>
5. Hooker, R., et. al. (2012). Journal of Academy Nutrition Dietetics. *Dietetics supply and demand: 2010-2020*. (v.112, no.3, pp.75-91).
6. Yeager, D. (2011, April). Today's Dietitian. *As America ages: Boomers need nutrition education now more than ever*. (v.13, no.4). Retrieved from: <https://www.todaysdietitian>
7. Christie B. & Kight M. (1993). Journal of American Dietetic Association. *Educational empowerment of the clinical dietitian: a proposed practice doctorate curriculum*. (v.93, no.2, pp.173-176).
8. Touger-Decker R. (2005). Topics in Clinical Nutrition. *Advanced practice doctorate in clinical nutrition: A new graduate degree option for registered dietitians*. (v.20, no.1, pp.48-53).
9. Jarratt, J. & Mahaffie, J. (2007). Journal of American Dietetic Association. *The profession of dietetics at a critical juncture: a report on the 2006 environmental scan for the American Dietetic Association*. (v.107, no.7, pp.29-57).
10. Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics. (2017, November). *Rationale for future preparation of nutrition and dietetics practitioners: Environmental scan*. Retrieved from: <http://www.eatrightpro.org/~media/eatrightpro%20files/acend/futureeducationmodel/finalrationale.ashx>
11. FederalPay.org. (2019). Common Federal Occupations. *Pay Rates for Dietitian and Nutritionist*. Retrieved from: <https://www.federalpay.org/employees/occupations/dietitian-and-nutritionist>
12. Rogers, D. (2018). Journal of Academy Nutrition Dietetics. *Compensation and Benefits Survey 2017*. (v.118, no.3, pp.499-511).
13. Compensation Research. (2019). Retrieved from: <https://www.payscale.com>



Oregon State University
College of Public Health
and Human Sciences

RUTGERS
School of Health Professions



**Report to the Kansas Board of Regents
regarding the Proposed Program for
a new Doctorate in Clinical Nutrition (DCN),
Department of Dietetics and Nutrition, School of Health Professions,
University of Kansas Medical Center (KUMC)**

August 28, 2019

Review Team Members:

Rebecca Brody, Associate Professor, Department of Clinical and Preventative Nutrition Sciences,
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

Norman Hord, Head and Celia Strickland Austin and G. Kenneth Austin III Professor in Public Health and

Human Sciences, School of Biological and Population Health Sciences, Oregon State University (Review Team Chair)

Kelly Tappenden, Professor and Head of the Department of Kinesiology and Nutrition, University of Illinois at Chicago, Illinois

Riva Touger-Decker, Professor and Chair, Department of Clinical and Preventative Nutrition Sciences, The State University of New Jersey

Preamble:

The review team appointed by the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) completed a site visit from July 31-August 1, 2019 and submits this written evaluation of the program proposal for a new Doctorate in Clinical Nutrition (DCN) in the Department of Dietetics and Nutrition at the University of Kansas Medical Center (KUMC). During our site visit, we made minor recommendations to KUMC leaders, Vice Chancellor Kline, Dean Akinwuntan and Department Chair Sullivan. Based on our site visit, our review of the program proposal, and responses from KUMC to our minor recommendations, we offer the following recommendation and report per KBOR policy.

The review committee appointed by the Kansas Board of Regents has judged that each of the six (6) standards described in the Board Policies on New Degree Programs has been met for the proposal for the Doctorate in Clinical Nutrition. The strong support of the DCN proposal by our review team is accompanied by specific commentary providing evidence that each standard has been adequately addressed.

We would like to thank the staff, faculty and administration at KUMC for their time, input and generous assistance during the review process. We were deeply impressed with the commitment to this proposed program and with the broad academic, technological and intellectual resources available to accomplish this proposed innovative program. It is worthy of comment that the review team noted consistent evidence of collaborative support among partners in other academic units, medical center departments, and other Kansas City-based health care institutions. This culture of collaboration and support at KUMC and the Kansas City metropolitan area portends well for the success of existing and proposed programs at this institution.

It is necessary to distinguish the training, clinical experience and research opportunities available to the DCN graduate relative to a research-focused Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree. Rapid shifts in the health care environment have driven advancement of education requirements for entry-level practice. Thus, as with practitioners with clinical practice doctorates in pharmacy, physical therapy and occupational therapy, the DCN fulfills this role in the nutrition and dietetics field.

Please note that two members of this review team serve as faculty in the pioneering Doctorate of Clinical Nutrition program in the U.S. at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. During the invited review of this proposal, the chair of the Department of Dietetics and Nutrition at KUMC has been responsive to commentary and critique which have led to refinement of the proposal curricula. There is no stronger support that can be voiced for this new proposed DCN program than to have one's potential competitor provide valuable collaborative assistance in program review and planning.

Section 1: Program justification

The review committee reports that the proposed DCN program is strongly justified and

provide supportive commentary in six points below.

1. The proposed program supports the Board-approved mission statement of the institution; programmatic goals have 3 foci including advanced practice skills, research and scholarly communication, and professional leadership. The establishment and growth of DCN-prepared clinical practitioners contrasts the expertise of PhD-prepared faculty who are involved in clinically-focused research. In the same vein, the career trajectories of DCN-prepared practitioners are demonstrably broader than PhDs given the “academia or industry” dichotomy often presented to such graduates. It is noteworthy that DCN graduates are employed in a broad range of environments including advanced clinical settings, clinical research, pharmaceutical research, food industry research and academic tenure-track and clinical faculty positions. The necessity for demonstrating competence in advanced practice clinical skills clearly distinguishes the DCN program from a typical academic PhD program.
2. With elevation to a required graduate degree for entry-level practice in the nutrition and dietetics profession in 2024, there will be an anticipated increased need for doctorally-prepared clinical educators to teach in master’s programs. RDs who want to distinguish themselves beyond those with a master’s degree may enter a DCN program for advancement. The Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics supports development of advanced practitioners to strengthen opportunities for RDs in practice, research and clinical education. Adequate growth in student numbers are expected and are clearly described in the proposal.
3. We agree with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Graduate Dean who stated the need for developing Registered Dietitians (RD) at the advanced practice level. Their clinical observations indicate that the impact of RDs will grow with advanced practice training as has occurred with other allied health professions. They propose that if RDs want a “seat at the clinical table, having those with advanced expertise, recognized by the DCN, is critical for the profession.”
4. Two similar DCN programs exist in the U.S.; if approved, this would be the third DCN program in the US. The Regents system does not have a similar program nor is there a DCN program in this region of the US. The online platform will extend the reach of the program beyond the Midwest; however, local interest has been demonstrated through surveys and interviews. The program can draw from graduates of the masters degree programs at KUMC.
5. A growing evidence base from DCN graduates surveyed nationally by Rutgers University report that 35% of DCN graduates have enhanced income, 44% report increase in depth and breadth of their current position and 43% report career advancement or promotion.
6. Interviews with current masters-prepared RDs- clinicians and clinical managers in the Kansas City area- report strong desire to participate in the proposed DCN program. This strong evidence of considerable “pent up” demand was striking to the review team. The stated desire of these RDs to pursue the proposed DCN stemmed from interests ranging from enhanced knowledge base to opportunities of promotion and enhanced ability to participate in and lead multidisciplinary health care teams.

Section 2: Curriculum of proposed program

The review committee reports that the DCN program proposal has articulated a strong curriculum and provide supportive commentary in ten points below.

1. It is noteworthy that the KUMC DCN program proposal is modeled after the pioneering DCN program at Rutgers University. The rigor of the proposed program is consistent with advanced practice needs of RDNS in education, skills development (residency), leadership and research and scholarship.
2. The proposed curriculum is mapped to the current advanced practice competencies established through a practice audit conducted by the Commission on Dietetic Registration for development of the advanced practice in clinical nutrition credential. The coursework is comprised of 3 core sections: Communication, Collaboration, and Leadership, Research, and Clinical Nutrition. Students may select

electives to support their area of clinical focus. The program offers a diverse selection of evidence-based courses that are expected to prepare graduates for advanced practice. The clinical practice residency, a 360- hour experience, will hone graduates' advanced practice skills. The proposed curriculum provides statistics and research courses to support development of a practice-based research project. Scientific inquiry, oral and written communication and critical thinking are threaded through the curricula.

3. We applaud the interdisciplinary training provided by the interprofessional education (IPE) programming across KUMC. The program goals related to IPE and professional leadership are significant differentiators from the PhD program and an essential element of the proposed program that will enable the graduates to provide professional leadership in collaborative health care settings.
4. The recommendation to include anticipated costs beyond tuition and fees associated with KUMC DCN program, as well as the established curricula for the program via web-based and print materials has been accomplished.
5. The recommendation to clarify the availability of both asynchronous and synchronous live sessions within courses for students to interact with faculty and demonstrate achievement of advanced practice knowledge beyond what is possible with the asynchronous approach has been met.
6. The recommendation that inclusion of interprofessional education (IPE) curricula in the DCN program curricula be "transcript visible" on student academic transcripts for each course or competency completed has been met.
7. The recommendation that the program proposal make clear that the program curricula will meet the knowledge, skills and abilities set forth in the *Advanced Practice Certification in Clinical Nutrition* by the Commission on Dietetic Registration of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics has been met.
8. The recommendation that the proposal clearly articulate the process for establishing approved residency sites and for approval of qualified advanced practice mentors for the residency component of the DCN has been met.
9. The recommendation that advanced practice clinical skills, particularly as part of their skills assessment for the assessment course and advanced MNT class, be taught using the KUMC Zamierowski Institute for Experiential Learning, the Neis Clinical Skills Lab and Simulation Center has been met. These skills may be accessible asynchronously, via KUMC Blackboard technologies, or synchronously, as appropriate to the course.
10. The recommendation that mentoring for research projects for DCN students include clear communication of mentoring committee composition and expectations for scholarship (including manuscript development and publication) consistent with doctoral-level programs has been met.

Section 3: Program faculty

The review committee reports that the DCN program proposal provides strong evidence that the faculty are highly qualified and appropriate to provide the current and, pending the new approved hires, for the proposed DCN program and provide supportive commentary in five points below.

1. The successful conduct of master's and doctoral programs in nutrition and medical nutrition science, respectively, demonstrate that the faculty and academic resources have been adequate for current degree programming.
2. The core faculty and adjuncts provide the expertise necessary to build a strong program. The requested and approved new faculty positions are a key strength of the proposed program. It would be supportive for the program director of the proposed DCN program if additional administrative support be provided by one or more graduate assistants.
3. The eight tenured, tenure-track and clinical faculty serving in the Department of Dietetics and Nutrition are excellent scholars and nutrition/dietetics practitioners. The additional three faculty affiliated with this program provide essential collaborative expertise in research and teaching to the program.

4. The recommendation to secure the firm commitment of KUMC administrative leadership to hire, at minimum, 2 faculty to implement the DCN program, has been met through communications from senior KUMC leadership, including Dean Abiodun Akinwuntan.
5. The recommendation to clarify teaching loads across program faculty within the department has been met with the 3-year teaching matrix supplied in response to reviewer recommendations.

Section 4: Academic support

The review committee reports that the DCN program proposal provides strong evidence that the academic support at the department, school and college level are appropriate to support the proposed DCN program and provide supportive commentary in three points below.

1. Comprehensive technical support for distance delivery technologies, as evidenced by current academic programs provided using these modalities, is strong evidence of potential program success.
2. It is clear that strong Institutional Review Board support exists and will be necessary to support DCN student research proposals and projects.
3. It is clear that strong central IT support is available at KUMC and that this infrastructure for online programs extends beyond curricula to all relevant student support services at KUMC (e.g., KUMC Computer Testing Center, Teaching and Learning Technologies, Academic Accommodations, and Counseling and Educational Support. Support services include Leadership, Human Resources, Student Services and Technology, etc.).

Section 5: Facilities and equipment

The review committee reports that the proposed DCN program proposal has met the need to describe available facilities and equipment for program needs and provide supportive commentary in three points below.

1. State-of-the-art clinical and technical facilities are available to support training the DCN program, including synchronous and asynchronous learning experiences.
2. The recommendations to more clearly describe adequate office space and resources for new faculty to perform their duties in teaching, research and administration have been met.
3. An excellent description of the superb career development resources for faculty at KUMC have been provided.

Section 6: Program review, assessment and accreditation

The review committee reports that the DCN program proposal has adequately outlined the elements of program assessment, review and accreditation; supportive commentary is provided in four points below.

1. The proposal describes elements of administration- and faculty-led DCN program evaluation including student application rates, retention rates and graduation rates, student course evaluation responses, student publications rates and national/regional presentation rates, program assessment surveys of graduates and employers immediately after graduation.
2. The recommendation to include screening interviews in the admission process with standard questions to evaluate knowledge of evidence-based practice, research experience/interest areas, and ideas for the clinical practice residency has been met.
3. The recommendation to establish and monitor additional student learning outcomes annually during the program has been met.
4. The recommendation to establish an advisory board for the DCN program was acknowledged and, contingent upon program approval and staffing, will be enacted.



August 29, 2019

Samantha Christy-Dangermond
Director, Academic Affairs
Kansas Board of Regents
1000 SW Jackson, Suite 520
Topeka, KS 66612-1368

Dear Dr. Christy-Dangermond:

As you know, we received initial feedback on our proposed Doctorate of Clinical Nutrition from the External Review Team with minor recommendations. We agreed with their initial recommendations and updated our proposal accordingly. After reviewing our updated proposal, the External Review Team now concludes that the DCN proposal meets all six standards. Indeed, they feel it is a strong program.

We thank the review team for their efforts and recommendations. We believe the program is stronger and more fully developed based on their suggestions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Debra K. Sullivan'.

Debra K Sullivan, PhD, RD
Chair and Midwest Dairy Endowed Professor of Clinical Nutrition
Department of Dietetics and Nutrition
University of Kansas Medical Center
3901 Rainbow Blvd M/C 4013
Kansas City, KS 66202

B. Fiscal Affairs & Audit

1. Act on Proposed Amended Memorandum of Agreement between Wichita State University and the American Federation of Teachers Local 6405 Representing Service and Maintenance Employees

Natalie Yoza,
Associate General Counsel

Summary and Staff Recommendation:

Wichita State University (WSU) requests that the Kansas Board of Regents approve and execute the Memorandum of Agreement between WSU and the American Federation of Teachers Local 6405 (AFT), which represents the service and maintenance employees of WSU. In compliance with state law, WSU and AFT have met and conferred, and have reached an agreement on proposed modifications to replace a previous agreement the Board approved in November 2008.

Board staff have reviewed the proposed amendments for compliance with Board policy, as well as state and federal law. WSU and Board staff recommend approval of the amendments and authorizing the Board Chairman to execute the Agreement.

Background:

Under the Public Employer-Employee Relations Act (PEERA), State agencies are required to meet and confer with their employees’ recognized bargaining units over terms and conditions of employment.² The Kansas Board of Regents is the governing body under PEERA and therefore “must approve any proposed agreement in order to make it binding and effective.”³ The Kansas Secretary of Administration must also approve the agreement, and the Secretary’s designee participates in the negotiations.

This Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) involves approximately 159 service and maintenance employees at Wichita State University (WSU) who are represented by the American Federation of Teachers Local 6405 (AFT)⁴. It will remain in effect for 3 years and then automatically renew each year thereafter unless a party opens the agreement for negotiations, except the parties shall meet and confer annually regarding the pay plan.⁵

The existing MOA was approved by the Board in November 2008. For almost 10 years, neither party asked to meet and confer regarding any article in the agreement. These negotiations began when AFT asked to open all articles in August 2017. For over a year and 9 months, WSU held bi-weekly or weekly meet and confer sessions until reaching agreement on the proposed MOA in June 2019.

The meet and confer sessions began before the Board’s revised policy regarding memoranda of agreement negotiated pursuant to PEERA in Chapter 1, Section B(3)(c) was proposed or adopted. But in September 2018, President Flanders, and the Board’s legal staff met regarding the meet and confer sessions with two representatives from the WSU bargaining team—WSU General Counsel, and a Department of Administration attorney leading the WSU bargaining team.

There are 49 articles in this MOA, and most have multiple subparts. The following summary highlights the provisions that most impact the finances or management of the unit. It is not intended to summarize the MOA’s entire contents.

² K.S.A. 75-4321 *et seq.*

³ *Kansas Board of Regents and Pittsburg State University v. Pittsburg State University Chapter of KNEA and PERB*, 233 Kan. 801, 812 (1983).

⁴ See Article 1 for a list of the job classes included in the unit.

⁵ Article 43 (Pay Plan and Forms of Compensation); Article 49 (Duration and Termination).

Fiscal Impact of the Agreement:

The following amendments result in a cost increase to the University:

- (1) WSU has already implemented a fiscal year 2020 pay increase of 1.5% for all unit members, which totaled \$65,000. Funds appropriated by the Kansas Legislature for salary enhancements were used.⁶
- (2) Although this is not a new cost to WSU, the pre-existing policy regarding employee uniforms was added to the agreement. It has a \$35,000 annual cost.⁷
- (3) There will be a new cost to WSU, not expected to exceed \$200 per grievance that advances to the Review Board.⁸

Employee wages under the pay plan will be determined by WSU's market-based compensation program. Using an April 2019 market-based review, job titles, pay ranges, and proposed pay changes resulting in an increase will be implemented as funding is available.⁹

Call-in and stand-by pay is necessary to ensure employees are available for unforeseen emergency business needs. Employees serving in stand-by status will be paid \$2 an hour. Employees called-in for unscheduled work receive their regular wage but receive a minimum of 2 hours pay.¹⁰

Provisions Governed by State Law, Board Policy, or WSU Policy:

The memorandum of agreement adopts state and/or federal law to govern: military leave, jury duty and witness leave, time off for voting, leave without pay, family medical leave, health insurance, workers compensation insurance, and retirement benefits.¹¹

Consistent with other WSU staff, unit employees receive the same holidays and discretionary day approved by the Governor and Board.¹² Vacation and sick leave are consistent with Board policy and state laws.¹³

Bereavement leave is consistent with state law and Board policy, although WSU's policy is slightly different. Board policy grants leave upon the "death of a close relative or that person's close relative" and it indicates leave shall not exceed 6 working days.¹⁴ The WSU-AFT agreement grants bereavement leave for any member of the employee's or their spouse's "immediate family" while defining immediate family to include domestic partners. The agreement also states that it will generally be interpreted as allowing 3 days.¹⁵

Current WSU Policies and Procedures are adopted to govern: (1) Notice of Nondiscrimination; (2) Tuition Assistance Program for Employees; (3) Tuition Assistance Program for Spouses and Dependent Children; (4) Coaching and Corrective Action; (5) Furlough; and (6) Reduction in Force.¹⁶ If the WSU policies change, the parties must meet and confer to replace the current policy with the revised one.

⁶ Article 43 (Pay Plan and Forms of Compensation).

⁷ Article 44 (Uniform & Uniform Allowance).

⁸ Article 34 (Grievance Procedure).

⁹ Article 43 (Pay Plan and Forms of Compensation).

¹⁰ Article 8 (Call In and Stand By).

¹¹ Article 13 (Military Leave); Article 14 (Jury Duty and Witness Leave); Article 15 (Time Off for Voting); Article 16 (Leave without Pay); Article 18 (Family Medical Leave Act); Article 22 (Health Insurance); Article 23 (Workers Compensation Insurance); Article 24 (Retirement Benefits).

¹² Article 9 (Holidays)

¹³ Article 10 (Vacation); Article 11 (Sick and Shared Leave).

¹⁴ Board Policy Manual, Chapter II, Section C(10).

¹⁵ Article 12 (Bereavement Leave).

¹⁶ Article 5 (Non-discrimination); Article 21 (Continuing Education and Tuition Assistance); Article 33 (Coaching and Corrective Action); Article 30 (Reduction in Force, Furlough, and Bumping).

The Notice of Nondiscrimination, which is consistent with WSU’s discrimination policy, diverges slightly from the Board’s equal opportunity statement as shown below:

<p>WSU Policy . . . [T]here will be equal opportunities and encouragement to every applicant and employee regardless of age, ancestry, color, disability, gender, gender expression, gender identity, genetic information, marital status, national origin, political affiliation, pregnancy, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or status as a veteran. This is in alliance with WSU’s Discrimination Policy (3.02 Notice of Non-Discrimination).”</p>	<p>Board Policy, Ch. II, Section F(4). The Board of Regents believes and supports the view that every individual has the right to expect that all decisions with reference to employment, i.e. selection, discipline, promotion or termination, and all decisions with reference to student status, i.e. admission, academic achievements and discipline, be made without regard to age, race, color, religion, sex, marital status, national origin, physical handicap or disability, status as a Vietnam Era Veteran, sexual orientation or other factors which cannot be lawfully considered, to the extent specified by applicable federal and state laws.</p>
---	--

Union Contact with Employees:

Recognizing that PEERA confers the right to form, join and participate in activities of the employee organization (or not), several Articles address employee/union rights and how to provide access to members of the unit. The requirements applicable to all unit employees, as opposed to provisions related to AFT management or bargaining unit members, include:

1. AFT can email updates, alerts and information to employees in the unit to their WSU account, but it recognizes that not all employees in the unit have electronic access. WSU is not required to provide those employees electronic access.¹⁷
2. At employee orientation, AFT can provide appropriate materials to WSU’s orientation coordinator to make available, but the employee organization will no longer be permitted to have a table or make a presentation to employees at orientation.¹⁸
3. AFT will have access to bulletin board space for posting official notices of AFT meetings and other functions.¹⁹
4. AFT can use certain meeting spaces, if reserved, and may meet with the entire bargaining unit up to three days per year if certain notification procedures are followed.²⁰

Rules Related to Seniority:

Several articles address how work will be allocated among unit members, including overtime, vacation, and shift preference.

All new employees and rehires are subject to a 3-month probationary period that may be extended to no longer than 6 months.²¹ And all employees receive an annual evaluation by their immediate supervisor with the ability to appeal the evaluation under the MOA’s grievance procedure.²²

¹⁷ Article 4 (Employee Rights and Union Rights).
¹⁸ Article 25 (New Employee Orientation); Article 37 (AFT Representatives).
¹⁹ Article 36 (Bulletin Boards).
²⁰ Article 39 (AFT Meeting and Use of Facilities).
²¹ Article 26 (Probationary Period).
²² Article 27 (Annual Employee Performance Evaluation and Appeal).

For job openings, internal applicants are given preference guaranteeing an interview if they meet the minimum qualifications, have a most recent evaluation that their performance “meets expectations,” and do not have any corrective action within the last 12 months. If multiple internal applicants are interviewed, the one who best meets the qualifications of the position will be selected. If two or more internal applicant’s qualifications are equal and no WSU Policy and Procedure or law requires otherwise, seniority will determine the selection for hire.²³

For overtime, WSU reserves the right to schedule overtime as may be required, and it will be distributed fairly and equitably among employees capable of performing the work in their respective departments. A voluntary overtime list will be maintained, and probationary employees are not eligible unless regular employees have refused the work. Mandatory/voluntary overtime shall be offered to the employee with the most department seniority in the classification of the work being done, who is qualified to perform the work, and who has the fewest hours of overtime for the year.²⁴

In assigning shifts, “where all factors are substantially equal between employees in the same position desiring the same shift, such conflict will be resolved by length of service.”²⁵ Length of service will no longer be used to resolve conflict among employees in the same class for vacation or shift assignments.²⁶

Conclusion:

WSU requests approval of the MOA, and Board staff recommend approval. The MOA is consistent with state and federal law. While each university MOA has its own unique requirements—a necessity of the collective bargaining process—this agreement is largely consistent in scope and content with other university MOA agreements.

²³ Article 28 (Job Openings).

²⁴ Article 6 (Workweek and Overtime).

²⁵ Article 31 (Shift Preference).

²⁶ Article 29 (Length of Service).

2. Act on Request to Raze the Facilities Administration Building – KU

**Nelda Henning,
Director of Facilities**

The University of Kansas requests authorization to raze the Facilities Administration Building located at 1503 Sunflower road on the Lawrence campus. This building has housed Facilities Offices, shops and storage. The building was vacated in 2018 due to the general overall condition of the building and numerous code issues that are not feasible to resolve. This project will be funded by the University’s allocation of the Educational Building Fund (EBF) for an estimated cost of \$566,000.

3. Act on Request to Raze the Pharmaceutical Chemistry Lab Building – KU

The University of Kansas requests authorization to raze the Pharmaceutical Chemistry Lab located at 2097 Constant Avenue. Over the years this building has housed a variety of research functions, but has asbestos containing materials, limited use and the overall condition of the facility is poorly rated. This project will be funded by the University’s allocation of the Educational Building Fund (EBF) for an estimated cost of \$373,500.

4. Act on Request to Amend Capital Improvement Plan for Renovation of Spencer Museum of Art – KU

The University of Kansas requests approval to complete phase two of the renovation to the Spencer Museum of Art. Phase two improvements include the Kress Foundation Gallery and a new associated study center. The gallery is one of the remaining galleries not previously updated with earlier renovation work and is heavily used for teaching and programming. The project is also seeking to utilize space for a new teaching gallery and study center adjacent to the Kress Foundation Gallery to improve visitor experience and support educational activities. Renovation to both spaces will include ceilings, walls for exhibit display, floors, display cases, and new lighting to better showcase and illuminate the vast collections of art and exhibits housed at the Spencer Museum of Art. This project will be funded by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities and private gifts. Total cost is estimated to be \$1,900,000.

C. Retirement Plan

1. Act on Appointment to the Retirement Plan Committee

Natalie Yoza,
Associate General Counsel**Summary and Staff Recommendation**

The Kansas Board of Regents appoints members to the Retirement Plan Committee (RPC) to carry out certain fiduciary and administrative responsibilities related to the Mandatory and Voluntary Retirement Plans. One current member, Gary Leitnaker, will be retiring December 31, 2019, and a replacement needs to be appointed to serve the remainder of his three-year term. Staff recommends the appointment of Jay Stephens, Vice President for Human Capital Services, Kansas State University, to serve the remainder of that term ending June 30, 2022.

Background

The Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) Retirement Plan, available to eligible university and Board employees, has four components: (1) a mandatory 403(b) retirement plan; (2) a voluntary 403(b) retirement plan; (3) a long-term disability plan; and (4) a phased retirement plan. The Board is responsible for administering the mandatory and voluntary components of the Plan as a fiduciary.

Retirement Plan Committee and Recommendation for Appointment

The Retirement Plan Committee (RPC) is a co-fiduciary for the Mandatory and Voluntary Retirement Plans, and the Board delegated certain tasks to the RPC to better facilitate proper fiduciary oversight.²⁷ These responsibilities include:

- (1) ensuring due diligence in the selection of investment managers and investment funds;
- (2) managing the plan documents;
- (3) retaining independent outside experts to assist in the development and monitoring of the overall investment program
- (4) establishing effective communication between investment managers, consultants, Plan participants, and campus administrators; and
- (5) ensuring required notices and information are distributed to Plan participants.²⁸

The Board appoints the RPC's 10 members to three-year terms, and Board policy requires that the RPC include one Board member, one member of the Council of Presidents, two members of the Council of Business Officers, three state university human resource directors, and two state university employees who are experts in the areas of investments and retirement planning.²⁹

One of the state university human resource directors, Gary Leitnaker, Director of Labor Relations and Special Projects for Human Capital Services, Kansas State University, will be retiring December 31, 2019. Leitnaker has been a dedicated member of the RPC since its inception in 2005, and he often volunteered to serve on RPC subcommittees.

President Myers nominated Jay Stephens, Vice President for Human Capital Services, to represent Kansas State University as a human resource director on the RPC. And Board staff recommend that the Board appoint Stephens effective immediately to the RPC to complete Leitnaker's term that ends on June 30, 2022.

²⁷ See Board Policy Manual, Chapter 1, Section A.4.a.(3).

²⁸ RPC Charter, Page 3.

²⁹ Board Policy Manual, Chapter 1, Section A.4.a.(2).

D. *Other Matters*

1. **Act on Appointments to the Joint Coordinating Council with the Kansas Board of Education**

Regent Bangerter

Summary

The Kansas State Board of Education and the Kansas Board of Regents first formed a coordinating council in the fall of 2012. The membership of this council included two members of the Kansas State Board of Education, two members of the Kansas Board of Regents, the Commissioner of Education at the Kansas State Department of Education, and the President and CEO of the Kansas Board of Regents. This council was formed to identify and address projects each year to improve the coordination of the education system between preK-12 and higher education. Then when the Governor’s Education Council was formed in 2018, the joint coordinating council decided to pause its work. At the September 2019 joint meeting between the Kansas State Board of Education and the Kansas Board of Regents, the members discussed reforming the coordinating council to identify and make recommendations on issues that overlap between the two systems. These recommendations will then be presented each year during a joint meeting of the Kansas State Board of Education and the Kansas Board of Regents.

At the September 2019 joint meeting, the members concurred that the membership of the coordinating council shall include members from the Kansas State Board of Education, the Kansas Board of Regents, and the Kansas. Chair Bangerter recommends appointing Regent Kiblinger, Regent Van Etten and President and CEO Flanders to represent the Kansas Board of Regents on the coordinating council.

2. Act on Request for Execution Authority for Two Related Contracts having Terms Greater Than Three Years that are Required to Fulfill Federal Data Reporting Requirements

**Natalie Yoza,
Associate General Counsel**

Summary and Staff Recommendation

The United States Departments of Labor and Education developed the Stage Wage Interchange System (SWIS) Data Access Agreement to facilitate the exchange of interstate quarterly wage records needed to satisfy reporting requirements in section 116 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). Governor Kelly approved the Kansas Department of Labor, Kansas Department of Commerce, Kansas Department of Children and Families, and the Kansas Board of Regents’ participation in the agreement. To satisfy SWIS’ requirements, a cost-sharing agreement between those four agencies is also required. The Board’s costs under the cost-sharing agreement are anticipated to be less than \$5,000 annually.

The SWIS data sharing agreement and cost-sharing agreement are for terms greater than three years, so Board policy requires that the Governance Committee approve the Board President and CEO’s execution of the agreements. Staff recommends that Dr. Flanders be authorized to review and enter the SWIS data access and cost-sharing agreements.

The Board of Regents receives \$3.4 million for adult education through the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and the Board spends \$1.4 million from a special SGF appropriation as a State match. The Kansas Department of Commerce and the Kansas Department of Children and Families also receive funding under WIOA.

The United States Department of Labor developed the State Wage Interchange System (SWIS) data access agreement to satisfy WIOA reporting requirements. It is an intra-state agreement that permits states to share wage data for the limited purpose of fulfilling WIOA reporting requirements. To date, 25 states have joined the SWIS data access agreement, including Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas.

On October 25, 2019, Governor Kelly approved Kansas’ participation in SWIS. To join, the four Kansas agencies—the Board, the Kansas Department of Labor, Kansas Department of Commerce, and the Department of Children and Families—need to execute the SWIS data sharing agreement. Under SWIS and federal law, the Kansas agencies must all also enter a cost-sharing agreement to reimburse the Kansas Department of Labor for its expenses associated with participation. The Board’s costs are not anticipated to exceed \$5,000 a year. In the event, the Kansas Department of Labor determines the expenses will exceed \$5,000 per agency (or \$15,000 total annually), the Kansas agencies will confer to determine whether participating in SWIS is still advisable. The Board can withdraw even if the other state agencies decide to continue participating.

Because the state wage data is required to satisfy WIOA reporting requirements, the alternatives to entering the SWIS are to forgo the funding or to attempt entering data access agreements with all states individually.

The SWIS clearinghouse begins operating on January 1, 2020. To complete the necessary set-up, Staff recommends that Dr. Flanders be authorized to review and enter both the SWIS data access agreement and the cost-sharing agreement.

DISCUSSION AGENDA

VII. Consideration of Discussion Agenda

A. Academic Affairs

1. Act on Private Postsecondary Education Institution Certificate of Approval

Regent Schmidt

Natalie Yoza,
Associate General Counsel

Summary and Staff Recommendation

The Kansas Board of Regents can revoke a certificate of approval if there is reasonable cause to believe the institution has violated the Kansas Private and Out-of-State Postsecondary Educational Institution Act. Entourage Institute of Beauty and Esthetics holds a board-issued certificate under the Act, and there is reasonable cause to believe it violated the Act. Staff recommends that the Board notify Entourage the certificate will be revoked in 30-days and provide an opportunity for a hearing on the revocation.

Background

Entourage Institute of Beauty and Esthetics, a Lenexa, Kansas cosmetology school, holds a Board-issued certificate of approval to operate in Kansas. There is reasonable cause to believe the institution has violated two provisions of the Kansas Private and Out-of-State Postsecondary Educational Institution Act (the Act), K.S.A. 74-32,162 *et seq.*

Entourage failed to timely notify the Board of two ownership changes in violation of K.S.A. 74-32,170(c). Additionally, once Entourage did notify the Board, only one change in ownership was reported even though two had occurred.

Entourage also failed to comply with federal regulations governing Title IV funding under the Higher Education Act. This resulted in the U.S. Department of Education (the Department) ending Entourage’s eligibility to participate in Title IV funding.

The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) authorized Board staff to issue a show cause order asking why Entourage’s certificate should not be revoked. In its response, Entourage admitted it did not comply with the change of ownership requirements and pledged to do better. Entourage disputes the Department’s findings that it violated federal Title IV regulations but provided insufficient evidence indicating that the Department’s findings were in error.

Based on the facts summarized below, the Board has grounds to revoke Entourage’s certificate. To revoke, the Board would send a letter notifying Entourage that it plans to revoke the certificate, enabling Entourage to request a hearing within 30 days. That hearing would be conducted by a hearing officer with the Kansas Office of Administrative Hearings and is like a court trial. If a hearing is not requested, the certificate would be revoked at the end of that 30-day period. Notably, the revocation will not result in Entourage’s closure because it is also licensed by the Kansas Board of Cosmetology. Entourage could reapply for a Board-issued certificate in the future if the Department determines Entourage is eligible for Title IV funding again.

There is Reasonable Cause to Believe Entourage Violated the Act

The Board may revoke a certificate of approval or impose reasonable conditions upon the continued approval represented by a certificate if there is “reasonable cause to believe that the institution is in violation of any provision of the Act or any rules and regulations adopted under the Act.”³⁰

³⁰ K.S.A. 74-32,172(b).

Entourage Violated Federal Regulations

Entourage was certified to receive federal Title IV funding under the Higher Education Act. In a July 25, 2019, letter, the Department denied Entourage’s recertification application to participate in Title IV funding.³¹ Entourage sought reconsideration and requested that the Department rescind that decision. On August 29, 2019, the Board received notice that Entourage’s request was denied. The Department stated it “carefully considered the explanations provided in the reconsideration request . . . and has determined that there is no basis to reverse its decision to deny Entourage’s recertification.”³² This ended Entourage’s participation in federal Title IV funding effective July 31, 2019.

In denying the recertification application, the Department concluded that Entourage failed to meet the standards of administrative capability and to exhibit the trustworthiness required of a fiduciary.³³ It found Entourage and its owners failed to meet the standards of administrative capability by: (1) failing to comply with change of ownership reporting requirements and failing to timely report a separate change of ownership to the Department and its accrediting agency; (2) failing to submit a materially complete application to the Department and failing to be responsive to requests for information; and (3) failing to submit annual compliance audits for another institution formerly owned by the controlling owner of Entourage.³⁴ It also found Entourage failed to adhere to the fiduciary standard of conduct by its “continued and repeated failure to properly administer the Title IV, HEA programs.”³⁵ The Department specifically found a change in ownership occurred on January 1, 2019, and Entourage violated 34 CFR § 600.21 by failing to report that change no later than 10 days after it occurred.³⁶

In its response to the Board’s show cause letter, Entourage continues to dispute the Department’s findings that it violated Title IV regulations, and Entourage provided the Board the same information it provided the Department in its request for reconsideration.³⁷ Generally, Entourage disputes the Department’s finding that two changes in ownership were not excluded transactions under the federal regulations. And it claims that approval was sought from the Board and Entourage’s accrediting agency without acknowledging that notification was untimely.³⁸ As the Department concluded, these arguments are insufficient to determine the Department erred.

An institution does not meet minimum standards required for a Kansas certificate of approval if it fails to comply with federal regulations.³⁹ The Department’s finding that Entourage failed to comply with federal regulations, as documented by its July and August letters denying recertification, is reasonable cause to believe Entourage violated the Kansas Act and to revoke the Board-issued certificate of approval.

Entourage Failed to Provide the Board Timely Change of Ownership Information & Some Information Provided was Inaccurate or Misleading

Entourage is owned by Heartland Education Properties, LLC. Under the Kansas Act, the owner of a limited liability company is “the company, its managers and all its members.”⁴⁰ And the Act requires that owners apply for a new certificate when there is a change in ownership “within 60 days prior to the change in ownership for a new certificate of approval.”⁴¹ Entourage failed to timely notify the Board of two changes in ownership.

³¹ Department Letter, Dated July 25, 2019.

³² Department Letter, Dated August 29, 2019, p. 1.

³³ Department Letter, Dated July 25, 2019, p. 2.

³⁴ Department Letter, Dated July 25, 2019, p. 2-6.

³⁵ Department Letter, Dated July 25, 2019, p. 6-7.

³⁶ Department Letter, Dated July 25, 2019, p. 2-3.

³⁷ Entourage October 7, 2019, Response to Show Cause Order.

³⁸ Entourage Response to Show Cause, Dated October 7, 2019.

³⁹ K.S.A. 74-32,169(h).

⁴⁰ K.S.A. 74-32,163(h)(4).

⁴¹ K.S.A. 74-32,170(c).

On March 1, 2016, the first change of ownership occurred when Dean Brownhill’s ownership interest in Heartland was transferred to the other members after his death. The Board was not informed of this change until May 23, 2019—over 3 years after the change in ownership occurred. Notably, this change was not reported even though Heartland renewed its certificate three times after it occurred—in September 2016, August 2017 and July 2018. Once it was disclosed, the notification letter did not indicate that Brownhill had died three years earlier. Instead, it stated Entourage “has recently had to re-distribute our company’s ownership shares (due to the death of Dean Brownhill).”⁴² This letter was signed by William Jones as the President of Heartland Education Properties, LLC.

Effective January 1, 2019, the second change in ownership occurred. Another owner, Phillip H. Weener, sold his shares in Heartland to William Jones effective January 1, 2019, for \$1. This transaction occurred after the Department requested a copy of Weener’s social security card because it determined “that the social security number listed in Section M for Mr. Weener also belonged to a different individual.”⁴³ This change in ownership was not timely reported to the Board either. On June 25, 2019—over 5 months after the sale occurred—Heartland notified the Board that Entourage had “another non-substantive change in ownership,” because “Philip Weener has resigned his ownership.”⁴⁴

The second change in ownership, i.e., the sale, occurred before Entourage sent the May letter informing the Board of the change stemming from an owner’s death. Both letters were signed by William Jones as the President of Heartland Education Properties, LLC. The Department noted these failures, stating “Entourage had opportunities to report the appropriate change in ownership updates to the required agencies after the substantive change in ownership took place in January 2019, but it either failed to do so or provided inaccurate or purposely misleading information.”⁴⁵

In response to the Board’s show cause letter, Entourage admits the error, stating “[w]e cannot argue that we submitted change of ownership in a timely manner. We can only ensure that lapses of this nature will not occur going forward.”⁴⁶ These facts, as documented by the Heartland March 2016 meeting minutes, the bill of sale, and the various letters and documents submitted to the Board, are reasonable grounds to revoke Entourage’s certificate.

Board Action to Begin Revocation Proceedings Would be Legally Appropriate and Factually Substantiated

There is reasonable cause to believe Entourage also violated the Act by failing to comply with federal Title IV regulations and failing to submit timely and accurate notifications of two changes in ownership. Revocation of the Board-issued certificate would be appropriate. But Entourage can continue operating in Kansas, as long as it is approved by the Kansas Board of Cosmetology.

Entourage could re-apply for a Board-issued certificate in the future if the Department determines it is eligible for Title IV funding. Since the Department requires state authorization, the Department has indicated it would coordinate review with the Board. The supporting documentation, including the Department’s letters and Entourage’s submissions to the Board regarding change in ownership, was provided separately.

⁴² Entourage May 23 Letter to the Board.

⁴³ Department Letter, July 25, 2019, p. 3.

⁴⁴ Entourage June 25, 2019 Letter.

⁴⁵ Department Letter, July 25, 2019, p. 4 (Emphasis added).

⁴⁶ Entourage Response to Show Cause, Dated October 7, 2019, p. 1.

B. Fiscal Affairs & Audit

1. Receive FY 2021 Housing and Food Service Rate Adjustment Proposals Submitted by State Universities (First Read)

Regent Hutton
 Elaine Frisbie
 VP, Finance & Administration

Background

According to Board policy (Ch.II.D.1c.(i)(1), the state universities submit housing rates to the Board for first reading in November, with final action taken by the Board in December. Accordingly, all six universities submitted proposals which, if approved, will take effect for the academic year 2020-2021. Food service rate proposals are also provided in the same sequence, as a student cost that typically accompanies on-campus housing.

User fees must cover the cost of operating these auxiliary enterprises. The six universities have different housing and food service rate structures that account for different circumstances, such as the amount of outstanding bonded indebtedness, occupancy rates, age of facilities, and economies of scale related to the capacity of the housing and food service operations.

To illustrate the rate increases for each university, the following tables compare the current and proposed annual (two semester) rate at each institution for a range of housing and dining options. The tables do not capture the entire array of options from which students have to choose but are somewhat illustrative of the cost variances.

Modest Double Occupancy Room and Limited Dining Option

	AY 2019-2020	Proposed AY 2020-2021	\$ Increase	% Increase	Projected Occupancy Rate*
ESU	\$9,020	\$9,156	\$136	1.5%	90.2%
FHSU	\$8,022	\$8,182	\$160	2.0%	90.0%
KSU	\$9,440	\$9,480	\$40	0.4%	76.8%
KU	\$9,768	\$9,700	-\$68	-0.7%	96.0%
PSU	\$7,354	\$7,538	\$184	2.5%	72.0%
WSU	\$11,110	\$11,110	\$0	0.0%	96.0%

ESU – Towers/Trusler/Singular Double Room Rate plus 185 Block Meal Plan

FHSU – McMindes Hall Double Room Rate plus 10 Meals/Week Plan

KSU – Goodnow Traditional Double Room plus Any 14 Meals/Week Plan

KU – Traditional Style Double Room plus All-Access Declining Small Plan

PSU – Double Room plus 160 Block Meal Plan (\$100 Dining Dollars)

WSU – Shocker Hall 2 Private Bedroom Suite/1 Bath plus Unlimited Plan

**Occupancy rate is projected as of the Fall 20th Day student count, except for FHSU, which averages the Fall and Spring 20th day counts together. Several factors may affect occupancy rates – including availability of rooms and requirements that students live on the campus. With some exceptions, ESU, FHSU, PSU and WSU require some students to live on campus.*

Renovated/New Construction Room and Unlimited Dining Option

	AY 2018-2019	Proposed AY 2020-2021	\$ Increase	% Increase	Projected Occupancy Rate*
ESU	\$9,852	\$9,952	\$100	1.0%	90.2%
FHSU	\$8,524	\$8,694	\$170	2.0%	90.0%
KSU	\$12,040	\$12,450	\$410	3.4%	76.8%
KU	\$10,950	\$11,025	\$75	0.7%	96.0%
PSU	\$7,996	\$8,196	\$200	2.5%	72.0%
WSU	\$12,780	\$13,020	\$240	1.9%	96.0%

ESU – Schallenkamp Double Room Rate plus All Access Meal Plan

FHSU – Victor E/Tiger Village Room Rate plus Open Access Meal Plan

KSU – Wefald Traditional Private Double Room Rate Plus All Access Meal Plan

KU – Suite Style Room (Double/Shared) Rate plus All Access Unlimited Meal Plan

PSU – Double Room Rate plus 7 Day Unlimited Meal Plan

WSU – The Flats 2 Bedroom Apartment-Single Room Rate plus All Access Meal Plan

**Occupancy rate is projected as of the Fall 20th Day student count, except for FHSU, which averages the Fall and Spring 20th day counts together. Several factors may affect occupancy rates – including availability of rooms and requirements that students live on the campus. With some exceptions, ESU, FHSU, PSU and WSU require some students to live on campus.*

Each university describes in the respective documentation the business case for the various proposed increases. Furthermore, each state university provides summary financial information for its housing system. Generally, the proposed increases are driven by anticipated inflationary costs and facility maintenance and enhancements. Each university indicates the proposed increases were reviewed by the appropriate campus groups with student representation.

The annual College Board “*Trends in College Pricing*” reports the prices charged by institutions in 2019-2020, how prices have changed over time, and how they vary within and across types of institutions. The report includes a calculation of average room and board charges weighted by the number of undergraduates living in college housing. The report can be found at <http://trends.collegeboard.org/college-pricing>. A comparison of national rates for the current year compared to last year is displayed below.

**Average Published Charges Room and Board
for Full-Time Undergraduates
Weighted by Number of Undergraduates Living in College Housing**

Carnegie Classification	AY 2018-2019	AY 2019-2020	\$ Increase	% Increase
All Public Four-Year In-State	\$11,190	\$11,510	\$320	2.9%
Doctoral Granting Institutions	\$11,650	\$11,990	\$340	2.9%
Master’s Granting Institutions	\$10,290	\$10,580	\$290	2.8%

**Emporia State University
Division of Student Affairs
Department of Residential Life and Memorial Union Corporation
Statement of Proposed Residence Hall and Contract Board Rates
Academic Year 2020-2021**

Emporia State University requests authorization to amend the Comprehensive Fee Schedule, effective fall semester 2020 as follows:

I. DESCRIPTION OF RATE ADJUSTMENT

Figures shown represent academic year totals, unless otherwise noted. The housing and meal contract’s default time period includes both the fall 2020 and the spring 2021 semesters.

Room & Board Options

<u>Change</u>	<u>From*</u>	<u>To*</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>Room⁽¹⁾ + Board</u>	<u>%</u>
Towers/Trusler/Singular Double	\$5,380	\$5,400	\$20	0.3%		
Towers Suite	\$5,680	\$5,900	\$220	3.9%		
Towers/Trusler/Singular Private	\$6,510	\$6,500	(\$10)	-0.1%		
Abigail Morse Double	N.A.	\$5,700	N.A.	N.A.		
Abigail Morse Single	N.A.	\$6,900	N.A.	N.A.		
Schallenkamp Double	\$6,120	\$6,100	(\$20)	-0.3%		
Schallenkamp Single	\$7,400	\$7,400	\$0	0.0%		
All Access Meal Plan	\$3,732	\$3,852	\$120	3.2%	\$9,252	1.54%
185 Block Meal Plan	\$3,640	\$3,756	\$116	3.2%	\$9,156	1.51%
90 Block Meal Plan	\$3,014	\$3,110	\$96	3.2%	\$8,510	1.38%

⁽¹⁾ Based on Towers/Trusler/Singular double room rate.

II. JUSTIFICATION FOR RATE ADJUSTMENT

Residence Hall Rate Adjustment

Proposed room rates for FY 2021 propose a change percentage near 0%. Abigail Morse room rates are based upon pro forma projections that prescribe revenue required to meet expenditures. Primary change in expenditures for FY 2021 arises from debt service related to bond refinancing, new construction, and ongoing renovations. Modest increases in expenditures are anticipated for utilities and employee salaries and benefits. Projected occupancy for FY 2021 results in the revenue required to meet financial obligations.

Memorial Union Rate Adjustment

The proposed rates for meal plans represent a 3.2% increase in food plan costs to students, which reflects the Consumer Price Index-Urban (CPI-U) “food away from home.” The change in expenditures for FY 2021 are contracted obligations required to the food vendor.

III. STUDENT REVIEW OF FEE ADJUSTMENT

The Residence Hall and meal plan increases and housing rates were developed in consultation with students who live in the residence halls and serve on the Memorial Union Board of Directors, which has student board member positions representing the Residence Halls and Associated Student Government. The proposed meal plan pricing information contained in this document was presented to the Memorial Union Board of Directors and approved

by that body on October 5, 2019. On October 2, 2019, residence hall community councils were presented information related to housing rates for FY 2021. Reaction was favorable to proceed with these proposed housing rates. Comments and suggestions were received and considered when preparing this final proposal for housing and meal rates.

IV. ALTERNATIVES TO PROPOSAL

None considered.

V. PROJECTION OF REVENUE FROM AND NUMBER OF STUDENTS AFFECTED BY FEE ADJUSTMENT

The percent change in the housing rates will result in an estimated \$25,000 in additional revenue from the rate increases and decreases. Addition of Abigail Morse and 100 rentable bed spaces will add revenue to cover expenses. Total students impacted projected at 960.

VI. PROJECTED IMPACT OF RATE ADJUSTMENT ON STUDENT OCCUPANCY

Given the modest level of increase and based on student review, there is no expected impact on student occupancy rates.

**Emporia State University
FY 2021 Rate Increase Request
Supplemental Financial Information**

	Projected FY 2021	Estimated FY 2020	Actual FY 2019	Actual FY 2018
Gross Operating Revenue	\$5,108,180	\$4,299,341	\$3,789,290	\$3,988,002
Transfer In - Renewal/Replacement	0	0	0	2,112,323
Gross Operating Expense	<u>2,201,964</u>	<u>2,158,788</u>	<u>2,116,458</u>	<u>2,103,119</u>
Gross Revenue Gain/(Loss)	2,906,216	2,140,553	1,672,832	3,997,206
Capital Improvement Expenditures	50,000	100,000	11,151	38,443
Debt Service	2,958,038	2,959,037	696,721	274,493
Other Capital Expenditures	<u>100,000</u>	<u>100,000</u>	<u>100,000</u>	<u>100,000</u>
Net Revenue/(Loss)	<u>\$(201,822)</u>	<u>\$(1,018,484)</u>	<u>\$864,960</u>	<u>\$3,584,270</u>
Ending Balance	\$4,453,988	\$4,655,810	\$5,674,294	\$4,809,334
Long Term Debt Outstanding⁴⁷	\$31,595,000	\$33,295,000	\$34,915,000	\$35,410,000
Occupancy Rate - Fall 20th Day	90.2%	85.3%	88.8%	91.2%

⁴⁷ As of June 30.

Capital Improvements Detail

FY 2021 Major Repairs	\$50,000
FY 2020 Major Repairs	\$100,000

Capital Improvements Description

- FY 2021 Major Repairs – Singular Hall HVAC Renovation
- FY 2020 Major Repairs – Repair and Maintenance of Towers Complex building envelope and Towers Complex HVAC
- FY 2019 Major Repairs – Towers Complex internet and wireless update
- FY 2018 Major Repairs – Towers Complex fan coil units, community kitchen and roofs

Other Capital Expenditures

Represents annual internal loan repayment for Singular/Trusler Hall renovation in Fiscal Years 2013 to 2015.

**FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY
DIVISION OF STUDENT AFFAIRS
Department of Residential Life**

Consistent with Board of Regents policy, the following amendments to the Comprehensive Fee Schedule are submitted for the Board's November 2019 meeting.

Recommended Residence Hall & Apartment Rates – 2020-2021
Rates are reported for both fall and spring semesters

McMindes Hall Double Room Rates, Fall & Spring Semester

Accommodations/Plan	2019-2020 Rate	2020-2021 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
No meal plan	\$3,968	\$4,047	\$79	2.00%
Open access meal plan	\$8,210	\$8,374	\$164	2.00%
10 meals per week	\$8,022	\$8,182	\$160	2.00%
7 meals per week	\$7,961	\$8,120	\$159	2.00%

Victor E Village Hall Room Rates, Fall & Spring Semester*

Accommodations/Plan	2019-2020 Rate	2020-2021 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
No meal plan	\$4,283	\$4,369	\$86	2.00%
Open access meal plan	\$8,524	\$8,694	\$170	2.00%
10 meals per week	\$8,336	\$8,503	\$167	2.00%
7 meals per week	\$8,275	\$8,441	\$166	2.00%

Tiger Village Housing Rates

Accommodations/Plan	2019-2020 Rate	2020-2021 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
No meal plan	\$4,283	\$4,369	\$86	2.00%
Open access meal plan	\$8,524	\$8,694	\$170	2.00%
10 meals per week	\$8,336	\$8,503	\$167	2.00%
7 meals per week	\$8,275	\$8,441	\$166	2.00%

Residence Hall Single Room Rates, Fall & Spring Semester*

Premium charge of \$651 will be added for any single room accommodation in standard McMindes, and Victor E Village Rooms. This results in an increase of 2.00% in the room charge for the next academic year.

Tiger Place Suites, Fall & Spring Semester

Accommodations/Plan	2019-2020 Rate	2020-2021 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
No meal plan	\$5,138	\$5,241	\$103	2.00%
Open access meal plan	\$9,387	\$9,567	\$180	1.92%
10 Meals per week	\$9,198	\$9,375	\$177	1.92%
7 Meals per week	\$9,135	\$9,313	\$178	1.95%

Dane G. Hansen Scholarship Hall, Fall & Spring Semester

Accommodations/Plan	2019-2020 Rate	2020-2021 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
No meal plan	\$2,917	\$2,975	\$58	2.00%
Open access meal plan	\$7,158	\$7,301	\$143	2.00%
10 Meals per week	\$6,970	\$7,109	\$139	2.00%
7 Meals per week	\$6,910	\$7,048	\$138	2.00%

Wooster Place Apartment, Fall & Spring Semester (10 Months)

Accommodations (Not Furnished)	2019-2020 Rate	2020-2021 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
1 Bedroom	\$5,709	\$5,823	\$114	2.00%
2 Bedroom	\$6,192	\$6,316	\$124	2.00%
2 Bedroom Shared	\$5,048	\$5,149	\$101	2.00%

Stadium Place Apartment, Fall & Spring Semester (10 Months)

Accommodations	2019-2020 Rate	2020-2021 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
2 Bedroom	\$6,192	\$6,316	\$124	2.00%
4 Bedroom	\$5,620	\$5,732	\$112	2.00%

Additional Fees

Fee	2019-2020 Rate	2020-2021 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
Application fee	\$40	\$40	\$0	0%
Late fee	\$25	\$25	\$0	0%

Weekly Rates

Accommodations	2019-2020 Rate	2020-2021 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
Early arrival for students with housing contracts	\$135	\$138	\$3	2.00%
Guest room	\$187	\$191	\$4	2.00%

Daily Rates

Accommodations	2019-2020 Rate	2020-2021 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
Early arrival for students with housing contracts	\$61	\$62	\$1	2.00%
Guest Room	\$83	\$85	\$2	2.00%

Summer Term

Accommodations	2019-2020 Rate	2020-2021 Proposed Rate	Difference in Amount	Difference in Percentage
Camper daily rate for a double room	\$13	\$13	\$0	0%
Camper daily rate for a single room	\$26	\$26	\$0	0%

**FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY
PROPOSED INCREASES IN RESIDENCE HALL, CONTRACT BOARD AND APARTMENT
RENTAL RATES AND FEES
2020 -2021**

Business Impact of Proposed Rates

Expenditure Impact

The proposed increase of 2.00%, in the traditional residence halls, suites, and apartments and an increase of 2.00% in contract board rates will generate approximately \$282,000 in additional revenue for the 2021 fiscal year. These resources will become part of the base budget and will be used for capital improvements and increases in ongoing operating expenses as a result of inflation. As an auxiliary operation, residence halls are independent of other University operations and must maintain revenue streams to fully account for all expenses. The proposed increase of 2% is well below the Higher Education Pricing Index (HEPI) for the past year of 2.7%, requiring use of reserve funds to maintain service levels.

Capital improvements include upgrades to security (electronic key access) of McMIndes Hall which includes door replacements. We will begin the first phase of a two-summer project to replace/improve the electrical service to and in McMIndes Hall. These projects are in addition to continuing ongoing expenses to maintain

facilities, replacing furniture and fixtures and adding electronic access (key card systems) to other residence halls in our continuing effort to improve security.

Estimated Benefits from Proposal

The proposed rate increase in university housing rates will be used to help offset general operating expense increases including health insurance cost increases and normal inflation, increases in the board rates proposed by Chartwells, our food service provider, due to increases in overall food and costs of operation, and will help fund facility improvements throughout residential life.

Alternatives to Proposal

The proposed rate increases depicted in the accompanying “Recommended Residence Hall and Apartment Rates 2020-2021,” were determined to be the most advantageous to all parties concerned. The rate proposal was presented to the Residence Hall Association at their meeting on Thursday, October 17, 2019, and was approved. No alternatives were discussed.

Impact of Not Implementing Proposal

The rate increases proposed are to cover anticipated and known increases in operational costs for Residential Life. While the operation could survive without the increase, future plans for the maintenance, improvement, and replacement of facilities would have to be reconsidered. The goal of Residential Life over the next four years is to replace or refurbish all its facilities and to accomplish that its price increases minimally should be near inflation during that time period.

Residential Life						
Supplemental Financial Information	Projected	Estimated	Actual	Actual	Actual	
KBOR Rate Increase Request	FY 2021	FY 2020	FY 2019	FY 2018	FY 2017	
Gross Operating Revenue	\$ 11,411,929	\$ 11,192,581	\$ 10,905,708	\$ 10,807,476	\$ 9,751,424	
Gross Operating Expense	\$ 6,984,369	\$ 6,790,316	\$ 6,531,813	\$ 6,595,295	\$ 5,935,227	
Gross Operating Revenue(Loss)	\$ 4,427,560	\$ 4,402,265	\$ 4,373,895	\$ 4,212,181	\$ 3,816,197	
Capital Improvements Expense*	\$ 1,285,151	\$ 1,358,399	\$ 1,629,277	\$ 4,941,671	\$ 3,571,636	
Annual Debt Service**	\$ 2,850,947	\$ 2,812,282	\$ 2,781,128	\$ 2,361,890	\$ 1,110,965	
Other Capital Expenditures					\$ -	
Net Operating Revenue(Loss)	\$ 291,462	\$ 231,584	\$ (36,510)	\$ (3,091,380)	\$ (866,404)	
Occupancy Rate	90%	90%	91%	90%	88%	
Reserve Balance (EOY)	\$ 2,652,746	\$ 2,361,284	\$ 2,129,700	\$ 2,166,210	\$ 5,257,590	
L/T Debt Outstanding	\$ 23,640,000	\$ 24,465,000	\$ 25,255,000	\$ 26,025,000	\$ 26,765,000	
Capital Improvements Planned*						
FY 2020		\$ 1,358,399				
FY 2021	\$ 1,285,151					
* Capital Improvements Description:						
FY 2020- McMIndes Hall Improvements including doors and electronic access and Wooster deck repairs						
FY 2021- McMIndes electrical upgrades and final phase of door and security system upgrades						
Debt Service:						
** Agnew replacement cash flow guarantee and annual bond payment						

**KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
FY 2021 HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICE RATES
NOVEMBER 2019**

I. DESCRIPTION OF RATE ADJUSTMENT

Residence halls – Manhattan campus ^{1,2,3}

Rates are listed per person for both Fall and Spring semesters

Effective July 1, 2020

	<u>2019-2020</u>	<u>2020-2021</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Traditional Rooms			
Traditional small single <i>Boyd, Putnam</i>	\$5,700	\$5,950	4.4%
Traditional small single <i>Haymaker, Moore</i>	\$5,740	\$5,940	3.5%
Traditional private single <i>Wefald</i>	\$8,750	\$9,000	2.9%
Traditional double <i>Boyd, Ford, Haymaker, Moore, Putnam</i>	\$5,080	\$5,200	2.4%
Traditional double <i>Goodnow, Marlatt</i>	\$5,250	\$5,200	-1.0%
Traditional private double <i>West</i>	\$5,900	\$6,000	1.7%
Traditional private double <i>Wefald</i>	\$7,250	\$7,550	4.1%
Traditional triple <i>Boyd, Putnam</i>	\$4,950	\$5,050	2.0%
Traditional quad <i>Ford</i>	\$5,080	\$5,080	0.0%
Suites			
1 person private suite <i>Boyd, Putnam, Van Zile</i>	\$8,000	\$8,350	4.4%
1 person private suite <i>Marlatt</i>	\$8,200	\$8,350	1.8%
1 person by 1 person suite <i>Van Zile</i>	\$7,400	\$7,450	0.7%
1 person by 2 person suite (1 person side) <i>Van Zile</i>	\$7,300	\$7,350	0.7%
2 person private suite <i>Ford, Haymaker, Van Zile</i>	\$7,500	\$7,750	3.3%
2 person private suite <i>Goodnow, Marlatt</i>	\$7,650	\$7,850	2.6%
2 person private suite <i>West</i>	\$7,980	\$7,750	-2.9%
2 person by 1 person suite (2 person side) <i>Van Zile</i>	\$7,000	\$7,050	0.7%
2 person by 2 person suite <i>Ford, Haymaker, Van Zile</i>	\$7,200	\$7,400	2.8%
2 person by 2 person suite <i>Goodnow, Marlatt</i>	\$7,300	\$7,450	2.1%
3 person room with private unattached bathroom <i>Ford, Haymaker</i>	\$6,000	\$6,200	3.3%
3 person room with private unattached bathroom <i>Goodnow, Marlatt</i>	\$6,250	\$6,400	2.4%
3 person private suite <i>Boyd, Putnam</i>	\$7,150	\$7,300	2.1%
3 person private suite <i>Goodnow, Marlatt</i>	\$7,470	\$7,670	2.7%
3 person private suite <i>Haymaker</i>	\$7,700	\$7,950	3.2%
3 person private suite <i>West</i>	\$7,790	\$7,950	2.1%
4 person private suite <i>Ford, Haymaker</i>	\$6,650	\$6,800	2.3%
4 person private suite <i>Goodnow, Marlatt</i>	\$6,850	\$7,050	2.9%
Clusters			
1 person inside cluster suite <i>Boyd, Putnam</i>	\$7,450	\$7,600	2.0%
2 person inside cluster suite <i>Boyd, Putnam</i>	\$7,050	\$7,100	0.7%
3 person inside cluster suite <i>Boyd, Putnam</i>	\$6,800	\$6,850	0.7%

	<u>2019-2020</u>	<u>2020-2021</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Honors House	\$5,720	\$5,800	1.4%
Cooperative House <i>Smirthwaite</i> ⁴	\$7,990	\$8,130	1.8%

¹ Includes housekeeping service other than within rooms.

² Application fee of \$30 (non-refundable) is assessed each academic year and is due before the contract will be processed. Up to \$25 of each application fee is transferred to the recreational and social use fund. If the full contract amount is not paid prior to July 1 for the fall semester and December 1 for the spring semester, all charges will be posted to the University Tuition and Fee account accessible within KSU’s Student Information System (KSIS). All charges will be billed by Cashiers and Student Accounts and subject to their terms and conditions.

³ For payment due dates, cancellation dates and charges, please refer to “Student Housing Contract Terms.”

⁴ Rate includes meals plus assisting with house and food service operations on an average of one hour per day.

Residence halls – Polytechnic campus ⁵

Rates are listed per person for both Fall and Spring semesters
Effective July 1, 2020

	<u>2019-2020</u>	<u>2020-2021</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Single room			
14 meal plan	\$11,020	\$11,240	2.0%
19 meal plan	\$11,502	\$11,732	2.0%
Double room			
14 meal plan	\$6,974	\$7,114	2.0%
19 meal plan	\$7,456	\$7,606	2.0%
Polytechnic campus housing fees			
Application fee	\$35	\$35	0.0%
Contract fee	\$75	\$75	0.0%

⁵ For dates, misuse fees, locking in returner rates and more, refer to “Student Housing Contract Terms.”

Residence halls – Summer session

Rates listed per week
Effective May 2020

	<u>Double Room as Single</u>			<u>Double Room</u>		
	<u>2019-2020</u>	<u>2020-2021</u>	<u>% Change</u>	<u>2019-2020</u>	<u>2020-2021</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Manhattan campus						
Room and 14 meals	\$415	\$425	2.4%	\$285	\$295	3.5%
Room and 20 meals	\$430	\$450	4.7%	\$295	\$310	5.1%
Polytechnic campus						
Room and 10 meals	\$419	\$419	0.0%	\$244	\$244	0.0%
Room and 15 meals	\$446	\$446	0.0%	\$271	\$271	0.0%

Apartments – Manhattan campus^{6,7}

Effective July 1, 2020

	<u>2019-2020</u>	<u>2020-2021</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Traditional (12-month rate per apartment)			
1 bedroom unfurnished	\$6,300	\$6,480	2.9%
2 bedroom unfurnished	\$7,320	\$7,500	2.5%
Renovated (12-month rate per apartment)			
1 bedroom unfurnished	\$7,260	\$7,320	0.8%
2 bedroom unfurnished	\$8,340	\$8,460	1.4%
Highly Renovated (12-month rate per apartment)			
1 bedroom unfurnished	\$7,860	\$7,980	1.5%
2 bedroom unfurnished	\$9,480	\$9,840	3.8%
3 bedroom unfurnished	\$10,020	\$10,200	1.8%
Modern Construction (12-month rate per person, unless otherwise noted)			
1 bedroom unfurnished	\$9,180	\$9,540	3.9%
2 bedroom 1 bath unfurnished-dormered ceilings	\$7,200	\$6,780	-5.8%
2 bedroom 1 bath unfurnished	\$7,200	\$7,320	1.7%
2 bedroom 2 bath unfurnished	\$7,620	\$7,920	3.9%
3 bedroom unfurnished	\$6,120	\$6,120	0.0%
4 bedroom unfurnished	\$5,520	\$5,520	0.0%
Studio unfurnished	\$8,160	\$8,520	4.4%
Studio loft unfurnished	\$8,880	\$9,300	4.7%
Town house unfurnished	\$11,976	\$12,060	0.7%
2 bedroom 1 bath furnished-hybrid apartment ⁸	\$7,150	\$7,150	0.0%
2 bedroom 2 bath furnished-hybrid apartment ⁸	\$7,500	\$7,500	0.0%
3 bedroom furnished-hybrid studio ⁸	\$6,350	\$6,500	2.4%
4 bedroom furnished-community studio ⁸	\$5,850	\$6,200	6.0%

⁶ In addition to the monthly rates, a refundable deposit of \$400 is required at time of application. A non-refundable application fee of \$30 is assessed each academic year and is due before the contract will be processed. Up to \$25 of each application fee is transferred to the recreational and social use fund. If the full contract amount is not paid prior to July 1 for the fall semester and December 1 for the spring semester, all charges will be posted to the University Tuition and Fee account accessible within the K-State Student Information System (KSIS). All charges will be billed by Cashiers and Student Accounts and subject to their terms and conditions. A late payment fee of \$10 will be charged for apartment rent not paid when due.

⁷ Students provide linen, dishes, telephone and electricity. Electricity is included for hybrid apartments.

⁸ 10-month room contract. Furniture is provided and rate includes electricity.

MEAL PLANS

Residence hall and honors house residents – Manhattan campus^{9,10}

Rates listed per academic year

	<u>2019-2020</u>	<u>2020-2021</u>	<u>% Change</u>
All Access (unlimited access)	\$4,790	\$4,900	2.3%
Any 14 (14 swipes per week)	\$4,190	\$4,280	2.1%
Flex 12 (12 swipes per week + \$150 Dining Dollars per semester) ¹¹	New	\$4,280	n/a

⁹ Sunday evening meals are not served.

¹⁰ Students may deposit funds into Cat Cash to be used in all K-State Student Union and Housing and Dining Services retail options, including JP’s Sports Grill, Union Station by JP’s, Cornerstone Coffee and Bakery, Derby Bakery, Quik Cats convenience stores, Cliffside Rec Center convenience store and Housing laundry facilities. Students will have limited Grab and Go meals with all residential meal plans.

¹¹ Flex dollars may be used at all Housing and Dining Services retail operations, including JP’s Sports Grill, Union Station by JP’s, Cornerstone Coffee and Bakery shops, Derby Bakery, Quik Cats convenience stores, Cliffside Rec Center convenience store and other participating restaurants in the K-State Student Union.

Optional meal plans – Jardine Apartments residents, off-campus students and faculty/staff

Rates listed per academic year

	<u>2019-2020</u>	<u>2020-2021</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Manhattan campus			
Optional Jardine resident 50 meal plan (50 entrances)	\$1,190	\$1,190	0.0%
Optional Jardine resident 100 meal plan (100 entrances)	\$2,260	\$2,260	0.0%
Optional Jardine resident all access meal plan ¹²	\$4,790	\$4,900	2.0%
Optional faculty/staff 25 breakfast/lunch meal plan (25 entrances)	\$520	\$520	0.0%
Optional faculty/staff 50 breakfast/lunch meal plan (50 entrances)	\$1,040	\$1,040	0.0%
Optional faculty/staff 100 any meal plan (100 entrances)	\$2,340	\$2,340	0.0%
Optional off-campus student 50 breakfast/lunch meal plan (50 entrances)	\$1,060	\$1,060	0.0%
Optional off-campus student 100 any meal plan (100 entrances)	\$2,510	\$2,510	0.0%
Optional off-campus student 150 any meal plan (150 entrances)	\$3,580	\$3,580	0.0%
Polytechnic campus			
Optional 5 meal plan (lunch, M-F)	\$898	\$898	0.0%

¹² Must buy full year plan.

II. JUSTIFICATION FOR RATE ADJUSTMENT

The traditional residence hall double room rate with the 14 meal plan used by half of students results in a 2.3% rate increase for the Manhattan campus. The proposed rates are recommended to cover increased operational costs within the Housing and Dining auxiliary. Increased expenditures for salaries and benefits due to the effects of market rate escalation in the building trades positions and the resulting compression in those areas has led to significant cost increases. Facility maintenance and repair costs continue escalating and building supplies costs are increasing due to the strong economy and real and perceived tariff effects. Contracted services, such as elevator maintenance, have had steep increases due to skilled labor shortages.

Although food prices have held steady overall during the past year, recent weather-related catastrophes may have impact in coming months. Energy prices, led by rising local water and Evergy electricity rates, will result in higher utility costs. Budgets have been reduced drastically to offset these increased costs but the rate increase is still needed to maintain needed services. Capital improvement projects are expected to be \$1,400,000 including self-funded/reserve improvements as the Goodnow portion of the Marlatt/Goodnow Hall renovations are finished, the Van Zile roof is replaced and a majority of main structural beams in the Jardine Apartment balconies are repaired.

Salaries and fringe benefit increases	\$330,154
Other Operating Expenditures:	
Debt increase as Derby renovation bond payments begin	\$992,000
Contracted Services Increase for Simplex Grinnell, Johnson Controls, Inc., elevator maintenance, etc.	\$205,000
Continued cost of Housing Scholarship	\$685,500

III. STUDENT REVIEW OF FEE ADJUSTMENT

On the Manhattan campus, the Director of Housing and Dining Services and Associate Vice President of Student Life met with the Executive Board of the Association of Residence Halls, comprised of residence hall students, and reviewed the proposed rate increases. Students had the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback before the rates were finalized and submitted to the Board of Regents.

The Polytechnic campus senior administration met with the Student Auxiliary Committee in early October to begin discussion on the room and board rates for Fiscal Year 2021.

IV. ALTERNATIVES TO PROPOSAL

Housing and Dining Services on both campuses are self-supporting auxiliary units. Their operations are managed effectively and efficiently to keep rate increases low. As self-supporting units, they are responsible for funding all of their cost increases including maintaining and renovating the residence halls, dining centers and apartment buildings. It is necessary to have adequate reserves to fund debt service and finance future capital improvements during times of enrollment fluctuations. Therefore, it is necessary to request rate increases. No other alternatives were identified to replace the fee adjustments.

V. PROJECTION OF REVENUE FROM AND NUMBER OF STUDENTS AFFECTED BY FEE ADJUSTMENT

The proposed rate increases generate an additional \$1,119,934 in revenue with \$886,934 from the Manhattan campus and \$233,000 from the Polytechnic campus. Since we now project a flat to only slight increase in residence hall occupancy, the revenue generation will be substantially lower than what would otherwise have been expected and is reflected herein. Hybrid options continue to be popular options among students and help maintain strong occupancy totals in Jardine Apartment complex. Approximately 5,000 students living in residence halls, the cooperative house, the honors house and apartments will be affected by the rate increase.

VI. PROJECTED IMPACT OF RATE ADJUSTMENT ON STUDENT OCCUPANCY

The rate increase is not projected to have a negative impact on student occupancy. We are projecting the Fall 2020 occupancy to stay flat or slightly increase in accordance with enrollment projections. As part of the University Strategic Enrollment Management efforts to reverse the recent enrollment decline, Housing and Dining Services offers a \$3,000 per year scholarship to assist economically-challenged students with on-campus housing costs. One cohort of students has proven to be strongly incentivized to attend K-State as a result of the scholarship. Retention of this cohort of students has also been very positive.

**Kansas State University
FY 2021 Rate Increase Request
Supplemental Financial Information**

	Projected FY 2021	Projected FY 2020	Actual FY 2019	Actual FY 2018
Gross Operating Revenue	\$49,164,000	\$48,245,000	\$46,750,000	\$46,335,000
Gross Operating Expense	\$38,329,000	\$37,769,000	\$35,406,000	\$33,424,000
Gross Operating Revenue ¹ Gain/(Loss)	\$10,835,000	\$10,476,000	\$11,344,000	\$12,911,000
Capital Improvements Expenditures*	\$1,000,000	\$1,400,000	\$3,292,000	\$4,428,000
Annual Debt Service	\$9,525,000	\$9,643,000	\$8,897,000	\$8,871,000
Other Capital Expenditures	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>	<u>\$148,000</u>	<u>\$175,000</u>
Net Operating Revenue/(Loss)	\$310,000	(\$617,000)	(\$993,000)	(\$563,000)
Housing System Earned Fund Balance	\$14,171,000	\$13,861,000	\$14,478,000	\$15,471,000
L/T Debt Outstanding	\$126,440,000	\$130,855,000	\$121,165,000	\$124,900,000
Occupancy Rate	76.8%	76.6%	77.6%	82.6%

*Capital Improvements Planned:

FY 2019: \$1,400,000 – finish rehabilitation and repair renovations including Goodnow Hall, replacement of Van Zile roof, two freight elevator replacements for Derby Dining Center prior to renovations, repair/replace majority of balcony structural beams in Jardine Apartments

FY 2020: \$1,000,000 - rehabilitation and repair of one or two of three chiller array in Strong Complex, several residential building concrete eyebrow repairs, possible replacement of suspended concrete walkway(s) in older Jardine Apartments (depending on engineer's directive)

¹ The university continues to maintain the best practice of maintaining cash reserves equal to 1.25 times annual debt service even though the bond covenants no longer require it.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
KU Student Housing
FY2021 Business Case for Increasing Student Housing and Dining Rates
Submitted to Kansas Board of Regents, November 2019

The University of Kansas requests authorization in Fiscal Year 2021 for the following adjustments to housing and dining plan rates.

I. DESCRIPTION OF RATE ADJUSTMENT

The University continues to offer a wide variety of housing and dining options for students who choose to live on campus. The double/two-person shared room in a residence hall is the most common option for students who wish to live on-campus and is reported as the standard comparison rate.

For Fiscal Year 2021, the proposed rate for a residence hall traditional double room will be \$6,100, a 0.3% increase. KU Dining has restructured dining plans, and is offering an unlimited access plan to residential dining centers at the academic year rate of \$3,800. The FY'20 comparison dining plan was the Silver/14-meal per week plan at a cost of \$4,266. For Fiscal Year 2021, a residence hall double room (\$6,100) plus the unlimited residential meal plan (\$3,800) will total \$9,900, a 4.5% *decrease* from the previous fiscal year's comparison plans.

Rates for on-campus housing and dining plans proposed to be effective July 1, 2020:

Residence Halls

	2019-20	2020-21	\$ Incr.	% Incr.
Traditional Style Room				
Double/Shared (<i>Ellsworth, GSP, Hashinger</i>)	\$6,084	\$6,100	\$16	0.3
Double/Shared, and 3-, 4-person (<i>Corbin</i>)	\$7,196	\$7,100	(\$96)	-1.4
Single/Private, small (<i>GSP</i>)	\$6,084	\$7,100	\$1,016	14.3
Single/Private (<i>Corbin</i>)	\$9,070	\$8,200	(\$870)	-10.6
Single/Private, double as single (<i>Ellsworth, GSP, Hashinger</i>)	\$8,236	\$8,200	(\$36)	-0.4
Semi-Suite Style Room				
Double/Shared (<i>Ellsworth, GSP, Hashinger, Lewis, Templin</i>)	\$6,540	\$6,600	\$60	0.9
Double/Shared (<i>Oswald, Self</i>)	\$7,878	\$7,900	\$22	0.3
Double/Shared (<i>Downs</i>)	\$7,916	\$7,900	(\$16)	-0.2
Single/Private (<i>Ellsworth, Templin</i>)	\$8,236	\$8,200	(\$36)	-0.4
Single/Private (<i>Oswald, Self</i>)	\$9,972	\$9,900	(\$72)	-0.7
Single/Private (<i>Downs</i>)	\$10,020	\$9,900	(\$120)	-1.2
Suite Style Room				
Double/Shared (<i>Ellsworth, Lewis, Templin</i>)	\$6,540	\$6,800	\$260	3.8
Double/Shared (<i>Oswald, Self</i>)	\$8,856	\$8,800	(\$56)	-0.6
Double/Shared (<i>Downs, Stouffer Place</i>)	\$9,320	\$9,200	(\$120)	-1.3
Single/Private (<i>Downs, Stouffer Place</i>)	\$10,394	\$10,200	(\$194)	-1.9

Rates listed for residence halls are for the academic year (fall and spring semesters) and include continuous occupancy during Thanksgiving and Spring Break; fully furnished bedrooms; all utilities plus data/internet; and unlimited, free access to resident laundry machines.

Apartments

	2019-20	2020-21	\$ Incr.	% Incr.
Four Person Units				
Double/Shared Bedroom (<i>Jayhawker Towers B, C</i>)	\$3,934	\$3,900	(\$16)	-0.9
Double/Shared Bedrooms (<i>Jayhawker Towers A, D</i>)	\$5,092	\$5,100	\$8	0.2
Single/Private Bedroom (<i>McCarthy, Stouffer Place</i>)	\$11,028	\$11,050	\$22	0.2
Two Person Units				
Single/Private Bedroom (<i>Jayhawker Towers B, C</i>)	\$6,732	\$6,700	(\$32)	-0.5
Single/Private Bedroom, small apartment (<i>Towers B, C</i>)	\$5,436	\$5,500	\$64	1.2
Single/Private Bedroom (<i>Jayhawker Towers A, D</i>)	\$8,782	\$8,800	\$18	0.2
Single/Private Bedroom (<i>McCarthy, Stouffer Place</i>)	\$12,038	\$12,050	\$12	0.1
Sunflower Duplex Unit				
Two Bedrooms, <i>monthly rent for unit</i>	\$804	\$820	\$16	2.0

Rates for apartments are per person in the unit and for the entire academic year (fall and spring semesters), including continuous occupancy from August through May; fully furnished bedrooms; all utilities plus data/internet; and unlimited, free access to resident laundry machines. Sunflower Duplex units are unfurnished and offered as short-term, transitional housing for new faculty and staff relocating to Lawrence. The monthly rate includes water and sanitation.

Scholarship Halls

	2019-20	2020-21	\$ Incr.	% Incr.
Traditional Halls				
Shared Bedroom (<i>Miller, Watkins</i>)	\$2,834	\$2,850	\$16	0.6
Shared Bedrooms (<i>Battenfeld, Douthart, Grace Pearson, Pearson, Sellards, Stephenson</i>)	\$4,272	\$4,300	\$28	0.7
Semi-Suite & Suite Halls				
Shared Bedroom (<i>K.K. Amini, Margaret Amini, Krehbiel, Rieger</i>)	\$4,720	\$4,750	\$30	0.6
Meal Plan				
All Halls, except Miller & Watkins	\$2,268	\$2,314	\$46	2.0

The Elizabeth Miller Watkins Trust provides a rate subsidy for Miller and Watkins residents. Because Miller and Watkins residents cooperatively purchase and prepare their own food, there is no meal charge in these two scholarship halls.

Rates listed for scholarship halls are for the entire academic year (fall and spring semesters) and include continuous occupancy during Thanksgiving and Spring Break; fully furnished bedrooms; all utilities plus data/internet; and unlimited, free access to resident laundry machines.

Residential Dining Plans

The Unlimited Residential Plan serves as the comparison plan for Fiscal Year 2021. The All-Access Unlimited plan provides the best overall value when combining unlimited residential dining center access and the \$425 declining plan that allows access to all KU Dining retail locations with a 15% discount on purchases.

The \$425 Plan is the basic declining balance plan that is the preferred choice of non-residence hall students, faculty, and staff. All declining balance plans receive 15% off all purchases at retail locations and reduced price entry into residential dining centers.

As residence hall students complete the on-line housing sign-up process they select dining plans based on their personal preferences and needs. Rates proposed are:

	2019-20	2020-21	\$ Incr.	% Incr.
All-Access Unlimited Unlimited access to residential dining centers plus a \$425 declining plan useable at any campus dining venue	\$4,410	\$4,225	(\$185)	-4.2
Unlimited Residential Unlimited access to residential dining centers (all-you-care-to-eat) plus to-go meals	N/A	\$3,800	\$0	0.0
All-Access Declining Large Declining balance plan useable at any campus dining venue	\$4,266	\$4,000	(\$266)	-6.3
All-Access Declining Small Declining balance plan useable at any campus dining venue	\$3,684	\$3,600	(\$84)	-2.3
\$425 Plan Basic declining balance useable at any campus dining venue (plan for non-residence hall students)	\$ 425	\$425	\$0	0.0

II. JUSTIFICATION FOR RATE ADJUSTMENT

Rates are established to cover operating costs required to maintain a highly qualified staff and manage facilities. For Fiscal Year 2021, rates have been realigned in order to allow students and their families an easier understanding of the variety and choices, by unit type and price point, in KU Student Housing facilities. Current and future facilities plans focus on accessibility and life safety enhancements throughout the system.

III. STUDENT REVIEW OF FEE ADJUSTMENT

Rates for Fiscal Year 2021 have been proposed following study and review by staff in KU Student Housing, KU Dining Services, and the Student Housing Advisory Board (SHAB), which includes representatives from the Association of University Residence Halls (AURH); the Apartment Living Association (APLA); and the All Scholarship Hall Council (ASHC). The proposals were reviewed by SHAB during their September meetings. In addition to SHAB meetings, the Director of KU Student Housing and the Director of KU Dining met with student government leaders and student groups for further discussion and to answer questions. These rates have been reviewed and recommended by the Vice Provost for Student Affairs. SHAB approval of these rates was confirmed at the October 18, 2019 meeting.

IV. ALTERNATIVES TO PROPOSAL

None identified. Only basic services are being provided and these charges are established to cover expenses associated with cost recovery including the cost of maintaining and remodeling the facilities. There are no state-appropriated funds in this auxiliary operation; therefore, user fees must cover total costs.

V. PROJECTION OF REVENUE FROM & NUMBER OF STUDENTS AFFECTED BY FEE ADJUSTMENT

The proposed rate increases will enable the housing and dining operations to continue providing exceptional on-campus living experiences, which remain a great value for the students’ dollar. Occupancy forecasts for the next fiscal year are flat, with estimated revenue increases based on these rate proposals to be an increase of about \$200,000.

VI. PROJECTED IMPACT OF RATE ADJUSTMENT ON STUDENT OCCUPANCY

KU Student Housing assignable space for Fiscal Year 2021 will again be around 5,500 total on-campus beds. With the limited proposed increases for Fiscal Year 2021, KU on-campus housing and dining rates will remain an outstanding value, well below national averages, reflecting good management practices and a continued commitment to good stewardship of students' money. With the proposed increase in rates, on-campus student occupancy is forecast to remain stable for Fiscal Year 2021.

**UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
FY 2021 Rate Increase Request
Supplemental Financial Information**

	Projected FY 2021	Estimated FY 2020	Actual FY 2019	Actual FY 2018
Gross Operating Revenue	37,529,000	36,435,881	36,236,093	32,841,029
Gross Operating Expense	<u>(22,044,695)</u>	<u>(21,591,901)</u>	<u>(22,403,005)</u>	<u>(21,319,407)</u>
Gross Operating Revenue (Loss)	\$15,484,305	\$14,843,980	\$13,833,088	11,521,622
Capital Improvements Expenditures	(800,000)	(897,570)	(1,723,881)	(792,207)
Annual Debt Service	(14,754,715)	(14,621,910)	(14,132,734)	(9,684,818)
Other Capital Expenditures	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	(70,410)	(675,500)	(2,023,527)	1,044,597
Ending Cash Balance	5,062,187	5,132,597	5,808,097	7,831,624
Occupancy Rate - Fall 20th Day	96.0%	95.1%	93.4%	94.6%
Long-Term Debt Outstanding (as of 6-30)	77,890,000	81,925,000	85,800,000	89,510,000
L-Term Capital Lease Principal Outstanding (as of 6-30)	115,523,716	117,222,883	118,713,267	120,003,483

Capital Improvements Planned

FY 2022: \$9.6 M	Jayhawker Tower B	Mechanical, security, and apartment updates
FY 2023: \$9.7 M	Jayhawker Tower C	Mechanical, security, and apartment updates

**PITTSBURG STATE UNIVERSITY
NOVEMBER 2019**

REQUEST AMENDMENT TO HOUSING RATES - Pittsburg State University

In accordance with Board Policy, Pittsburg State University requests that the Board of Regents consider for final action at its December 2019 meeting the following adjustments in housing rates to be effective with the 2020 Fall Semester.

	Academic Year	
	<u>19-20</u>	<u>20-21</u>
Residence Halls (annual)		
Double Room/7 Day Unlimited Meal Plan	\$7,996	\$8,196
Double Room/5 Day Unlimited Meal Plan (+\$100 Dining Dollars)	7,762	7,956
Double Room/160 Block Meal Plan (+100 Dining Dollars)	7,354	7,538
Double Room/900 Dining Dollar Meal Plan	6,606	6,771
Single room charge (maximum)	1000	1000
Crimson Commons room additional charge	900	900
Willard Hall room additional charge	400	400
Student Family Apartments (monthly)		
Two Bedroom	\$525	\$525
Three Bedroom	590	590
Block 22 Apartments (monthly)		
Studio Unit II	\$550	\$550
Studio I	575	575
Loft	600	600
Flat	600	600
Suite II	625	625
Suite I	650	650
2 Bedroom/2 Bath (rate per bedroom/bath)	575	575
Suite Unit additional occupant charge	200	200
General Administration Fees		
Application fee	45	45
Payment Plan fee (optional/per semester)	25	25
Late Payment fee	30	30

**Financial Impact Statement
Housing Rates**

I. DESCRIPTION OF RATE ADJUSTMENT

An increase in the rates is proposed. If approved, the new rate schedule would be effective for the 2020 fall semester.

	Academic Year		<u>Increase for</u>	
	<u>19-20</u>	<u>20-21</u>	<u>Annual Cost</u>	<u>%</u>
Residence Halls (annual)				
Double Room/7 Day Unlimited Meal Plan	\$7,996	\$8,196	\$200	2.50
Double Room/5 Day Unlimited Meal Plan (+100 Dining Dollars)	7,762	7,956	194	2.50
Double Room/160 Block Meal Plan (+100 Dining Dollars)	7,354	7,538	184	2.50
Double Room/900 Dining Dollars Meal Plan	6,606	6,771	165	2.50
Single room charge (maximum)	1,000	1,000	--	--
Crimson Commons room charge	900	900	--	--
Willard Hall room charge	400	400	--	--
Application Fee	45	45	--	--
Payment Plan Fee (optional per semester)	25	25	--	--
Late payment fee	30	30	--	--
 Apartments (monthly)				
<u>Crimson Village</u>				
Two Bedroom	\$525	\$525	--	--
Three Bedroom	590	590	--	--
 <u>Block 22</u>				
Studio II	\$550	\$550	--	--
Studio I	575	575	--	--
Loft	600	600	--	--
Flat	600	600	--	--
Suite II	625	625	--	--
Suite I	650	650	--	--
2 Bdrm/2 Bath Units (rate per bedroom/bath)	575	575	--	--
Suite Unit additional occupant charge	200	200	--	--
 General Administration Fees				
Application Fee	45	45	--	--
Payment Plan Fee (optional per semester)	25	25	--	--
Late payment fee	30	30	--	--

II. JUSTIFICATION FOR RATE ADJUSTMENT

A rate increase of approximately 2.5% for the residence hall room and board packages is requested for next fiscal year to fund increased costs in employee benefits, wage adjustments for staff, anticipated increases in utility costs, and increase in daily rate cost for dining plan. The Director of University Housing in consultation with the Assistant Director of University Housing Operations and the Vice President for Student Life developed the proposed rate increases with input from the students serving on the Residence Hall Assembly.

III. STUDENT REVIEW OF FEE ADJUSTMENT

A rate adjustment of up to 3% increase for residence halls was discussed with the members of the Residence Hall Assembly at their October 8, 2019, regular session. The assembly voted in favor of rate increases of this level if deemed necessary to maintain quality services and programs by the following vote: 16 affirmative; 5 negative; and, 0 abstaining. The group endorsed the university's continuing efforts to invest funds in the maintenance, staffing and programming for on-campus housing for students.

IV. ALTERNATIVES TO PROPOSAL

No significant alternatives were identified. The requested increase maintains competitive rates in the local market, maintains the lowest rates in the Regents system, and ensures the housing system can continue to cover direct costs and maintain the level of service.

V. PROJECTION OF REVENUE FROM AND NUMBER OF STUDENT AFFECTED BY FEE ADJUSTMENT

The proposed fee increase is projected to generate \$155,000. Approximately 1,000 students are projected to live in the residence halls.

VI. PROJECTED IMPACT OF RATE ADJUSTMENT ON STUDENT OCCUPANCY

Because residence halls are in direct competition with off-campus rentals for student occupancy, any rate increase must remain within the appropriate levels that the overall market will support. University Housing is committed to providing students with high quality accommodations at reasonable rates. Given the proximity to campus, the programmatic efforts of the departmental staff, the amenities and services provided, and the reliable maintenance provided by the university, residence hall rates are very competitive with other student housing options of equal quality in the community. With the lower overall student enrollment, the fall occupancy percentage is lower. The housing system is at 70% occupancy of capacity for the Fall 2019 semester.

**Pittsburg State University Housing
KBOR Rate Increase Request
Supplemental Financial Information
October 21, 2019**

	Projected FY 2021	Estimated FY 2020	Actual FY 2019	Actual FY 2018
Gross Operating Revenue	\$8,100,000	\$7,940,305	\$7,875,851	\$8,508,389
Salaries and Benefits	1,750,000	1,700,992	1,681,399	1,934,641
Other Operating Expenses	3,525,000	3,461,850	3,190,428	3,010,340
Gross Operating Revenue(Loss)	\$2,825,000	\$2,777,463	\$3,004,024	\$3,563,408
Capital Improvements Expense	250,000	206,830	428,155	387,084
Annual Debt Service	2,400,000	2,523,811	2,499,231	2,526,823
Other Capital Expenditures		***400,000	**400,000	*400,000
Net Operating Revenue(Loss)	\$175,000	(\$353,178)	(\$323,362)	\$249,501
Operating Fund Balance (EOY)	\$2,764,028	\$2,589,028	\$2,942,206	\$3,265,568
L/T Debt Outstanding	\$18,075,000	\$19,375,000	\$21,250,000	\$22,125,000
Occupancy Rate	72.0%	70.1%	74.7%	84.1%

Capital Improvements Planned

*FY 2018 \$400,000 for repayment of internal loan on Nation Hall project (3rd of 5 years)

**FY 2019 \$400,000 for repayment of internal loan on Nation Hall project (4th of 5 years)

***FY 2020 \$400,000 for repayment of internal loan on Nation Hall project (5th of 5 years)

**Wichita State University
Proposed Housing and Board Rates for Fiscal Year 2021
Fiscal Impact Statement and Business Case
Submitted to the Kansas Board of Regents**

Proposed Housing and Board Rates for Fiscal Year 2021

Wichita State University requests authorization to amend the Comprehensive Fee Schedule for Fiscal Year 2021, for the following adjustments to housing and board rates in the residence halls.

Proposed Fiscal Year 2021 Residential Board Options
--

Meal Plan by Type	FY 20 Rate	Proposed FY 21 Rate	Percent Increase
<u>Academic Year 2020-2021</u>			
Unlimited Plan	\$4,280	\$4,280	0%
<u>The Flats Dining Plans</u>			
\$1000 Dining Dollars	\$1,000	\$1,000	0%
\$1500 Dining Dollars	\$1,500	\$1,500	0%
\$2000 Dining Dollars	\$2,000	\$2,000	0%
<u>Summer Term Meal Plan Prices 2020</u>			
19 Meals per Week	\$1,200	\$1,200	0%
14 Meals per Week + \$300 Dining Dollars	\$1,200	\$1,200	0%
\$1200 Dining Dollars	\$1,200	\$1,200	0%

Notes to Meal Plans

Note 1 – Our dining provider requires all mandatory unlimited meal plan holders to have dining dollars in addition to the base rate as listed above. They can choose from \$75, \$250, and \$400 per semester.

Note 2 – The Flats residents can purchase the unlimited meal plan (with choice of dining dollars) as well as those meal plans designated just for them.

Note 3 – Residents may purchase additional Shocker Dollars at face value at any time directly from our dining provider.

The Flats Proposed Fiscal Year 2021 Room Options

Unit Type Style	FY 20 Per Person Occupancy Rate	Proposed FY 21 Per Person Occupancy Rate	Percent Increase
------------------------	------------------------------------	--	---------------------

Standard Plan for The Flats			
3 or 4 Bedroom Double with Unlimited Access Meal Plan	\$11,180	\$11,180	0.00%
<u>Academic Year 2020-2021</u>			
1 Bedroom Apartment	\$9,200	\$9,460	2.83%
2 Bedroom Apartment-Single Room	\$8,500	\$8,740	2.82%

2 Bedroom Apartment- Double Room	\$6,900	\$6,900	0.00%
3 or 4 Bedroom Apartment- Single Room	\$7,900	\$8,120	2.78%
3 or 4 Bedroom Apartment- Expandable Single Room	\$7,200	\$7,400	2.78%
3 or 4 Bedroom Apartment- Double Room	\$6,900	\$6,900	0.00%

Summer Session 2020			
1 Bedroom Apartment	\$268.33	\$275.92	2.83%
2 Bedroom Apartment- Single Room	\$247.92	\$254.92	2.82%
2 Bedroom Apartment- Double Room	\$201.25	\$201.25	0.00%
3 or 4 Bedroom Apartment-Single Room	\$230.42	\$236.83	2.78%
3 or 4 Bedroom Apartment- Expandable Single Room	\$210.00	\$215.83	2.78%
3 or 4 Bedroom Apartment-Double Room	\$201.25	\$201.25	0.00%
Rates per Room Type vary by session (which are 2, 4 and 8 weeks), and are thus listed at a weekly rate.			

**The Suites
Proposed Fiscal Year 2021 Room Options**

Unit Type Style	FY 20 Per Person Occupancy Rate	Proposed FY 21 Per Person Occupancy Rate	Percent Increase
-----------------	---------------------------------	--	------------------

Standard Plan for The Suites			
2 Bedroom Hybrid Suite (double) with Unlimited Access Meal Plan	\$11,110	\$11,110	0.00%
Academic Year 2020-2021			
1 Bedroom Suite	\$9,100	\$9,360	2.86%
2 Bedroom Suite	\$8,150	\$8,380	2.82%
4 Bedroom Suite	\$7,730	\$7,950	2.85%
2 Bedroom Hybrid Suite- Single Room	\$7,630	\$7,850	2.88%
2 Bedroom Hybrid Suite- Double Room	\$6,830	\$6,830	0.00%

Summer Session 2020			
1 Bedroom Suite	\$265.42	\$273.00	2.86%
2 Bedroom Suite	\$237.71	\$244.42	2.82%
4 Bedroom Suite	\$225.46	\$231.88	2.85%
2 Bedroom Hybrid Suite- Single Room	\$222.54	\$228.96	2.88%
2 Bedroom Hybrid Suite- Double Room	\$199.21	\$199.21	0.00%
Rates per Room Type vary by session (which are 2, 4 and 8 weeks), and are thus listed at a weekly rate.			

Shocker Hall			
Proposed Fiscal Year 2021 Room Options			

Unit Type Style	FY 20 Per Person Occupancy Rate	Proposed FY 21 Per Person Occupancy Rate	Percent Increase
------------------------	--	---	-------------------------

Standard Plan for Shocker Hall			
Double 2 Bedroom Suite/1 bath with Unlimited Access Meal Plan	\$11,110	\$11,110	0.00%

Academic Year 2020-2021

Single 1 Bedroom Suite/1 bath	\$9,100	\$9,360	2.86%
Single 2 Bedroom Suite/1 bath	\$8,150	\$8,380	2.82%
Single 4 Bedroom Suite/2 bath	\$7,730	\$7,950	2.85%
Single 4 Bedroom Suite/1 bath	\$7,630	\$7,850	2.88%
Hybrid Suite/1 bath (single bedroom)	\$7,630	\$7,850	2.88%
Single 3 Bedroom Suite/1 bath (room B)	\$7,630	\$7,850	2.88%
Single 3 Bedroom Suite/1 bath (rooms A & C)	\$7,410	\$7,620	2.83%
Double 2 Bedroom Suite/1 bath	\$6,830	\$6,830	0.00%
Hybrid Suite/1 bath (double bedroom)	\$6,830	\$6,830	0.00%
Double 1 Bedroom Suite/1 bath	\$6,830	\$6,830	0.00%
Triple 2 Bedroom Suite/ 1 bath	\$5,460	\$5,460	0.00%

Summer Session: Weekly Rate 2020

Single 1 Bedroom Suite/1 bath	\$265.42	\$273.00	2.86%
Single 2 Bedroom Suite/1 bath	\$237.71	\$244.42	2.82%
Single 4 Bedroom Suite/2 bath	\$225.46	\$231.88	2.85%
Single 4 Bedroom Suite/1 bath	\$222.54	\$228.96	2.88%
Hybrid Suite/1 bath (single bedroom)	\$222.54	\$228.96	2.88%
Single 3 Bedroom Suite/1 bath (room B)	\$222.54	\$228.96	2.88%
Single 3 Bedroom Suite/1 bath (rooms A & C)	\$216.13	\$222.25	2.83%
Double 2 Bedroom Suite/1 bath	\$199.21	\$199.21	0.00%
Hybrid Suite/1 bath (double bedroom)	\$199.21	\$199.21	0.00%
Double 1 Bedroom Suite/1 bath	\$199.21	\$199.21	0.00%
Triple 2 Bedroom Suite/ 1 bath	\$159.25	\$159.25	0.00%
Rates per Room Type vary by session (which are 2, 4 and 8 weeks) and are thus listed at a weekly rate.			

Other Housing Fees			
Proposed Fiscal Year 2021			

Fee Description	FY 20 Rate	Proposed FY 21 Rate	Percent Increase
Non-refundable Application Fee	\$75.00	\$75.00	0.00%
Late Payment Fee *	\$100.00	\$100.00	0.00%
Contract Prepayment – Shocker Hall, The Suites, & The Flats	\$200.00	\$200.00	0.00%
Late Application Fee	----	\$100.00	----
Living Learning Community Activity Fee	\$60.00	\$60.00	0.00%

Additional Dates Outside Contract Term (Daily Rate)	\$35.00	\$35.00	0.00%
* Two \$100 late fees are applied each semester: on the first business day after last day to pay, and ninety days into the semester.			

Expenditure Impact of the Proposal

The revenue received from the proposed housing and board rates will be used to pay for operating expenditures, utilities, staffing, capital expenditures, major remodeling and improvements and debt service/lease payments university owned and/or operated housing facilities. Board rates reflect a mandatory meal plan in accordance with WSU’s food service management contract.

Revenue Impact of the Proposal

We are seeking to increase the rates on our single rooms and leave flat rates on all other room types. Room rate revenue will have an overall increase of 1.50%.

Student Involvement with the Proposal

Student feedback on rates and increases on meal costs were conducted with a number of task force meetings in October. These meetings were held to allow students feedback on the current housing structure, future rates, and room assignments:

Wednesday, October 16	7:00 – 7:45 PM	Student Focus Group #1 – Student Government Association	Rhatigan Student Center
Monday, October 21	7:00 – 7:40 PM	Student Focus Group #2 – Flats & Suites Activity Board	Suites Clubhouse
Tuesday, October 22	8:00 – 8:30 PM	Student Focus Group #3 – Shocker Hall Activity Council	Shocker Hall Multi-Purpose Room

Estimated Benefits from the Proposal

Students who live on campus accrue a variety of benefits, including easy access to classrooms, laboratories, dining facilities, Ablah Library, the Heskett Center, the Innovation Campus additions, and the Rhatigan Student Center. Professional and paraprofessional staff members live in each building to provide academic and personal support services to the residents. Additionally, residents are provided with laundry facilities, meeting facilities, and are more easily able to participate in campus events and activities compared to those who commute. Wireless and wired internet access is also provided.

Alternatives to the Proposal

Alternatives to the proposed rates have not been identified. As an auxiliary operation, housing must cover all expenses through fees charged to students living in the residence hall facilities.

Impact of Not Implementing the Proposal

If the proposed housing and board rates are not implemented, the current financial stability of the housing and residence life operations would be compromised. Financial stability is also important to maintaining quality ratings on the outstanding revenue bonds.

Implementation Date

If approved, the rates will become effective on July 1, 2020. Rates for the summer session housing will become effective with the beginning of the summer contract of 2020.

Implications of New Model on Occupancy

As the table below will show, our occupancy numbers have continued to climb. We anticipate having our third consecutive largest housing population next year.

Supplemental Financial Information

	Projected FY 2021	Projected FY 2020	Actual FY 2019	Actual FY 2018	Actual FY 2017
Gross Operating Revenue	\$ 16,067,055	\$ 15,802,053	\$ 13,951,358	\$ 12,387,783	\$ 11,846,291
Gross Operating Expenditures - See Note 1	10,735,432	10,473,580	8,840,896	7,523,528	6,448,164
Gross Operating Revenue (Loss)	\$ 5,331,623	\$ 5,328,473	\$ 5,110,462	\$ 4,864,255	\$ 5,398,126
Annual Debt Service	4,881,623	4,878,473	4,877,523	4,872,992	4,882,236
Other Capital Expenditures	150,000	150,000	321,618	101,506	105,909
Transfers (In) Out	-	-	-	-	-
Other Operating (Revenue) Expenditures	\$ 5,031,623	\$ 5,028,473	\$ 5,199,141	\$ 4,974,499	\$ 4,988,145
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ (88,678)	\$ (110,243)	\$ 409,981
Less Capital Improvement Expense	300,000	300,000	125,166	137,520	143,728
Net Change in Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (213,844)	\$ (247,764)	\$ 266,254
Occupancy Rate - See Note 2	96.00%	96.00%	119.60%	109.90%	81.20%
Housing System Cash Balance	\$ 5,546,796	\$ 5,546,796	\$ 5,546,796	\$ 5,958,464	\$ 6,327,351
Long Term Debt Outstanding	\$ 56,745,000	\$ 58,715,000	\$ 60,610,000	\$ 62,435,000	\$ 64,190,000

Notes to Supplemental Financial Information

Note 1 – Operating revenues and expenditures are expected to increase 13.3% and 18.5% respectively in Fiscal Year 2020 as a result of WSU leasing The Suites, a new suite style residence hall on WSU’s Innovation Campus.

Note 2 – The occupancy rate shown in the table above is occupancy rate based on original design.

2. Act on Request to Revise Tuition Rate – KU

The University of Kansas offers an undergraduate certificate in Strength and Conditioning through the Edwards Campus. KU requests approval for this online program tuition rate to set the hourly rate to an all-inclusive amount of \$485. Currently, students taking the five courses that lead to this certificate pay \$481.50 or \$1,043.55 per credit hour, depending on residency status. This new rate would match the rate of the online Bachelor of Applied Science (BAS) in Exercise Science. The BAS in Exercise Science was launched this fall with its all-inclusive rate of \$485 per credit hour, a rate approved by the Board in June 2019. The requested all-inclusive tuition rate of \$485 per credit hour for the certificate will align the certificate tuition with the BAS tuition rate. The aligned tuition rates will support student accessibility efforts by allowing students enrolled in the certificate program to pay the same tuition rate upon transitioning to the BAS program, as well as meet industry demand.

3. Act on Recommendation to Adopt Board Policy on Financial Reserves

Summary and Staff Recommendation

Within the work plan for the Fiscal Affairs & Audit Standing Committee last year was the adoption of a Board policy on university reserves. The proposed policy has been drafted and reviewed by the Council of Business Officers and the Fiscal Affairs and Audit Standing Committee. Changes include clarifying that universities would no longer submit a separate operating budget to the Board Office, but they would instead continue to submit an annual budget request, in accordance with instructions provided by the Division of the Budget. Staff recommends adoption of the proposed policy amendments set forth below.

Background

As agencies within the executive branch of state government, the state universities adhere to the state’s accounting and budget rules. Although the state has a statutory ending balance requirement, there is no standard agencies must follow for financial reserves. Typically, agencies rely on appropriations from the Legislature or retain cash balances in special revenue funds that can serve as a reserve for unforeseen costs. Having an excess of cash in a special revenue funds, however, has, in some cases, resulted in transfers out of the agency’s funds to benefit the State General Fund by the Legislature.

For those auxiliary units within the universities with bonded indebtedness, there can be required reserve ratios, depending on the conditions of the issuance. The state universities also rely on reserves in the tuition fund to finance payroll cycles and other operating expenses in July and August before Fall tuition revenues are realized. The bond rating agencies such as Standard & Poor’s and Moody’s review university reserves when assigning a bond rating and the Board annually receives information about the universities’ composite financial index (CFI), with accompanying ratios that feed the index.

Four ratios feed the composite financial index, two of which measure reserves and compose the majority of the CFI. The primary reserve ratio measures the financial strength of the institution by comparing expendable net assets to total expenses (35% weighting). The viability ratio measures the availability of expendable net assets to cover debt should the institution need to settle its obligations as of a specific date (35% weighting). The return on net assets ratio provides the most comprehensive measure of the growth or decline in total wealth of an institution over a specific period of time (20% weighting). The net operating revenues ratio determines whether there a large surplus or deficit directly impacts the amount of funds an institution adds to or subtracts from net assets (10% weighting).

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends adoption of the proposed policy amendments set forth below, which also corrects a statutory citation and eliminates an unnecessary budget document:

CHAPTER II: GOVERNANCE – STATE UNIVERSITIES

C CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, FACULTY AND STAFF

- a Chief Executive Officer
- ...
- b Faculty and Staff
 - i General Provisions

- (1) In accordance with K.S.A. 76-715, the Board has authorized each state university chief executive officer to make all employee appointment decisions at his or her institution. The chief executive officer may delegate that authority. Each faculty and staff appointment must be approved by the chief executive officer or the chief executive officer’s designee. The Board delegates to each chief executive officer the authority to appoint unclassified employees and to establish salaries for individual unclassified employees within the authorization provided by the Legislature and within any general guidelines issued by the Board.

...

D FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (see Chapter III., Section B. for additional fiscal management policies applicable to state universities)

...

2 STATE APPROPRIATIONS

a Unified State Appropriation Request

- i The official request for any new state appropriations for the state universities shall be made by the Board of Regents, pursuant to K.S.A. 74-3202c(a)(b)(6), and amendments thereto, as a part of its unified budget for state funding of postsecondary educational institutions.

...

b State University Annual ~~Operating~~ Budgets

- i The fiscal year of all institutions is July 1 through June 30, and shall be designated by reference to the calendar year in which the fiscal year ends.
- ii ~~The Board shall receive an annual operating budget that includes budgeted expenditures by program, source of funds and budgeted staffing and salaries by position for each program. The Board delegates to each chief executive officer the authority to appoint unclassified employees and to establish salaries for individual unclassified employees within the authorization provided by the Legislature and within general guidelines issued by the Board~~ a copy of the budget submitted to the Division of the Budget, assembled in accordance with the instructions provided by the Division of the Budget.

...

8 FINANCIAL RESERVES

To ensure long-term financial sustainability, the state universities shall maintain sufficient resources to manage risks, to recognize commitments and to take advantage of opportunities. Recognizing that the publication “Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education” provides an effective benchmarking tool developed specifically to evaluate the financial well-being of institutions of higher education, the state universities shall provide an annual update on the metrics included within the ratio analysis, which shall include the resulting composite financial index. The annual update shall conform to a format determined by the Council of Business Officers.

...

9 AFFILIATED CORPORATIONS

...

4. Act on Recommendation to Adopt Board Policy on University Occupancy Leases **Julene Miller,
General Counsel**

Summary and Staff Recommendation

The Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee recommends amendments to the policy on state university leases to require Board approval of university leases of space in privately-owned buildings when the university and lessor have or had a direct or indirect partnership to construct the building, unless the term of the lease is 10 years or less and the lease is to be paid with an aggregate of \$100,000 or less per year from non-grant funds.

Background

At the November 2018 Board meeting, Regents directed staff to develop policy around leases of space in privately-owned buildings on state-owned property in situations where the university and developer of the building have or had a partnership to construct the building. At its April meeting, the Board referred the policy to the Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee and on the May agenda call, that Committee referred the policy to the Council of Presidents for feedback. Based on those discussions and feedback from the campuses, the Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee is recommending amendments to the policy to require Board approval of university leases of space in such situations, whether or not the building is located on state-owned property, unless the term of the lease is 10 years or less and the lease is to be paid with an aggregate of \$100,000 or less per year from any funds other than grant proceeds.

Recommendation

The Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee recommends Board adoption of the new language proposed for Section II.E.12. of the policy manual set forth below.

E FACILITIES

...
11 LAND TRANSACTIONS

- a Leases (Including Oil and Gas Agreements)
 - i All leases of state-owned real property shall be approved by university counsel as to form, shall be submitted to the Board for approval in accordance with paragraph iv. of this subsection or subparagraph 11.e.i. 4., 5, or 6, as applicable, and shall be submitted to other state agencies for approval where required by law. (K.S.A. 75-3739(1), 75-3743, 75-3744, 76-165, and/or 76-769(b)) All leases of state-owned real property for less than fair lease value shall be subject to the approval of the Board unless: (1) the use of the leased space is determined by the state university’s chief executive officer to be of benefit to the institution, (2) the lease meets the criteria for execution by the state university’s chief executive officer in paragraph iv. of this subsection, and (3) the rental rates are certified by the state university’s chief financial officer as fair and equitable for the type of lease arrangement, which may include non-monetary considerations.
 - ii No real property owned or controlled by the State of Kansas shall be leased unless a notice of intention to lease said property has been published at least thirty days prior to execution of any documents; provided, however, that this requirement shall not be imposed on leases with another state agency or a political subdivision. (K.S.A. 75- 430a(d))
 - iii No lease of land for the production of oil, gas or other minerals shall be for a period of more than ten years and so long as oil, gas or other minerals are produced in paying quantities thereon, shall be awarded only upon competitive bids pursuant to K.S.A. 76-165, and shall

retain to the state a royalty interest of not less than one-eighth part of all oil, gas or other minerals produced. When a state university leases land for the production of oil, gas, sand, gravel or any other mineral, the university shall provide information to the state geological survey in accordance with K.S.A. 76-323b. (K.S.A. 76-164 through 76-168)

iv State university leases of state-owned real property to or from third parties not associated with the state university may be executed by the university’s chief executive officer without Board approval unless:

- (1) the lease involves construction on state property;
- (2) the lease is an oil, gas or mineral lease covered by K.S.A. 76-165;
- (3) the lease is for a term of more than 10 years; or
- (4) the lease is for an amount in excess of \$25,000 per year.

v Leases with state university endowments, foundations, and other related organizations are governed by subsection 11.e. below.

...

e Real Property Transactions with State University Endowments, Foundations and Other Related Organizations

i State university endowments, foundations and other related organizations are organized under the laws of the State of Kansas and exist to support the state universities. While state law and organizational charters typically impose upon these related organizations special responsibilities for the administration of property received by the organizations, this policy shall establish the basis for all real property transactions described herein between all related organizations, the state universities and the Board. For purposes of this paragraph e., the term “related organizations” includes all state university affiliated corporations as defined in section II.D.8. of this Policy Manual.

...

(4) Leases of real property by the state universities from any related organizations shall be subject to the approval of the Board and to the following limitations:

- (a) If the related organization holds properties in unrestricted accounts for which no remuneration is required under its fiduciary responsibility, or if the property is held on the basis of a gift or devise which so permits, the related organization may make the property available to the state university on a no-fee basis.
- (b) Any occupancy by the state university shall be subject to a written agreement.
- (c) For properties held by any related organization as investments for eventual development by the state university, the rental cost shall not exceed an amount calculated to amortize the investment, or the market value in a case where the state university seeks to occupy a property previously leased by the related organization on a private or commercial basis.

(5) Leases of state-owned real property by the state universities to any affiliated corporation or other related organization shall be subject to the approval of the Board, but may be approved by the Board President and Chief Executive Officer if:

- (a) the terms of the lease require state university funding of less than \$1,000,000 in construction costs per project; and
- (b) the terms of the lease require no state university funds for operating and maintenance expenses.

(6) To the extent the terms of any sublease were identified in the request for authorization of a lease submitted to the Board for approval pursuant to subparagraph (5), no further Board approvals of the sublease are required. Any subsequent subleases of state-owned real property by an affiliated corporation or other related organization to third parties, the terms of which are not identified in the request for authorization of a lease submitted to the Board for approval pursuant to subparagraph (5), shall be subject to the approval of the Board, but may be approved by the Board President and Chief Executive Officer if:

- (a) the terms of the sublease require state university funding of less than \$1,000,000 in construction costs per project;
- (b) the terms of the sublease require no state university funding for operating and maintenance expenses;
- (c) the sublease is for a term of less than 30 years; and
- (d) the sublease includes a provision that either requires the facility condition index to be at least 80% of new at the end of the sublease, or the facility will be demolished at no cost to the university.

(7) State university transfers of real property received by devise to the state university's endowment or foundation in accordance with K.S.A. 74-3254 shall be subject to approval by the Board and any conditions imposed by the testator.

ii Construction of Buildings: When any related organization constructs a building on the organization's property for the state university's use and at the request of the state university, the state university is authorized to enter into lease agreements on an amortizing basis, subject to the advance approval of the Board of Regents.

12 ... OCCUPANCY LEASES

State university leases of space in a privately-owned building from an entity with which the university has or had a direct or indirect partnership to construct the building may be executed by the university's chief executive officer without Board approval unless:

- a The lease is for a term of more than 10 years; or
- b the lease is for an aggregate amount in excess of \$100,000 per year paid from any funding source other than grant moneys.

C. *Governance*

1. **Act on Proposed Changes to CEO Assessment Policy and Process**

Regent Bangerter
Julene Miller,
General Counsel

Summary

Board policy requires an annual performance evaluation of each state university President, the Chancellor and the Board President and CEO, and one of the Board's 2019-2020 goals is to review the process. Based largely on discussions at the Board's August retreat and at the Governance Committee meetings in June and September, staff proposes significant changes to both the evaluation instrument and the process, as outlined herein. Board action on these proposed changes will conclude the 2019-2020 Board Goal to review the CEO assessment process.

Background

Evaluation Instrument. The Board and the Governance Committee regularly review the processes and tools used to facilitate the CEO evaluations to continually improve both effectiveness and efficiency. In 2010 and 2011, the Board made comprehensive changes to the CEO assessment process, in part to combine the annual CEO evaluation with a multi-rater feedback survey administered electronically on each campus and at the Board office. To accommodate the survey and to dovetail the Board member evaluation with the survey results, a tool was created that posited a series of questions in each of five separate performance categories:

- Strategic Direction and Planning
- Leadership and Decision Making
- Financial Stewardship
- Communication
- Culture and Climate
- Personnel Management

In subsequent years, the Board has continued to use some version of this evaluation instrument. It continues to be web-based and secure, as necessary for maintaining the confidentiality of personnel records. Over time the tool has been adjusted to

- reduce the number of rating questions
- add a section for assessing progress toward meeting the Board's strategic planning goals
- add sections for assessing each CEO's current and proposed personal and institutional goals, and
- provide space for Regents to include comments to further explain their ratings in each performance category.

CEO Self-Assessments. The CEOs have made corresponding changes to their self-assessments, limiting the number of pages and providing an executive summary. The self-assessments are used by Regents in completing the annual evaluations; several CEOs craft their self-assessment to follow the order of the evaluation instrument.

Consensus Statements. Board member feedback provided through the evaluation instrument is then compiled in a summary report to help the Board reach consensus on significant points and to guide the annual in-person evaluations. In the past few years, the Board has met via conference calls to develop a draft consensus statement for each CEO. The draft consensus statement (as well as the compiled summary report) has been provided to the CEO prior to the in-person annual evaluation to help them prepare for that meeting. The consensus statement is finalized during the in-person evaluation meeting, a copy is provided to the CEO and a copy of both the consensus statement and summary report are placed in the CEO's personnel file.

In-Person Assessment Meetings. To allot sufficient time and focus for each, the seven in-person evaluations are spread over three Board meetings with two or three evaluations occurring each month. Last year these meetings occurred in March, April and May.

Three-Person Committees. The Board has also utilized committees composed of three Regents each to provide mid assessment-year opportunities for Regents to meet more informally with individual university CEOs. The purpose of these meetings is to discuss the CEO's most recent evaluation, including progress being made on the CEO's goals for the current year and any other personnel matters related to the CEO. University Presidents and the Chancellor have found these meetings to be valuable, but also indicate that they could benefit from being more structured.

Proposal for Enhancing the Evaluation Instrument and Process

Individual Regents brought three suggestions to the Governance Committee in June 2019, and all have been included in the recommendations set forth below:

- The Board should develop consensus statements during regular Board meetings a month in advance rather than on conference calls the week before the Board meeting at which the in-person evaluation is to occur;
- The individual comments [and other responses] submitted by Regents via the evaluation instrument should be used by Regents for internal discussion and development of the consensus statements only and not provided to the CEO; and
- The Strategic Direction and Planning section of the evaluation instrument should be combined with the Leadership and Decision-Making section of the tool.

The Board discussed these and other items at the August retreat. In September the Governance Committee reviewed recommendations to address these items and other enhancements to the instrument and the process. The following lists combine the items discussed at the retreat with items discussed by the Governance Committee.

Recommended Changes to the Evaluation Instrument:

- Combine the Strategic Direction & Planning category and list of performance indicators with the Leadership & Decision-Making category and list of performance indicators;
- Update, streamline and prioritize performance indicators for each category in Sections I-V;
- Add performance indicators to the Financial Stewardship category in Section II to highlight time spent fundraising and working with the Kansas Legislature;
- Eliminate the comment/text boxes after each category in Sections I-V and each goal in Sections VI-VIII;
- Provide one comment/text box at the end of each set of Sections for any comments Regents may have about CEO performance in any of the areas covered in that set of Sections;
- Provide more context, in the evaluation instrument, around the *Foresight* data that has been included in the evaluation instrument (the source of the data and why it has been included);
- Replace the comment/text box after each *Foresight* and Board-approved CEO goal with a question; and
- Require every question to be answered, but provide additional options for response, *i.e.*
 - Consistently exceeds expectations for this category/goal
 - Consistently meets expectations for this category/goal
 - Has made progress during the past year for this category/goal
 - Does not meet expectations for this category/goal
 - I am unable to assess performance in this category/goal

Recommended Changes to the Evaluation Process:

- Develop each consensus statement at a regular Board meeting, one month before the scheduled in-person evaluation with that CEO, and accordingly move the timing of in-person evaluations back to the April, May, June time-frame;
- Discontinue the practice of providing the evaluation summary report to each CEO and remind Regents in the evaluation instrument that their comments and other responses will not be shared except in a compiled way with other Regents for purposes of developing the consensus statement;
- Ask each CEO to write his or her self-assessment to the evaluation instrument, addressing each performance indicator, section or goal in the order presented in the instrument; and
- Improve communications
 - Provide a user guide to Regents along with the link to and password for each evaluation instrument;
 - Communicate expectations for self-assessments, annual in-person evaluations and three-person committee meetings to CEOs at appropriate times;
 - Provide more time for the in-person evaluation meetings;
 - Arrange for two opportunities for three-person committees to meet during regular Board meetings; these committees may arrange to meet more often and at the campuses should they so desire;
 - Seek feedback from CEOs as to how the three-person committees may be better utilized; and
 - Give three-person committees an opportunity to report back to the full Board, when the consensus statements are being developed and otherwise as needed.

The Governance Committee has reviewed these proposed changes and presents them to the Board for consideration and final action. Staff recommends approval.

**2020 CEO Assessment
President _____**

I. Strategic Direction and Planning, Leadership and Decision Making

1) Performance indicators for the Strategic Direction and Planning, Leadership and Decision Making category include the following:

The President . . .

- Develops a strategic vision for the University and effectively implements plans to realize that vision in a timely manner.
- Focuses the University on higher education attainment for Kansas, alignment of the University with the needs of the economy and ensuring institutional excellence as a central theme to institutional accountability and performance.
- Focuses the University on the mission and strategic vision of the institution in the midst of competing interests.
- Appropriately addresses issues confronting the institution and informs the Board of critical issues as they arise.
- Ensures that the institutional performance agreement is aligned with the Board and institutional goals and meets annual expectations for full funding.
- Stays abreast of higher education issues, trends, ideas, and innovations.
- Takes appropriate risks in order to accomplish the goals of the institution.
- Leads ethically and with integrity.

President _____ . . .*

- consistently exceeds expectations for this category.
- consistently meets expectations for this category.
- has made progress during the past year for this category.
- does not meet expectations for this category.
- I am unable to assess performance in this category.

II. Financial Stewardship

2) Performance indicators for the Financial Stewardship category include the following:

The President . .

- Appropriately links financial needs and requests to the University mission, vision, and goals.
- Advocates on behalf of the University to ensure that financial and programmatic needs are properly considered by the Legislature and other funding sources.
- Effectively directs and administers the annual operating and capital budgeting processes.
- Leads development efforts to maximize funding for the University and has a favorable record of attracting funds to the University.
- Appropriately manages personal time spent on fundraising, both on and off campus and with both the Legislature and private donors.
- Promotes policies that ensure responsible and accountable utilization of fiscal resources.
- Demands accountability in every aspect of funding.

President _____ . . .*

- consistently exceeds expectations for this category.
- consistently meets expectations for this category.
- has made progress during the past year in this category.
- does not meet expectations for this category.
- I am unable to assess performance in this category.

III. Communication and Interaction with Constituencies

3) Performance indicators for the Communication and Interaction with Constituencies category include the following:

The President . . .

- Communicates in a positive and engaging manner.
- Listens in a respectful manner.
- Keeps the members of the community informed of important matters.
- Encourages participative decision making, seeking input from those most directly affected.
- Discusses the rationale of administrative actions and decisions.
- Clearly communicates and effectively engages with the Kansas Board of Regents.
- Clearly communicates and effectively engages with University leadership and staff in carrying out the mission, strategic goals, and value of the institution and the Board's strategic agenda.
- Effectively represents the University before the Kansas Legislature.

President _____ . . .*

- consistently exceeds expectations for this category.
- consistently meets expectations for this category.
- has made progress during the past year for this category.
- does not meet expectations for this category.
- I am unable to assess performance in this category.

IV. Culture and Climate

4) Performance indicators for the Culture and Climate category include the following:

The President . . .

- Creates a positive, professional and student-centered campus atmosphere.
- Creates an environment that is conducive to sharing new ideas.
- Creates and maintains a productive working relationship with faculty, staff, students, alumni, the Board, and a variety of other constituents.
- Builds an administration that is responsive to student, faculty, and staff interests and concerns.
- Energizes and motivates others toward attainment of difficult goals.
- Encourages faculty, students, and staff to collaborate with colleagues at other institutions within the Regents' system.
- Instills a strong sense of constituency focus in institutional leadership and staff.

President _____ . . .*

- consistently exceeds expectations for this category.
- consistently meets expectations for this category.
- has made progress during the past year for this category.
- does not meet expectations for this category.
- I am unable to assess performance in this category.

V. Personnel Management

5) Performance indicators for the Personnel Management category include:

The President. . .

- Has an effective administrative team.
- Delegates administrative duties and responsibilities appropriately.
- Selects outstanding leaders and staff, and challenges as well as empowers them to utilize their expertise for the benefit of the University.
- Gives due recognition to faculty/staff accomplishments.
- Utilizes appropriate measurement tools and reports to track individual and group performance.

President _____ . . .*

- consistently exceeds expectations for this category.
- consistently meets expectations for this category.
- has made progress during the past year for this category.
- does not meet expectations for this category.
- I am unable to assess performance in this category.

6) Please use the space below for any comments you may have about President _____'s performance in the areas identified in Questions 1-5, above.

Comments made in this space will be shared only with other Regents, the Board President and CEO, and Board legal staff; comments made in this space will not be shared with the university CEO except as they may be included in the final consensus statement.

VI. Progress Toward Kansas Board of Regents' Strategic Plan Goals.

7) Progress on the Board of Regents' *Foresight 2020* goals.

Goal 1 -- Increase Higher Education Attainment Among Kansans

President _____'s performance in positioning the University to achieve this Goal . . .*

- consistently exceeds expectations.
- consistently meets expectations.
- shows progress during the past year.
- does not meet expectations.
- I am unable to assess performance in this category.

8) Progress on the Board of Regents' *Foresight 2020* goals.

Goal 2 -- Improve Economic Alignment

President _____'s performance in positioning the University to achieve this Goal . . .*

- consistently exceeds expectations.
- consistently meets expectations.
- shows progress during the past year.
- does not meet expectations.
- I am unable to assess performance in this category.

9) Progress on the Board of Regents' *Foresight 2020* goals.

Goal 3 -- Ensure State University Excellence

President _____'s performance in positioning the University to achieve this Goal . . .*

- consistently exceeds expectations.
- consistently meets expectations.
- shows progress during the past year.
- does not meet expectations.
- I am unable to assess performance in this category.

10) Progress on the Board of Regents' *Foresight 2020* goals.

Please use the space below for any comments you may have about President _____'s performance in positioning the University to meet the Board of Regents' *Foresight 2020* Goals 1-3.

Comments made in this space will be shared only with other Regents, the Board President and CEO, and Board legal staff; comments made in this space will not be shared with the university CEO except as they may be included in the final consensus statement.

VII. Progress Toward Board Approved CEO Goals for 2019-2020.

11) Goal 1:

President _____'s performance toward achieving this Goal . . . *

- consistently exceeds expectations.
- consistently meets expectations.
- has shown progress during the past year.
- does not meet expectations.
- I am unable to assess performance in this category.

12) Goal 2:

President _____'s performance toward achieving this Goal . . . *

- consistently exceeds expectations.
- consistently meets expectations.
- has shown progress during the past year.
- does not meet expectations.
- I am unable to assess performance in this category.

13) Goal 3:

President _____'s performance toward achieving this Goal . . . *

- consistently exceeds expectations.
- consistently meets expectations.
- has shown progress during the past year.
- does not meet expectations.
- I am unable to assess performance in this category.

14) Goal 4:

President _____'s performance toward achieving this Goal . . . *

- consistently exceeds expectations.
- consistently meets expectations.
- has shown progress during the past year.
- does not meet expectations.
- I am unable to assess performance in this category.

15) Goal 5:

President _____'s performance toward achieving this Goal . . . *

- consistently exceeds expectations.
- consistently meets expectations.
- has shown progress during the past year.
- does not meet expectations.
- I am unable to assess performance in this category.

16) Progress Toward Board Approved CEO Goals for 2019-2020.

Please use the space below for any comments you may have about President _____'s performance toward achieving his Board approved 2019-2020 Goals 1-5.

Comments made in this space will be shared only with other Regents, the Board President and CEO, and Board legal staff; comments made in this space will not be shared with the university CEO except as they may be included in the final consensus statement.

VIII. Consideration of University CEO Proposed Goals for 2020-2021. At least one proposed goal shall address an aspect of the Board's Strategic Plan and one proposed goal shall address engagement with the Legislature.

17) Proposed Goals for 2020-2021

Goal 1:

Goal 2:

Goal 3:

Goal 4:

Goal 5:

Goal 6:

Please use the space below to comment on whether you agree these are the goals on which President _____ should focus in academic year 2020-2021.

Comments made in this space will be shared only with other Regents, the Board President and CEO, and Board legal staff; comments made in this space will not be shared with the university CEO except as they may be included in the final consensus statement.

D. Other Matters

1. Receive the Non-Budgetary Legislative Proposals
(First Read)Matt Casey,
Director, Government Relations**Summary**

The Board will receive a first read for two non-budgetary items. These items will receive a final read in December where Board action will be requested for approval of the items. No action is needed at this time.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL: KANSAS PRIVATE AND OUT-OF-STATE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENTS

Request: Clarify and strengthen the Board’s authority over private and out-of- state postsecondary educational institutions operating in Kansas to allow for additional consumer/student protection and institutional accountability.

Background: The most recent comprehensive legislative review of the Kansas Private and Out-of-State Postsecondary Educational Institution Act was conducted in 2010. Since that time there have been significant changes in the industry, the players, and federal regulation. As the Board has attempted to implement the Act in this changing environment, it has become increasingly apparent that statutory amendments are necessary to keep pace and to provide the Board with enhanced enforcement mechanisms with which to facilitate compliance with, and address violations of, the Act.

Impact: If enacted, the proposed amendments to the Act would include the following:

1. Update definitions for “distance education,” “ownership,” and “physical presence” to clarify the Board’s subject matter jurisdiction
2. Clarify situations that exempt institutions from the Act and courses of study that are exempt from the Act
3. Codify the ability of an otherwise exempt institution to voluntarily bring itself under the Board’s jurisdiction if required for Title IV funding eligibility
4. Require accredited status before awarding degrees (grandfathering in the one institution that has long had degree-granting authority but no accreditation)
5. Allow the Board to set special standards for institutions that receive Title IV student financial aid, including a requirement for audited financial statements
6. Allow the Board to issue provisional certificates of authority when a degree-granting institution has not yet achieved accreditation, *with potentially increased bonding amount* and additional milestones and reporting requirements
7. Add to the list of minimum standards required for a certificate of approval
 - Institutions cannot award credentials based solely on payment of tuition or credit earned from other institutions or other bases
 - Institutions cannot award honorary degrees if they do not award earned degrees and cannot charge for the award of an honorary degree
 - Institutions must institute appropriate measures to protect students’ personally identifiable information
 - Provide the Board the ability to require institutions to publish graduation, placement and loan default rates
8. Allow the Board to begin closure procedures once a renewal application is deemed late; closure procedures may include notice requirements, teach-out plans, maintenance of academic records, refund requirements, and a plan for handling transcript requests
9. Allow the Board to condition a certificate of approval at any time the Board determines additional information is necessary including, but not limited to, when there are changes in the institution’s financial

stability, pending building compliance, or when the institution is sanctioned by their accreditor or a government agency; conditions may include reporting requirements, performance standards, increased bond amount, suspension or termination of institutional activity such as enrolling students, advertising or delivering certain courses or programs, and setting a time limit for winding down and teaching out students

- 10. Allow the Board to fine institutions, up to \$3,000, for violations of the Act
- 11. Expand the coverage of the bond to include any fines imposed by the Board
- 12. Add to the list of violations of the act
 - Obtaining of a certificate of approval through fraud or misrepresentation
 - Failure to submit accurate data on a timely basis
- 13. Increase the amount of civil penalty that can be imposed by a court for violation of the Act from \$5,000 to \$15,000

Fiscal Note: Any fines imposed and collected by the Board would be deposited to the State General Fund (SGF). No additional fees are expected to be collected as the amendments are not intended to bring new institutions under the scope of the Act’s application.

Draft Bill Language: Will be provided as a separate attachment.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL: AMENDMENTS FOR EXCEL IN CTE

Request: Technical edits of K.S.A 72-3810, K.S.A 72-3813 and K.S.A 72-3819 to clarify outstanding issues that have arisen since the Excel in CTE program was initially enacted.

Background: Excel in CTE was created to give all Kansas high school students the ability to pursue a career in a technical field that requires a college credential. Over the years, situations have arisen that have raised questions regarding the intent of the statute in terms of the fees colleges may assess against participating students. The purpose of the proposed changes is to resolve these questions and clarify the intent of the legislation. The proposal would also transfer administration of the Career Technical Education Incentive Program to the Kansas Department of Education and require school districts receiving this incentive to pay for students’ certification tests.

Impact: If this proposal is enacted, Board approval would be required for all fees charged to students participating in this program. Additionally, we propose removing a reference to a statute that has been repealed, clarifying that school districts pay for students to take certification tests if they are receiving a CTE incentive and transferring responsibility for the CTE incentive program to KSDE.

Fiscal Note: Minimal to no impact on the State General Fund (SGF) is projected.

Draft Bill Language: See below.

72-3810. Tuition and fees of students; liability; schedule. (a) Students admitted to a career technical education course or program which is conducted by the school district in which the student is enrolled may be charged fees but shall not be charged tuition.

(b) Postsecondary students admitted to a career technical education course or program shall pay tuition and fees as provided by laws applicable thereto.

(c) (1) Secondary students admitted to a career technical education course or program which is conducted by a community college, technical college or institute of technology ~~may shall not~~ be charged fees, ~~but shall not be charged or~~ tuition, except as specifically authorized by policies of the state board of regents.

(2) Each school year, to the extent there are sufficient moneys appropriated to the career technical education secondary program, the state board of regents shall distribute state funds to community colleges, technical colleges

and the Washburn institute of technology for the cost associated with secondary students enrolled in postsecondary career technical education programs as determined by the state board of regents.

(3) For purposes of this subsection:

(A) "Community college" means any community college established in accordance with chapter 71 of the Kansas Statutes Annotated, and amendments thereto.

(B) "Fees" means those charges assessed against a student by a community college, technical college or the institute of technology for student services, such as health clinics, athletic activities and technology services, or for books, uniforms, tools, supplies or other materials necessary for a particular course or program, or any other assessment charged to a student by an institution, the expense of which is not covered by tuition.

(C) "Institute of technology" means the institute of technology at Washburn university.

(D) "Secondary student" means a pupil who: (i) Has not attained a high school diploma or a general educational development (GED) credential; and (ii) is regularly enrolled in and attending a public or private secondary school.

(E) "State board of regents" means the state board of regents provided for in the constitution of this state and established by K.S.A. 74-3202a, and amendments thereto.

(F) "Technical college" means a technical college designated pursuant to K.S.A. 2018 Supp. [74-32,458](#), [74-32,460](#), [74-32,461](#), [74-32,462](#), [74-32,464](#) or [74-32,465](#), and amendments thereto.

~~(F)~~ (G) "Tuition" means those charges assessed against a student by a community college, technical college or the institute of technology on a per credit hour, per course or per term basis, and that are charged to cover the general expense of providing instructional services.

(d) Students admitted to a vocational education course or program ~~which that~~ is not conducted by the school district in which the student is enrolled shall be charged tuition and fees determined in accordance with subsection (e), subject however to the following: (1) Tuition or fees, or tuition and fees may be paid for the student in accordance with any agreement made under K.S.A. 2018 Supp. [72-3814](#), and amendments thereto; or

(2) if tuition of a student is not paid under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the tuition of the student shall be paid by the school district in which the student is enrolled. No school district shall pay tuition for a student who is a postsecondary student, and no school district shall be required to pay tuition or fees of a student who is eligible to have tuition and fees for the course or training the student selects paid by any state or federal agency from moneys, funds or appropriations made available under any one or more state or federal programs. Any state agency administering any one or more such programs shall pay such tuition and fees upon proper application by a student therefor.

(e) All tuition and fees charged for career technical education by any board shall be in such amounts as are authorized by rules and regulations or policies adopted by the state board of regents, which shall establish general guidelines for tuition and fee schedules in career technical education courses and programs, ~~except that tuition of postsecondary students shall be fixed in accordance with K.S.A. [72-4433](#)*, and amendments thereto~~. The particular tuition and fee schedule of every career technical education program shall be subject to annual approval of the state board of regents. A current complete schedule of tuition and fees for each career technical education course and program of each board as approved by the state board shall be maintained on file in the office of the state board, and shall be open for public inspection at any reasonable time.

72-3813. Career technical education fund; source of payment of tuition; transfers from general fund authorized, when. The school district in which a student is enrolled shall pay the tuition of such student to attend any career technical education course or program when such attendance is approved as provided in K.S.A. 2018 Supp. [72-3812](#), and amendments thereto, from its vocational education fund, except that any board receiving funds under an agreement under K.S.A. 2018 Supp. [72-3814](#), and amendments thereto, shall pay such tuition when the student is enrolled in a school district which is a party to the agreement if the agreement so provides. In the case of a school district which is not a party to an agreement under K.S.A. 2018 Supp. [72-3814](#), and amendments thereto, should there be insufficient or no moneys in the career technical education fund to pay such tuition, the board of education shall transfer from the general fund to the career technical education fund such amount as will satisfy the insufficiency. School districts receiving a career technical education incentive pursuant to K.S.A. 72-

3819, and amendments thereto, shall pay for students to take certification tests required to obtain an industry-recognized credential in an occupation that has been identified by the secretary of labor, in consultation with the state board of regents and the state board of education, as an occupation in highest need of additional skilled employees at the time the student entered the career technical education course or program in the school district.

72-3819. Career technical education incentive program. (a) The state board of ~~regents~~ education shall establish the career technical education incentive program.

(b) (1) Each school year, to the extent there are sufficient moneys appropriated to the career technical education incentive program, the state board of ~~regents~~ education shall make an award to those school districts who have at least one pupil who graduates from a high school in the school district having obtained an industry-recognized credential either prior to graduation from high school or by December 31 immediately following graduation from high school in an occupation that has been identified by the secretary of labor, in consultation with the state board of regents and the state board of education, as an occupation in highest need of additional skilled employees at the time the pupil entered the career technical education course or program in the school district. Such school districts shall receive an award in an amount equal to \$1,000 for each such pupil graduating from a high school in the school district. Such awards shall be paid at such times as established by the state board of ~~regents~~ education. Such awards shall be expended for the expenses incurred by the board of education of the school district under this subsection, and any moneys remaining after distribution in accordance with this subsection may be expended as determined by the board of education of a school district towards operating the school from which the pupils graduated. Upon receipt of such award and application by a pupil who has not attained a high school diploma and is currently or was previously enrolled in a career technical education course or program in the school district, the board of education of each school district shall pay $\frac{1}{2}$ of the costs of the industry-recognized credential assessment specified in such application in an amount not to exceed \$1,000. Such industry-recognized credential assessment shall be related to the career technical education course or program which such pupil is currently or was previously enrolled as determined by the board of education. No board of education shall be required to pay $\frac{1}{2}$ of the cost of three or more industry-recognized credential assessments for the same or substantially the same industry-recognized credential for a pupil if such pupil fails to earn the industry-recognized credential within two attempts of taking the industry-recognized credential assessment.

(2) The state board of education shall certify to ~~the state board of regents and~~ the director of accounts and reports the amounts due to each school district pursuant to this subsection. Such certification, and the amount payable, shall be approved by the director of the budget. The director of accounts and reports shall draw warrants on the state treasurer payable to the district treasurer of each school district entitled to payment of such award amount, pursuant to vouchers approved by the state board of ~~regents~~ education. Upon receipt of such warrant, each district treasurer shall deposit the amount of such award in the general fund of the school district.

~~(c) (1) Each school year, to the extent there are sufficient moneys appropriated to the career technical education incentive program, the state board of regents shall make an award to a community college, technical college or institute of technology who has at least one secondary student who is currently or was previously admitted to a career technical education course or program in accordance with subsection (c) of K.S.A. 2018 Supp. 72-3810, and amendments thereto, and such secondary student is regularly enrolled in and attending a private secondary school. The purpose of such award is to reimburse such community college, technical college or institute of technology for paying $\frac{1}{2}$ of the costs of an industry recognized credential assessment in an occupation that has been identified by the secretary of labor, in consultation with the state board of regents and the state board of education, as an occupation in highest need of additional skilled employees at the time the secondary student was admitted into such career technical education course or program. Upon receipt of such award and application by a secondary student who is currently or was previously enrolled in a career technical education course or program in accordance with subsection (c) of K.S.A. 2018 Supp. 72-3810, and amendments thereto, and is regularly enrolled in and attending a private secondary school, the governing body of the community college, technical college or the institute of technology which admitted such secondary student shall pay $\frac{1}{2}$ of the costs of the industry recognized credential assessment specified in such application in an amount not to exceed \$1,000. Such industry recognized credential assessment shall be related to the career technical education course or~~

~~program in which such secondary student is currently or was previously enrolled as determined by such governing body of a community college, technical college or institute of technology. No governing body of a community college, technical college or institute of technology shall be required to pay ½ of the cost of three or more industry-recognized credential assessments for the same or substantially the same industry recognized credential for a secondary student if such secondary student fails to earn the industry recognized credential within two attempts of taking the industry recognized credential assessment.~~

~~(2) Each governing body of a community college, technical college or institute of technology shall certify to the state board of regents the amount of any payments such community college, technical college or institute of technology will pay based on applications submitted by students pursuant to paragraph (1). The certification shall be on a form prescribed and furnished by the state board of regents, shall contain such information as the state board of regents shall require and shall be filed at the time specified by the state board of regents.~~

~~(3) In each school year, each governing body of a community college, technical college or institute of technology is entitled to receive from appropriations for the career technical education incentive program an amount which is equal to the amount certified to the state board of regents in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2). The state board of regents shall certify to the director of accounts and reports the amount due each governing body of a community college, technical college or institute of technology. The director of accounts and reports shall draw warrants on the state treasurer payable to the treasurer of each governing body of a community college, technical college or institute of technology entitled to payment under this subsection upon vouchers approved by the state board of regents.~~

~~(4) Moneys received by a state board of regents under this subsection shall be deposited in the postsecondary technical education fund of each community college and at Washburn university for the Washburn institute of technology or the general operating fund in the technical college in accordance with K.S.A. 2018 Supp. 71-1808, and amendments thereto, and shall be considered reimbursements to the community college, technical college or institute of technology.~~

~~(d) Each school year, at such time as agreed to by the secretary of labor, the president chief executive officer of the state board of regents and the commissioner of education, the secretary shall provide the state board of regents and the state board of education with a list of those occupations in highest need of additional skilled employees. If the occupations identified in such list are not substantially the same as those occupations identified in the list from the prior year, reasonable notice of such changes shall be provided to school districts, community colleges, technical colleges and the institute of technology.~~

~~(e) (d) The state board of regents and the state board of education, jointly, may adopt such rules and regulations necessary to implement and carry out the provisions of this section.~~

K.S.A. 72-3810, 72-3813, and 72-3819 are hereby repealed.

This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its publication in the statute book.

**2. Receive Report from Kansas Postsecondary
Technical Education Authority**

**Ray Frederick,
Chair, TEA**

The Kansas Postsecondary Technical Education Authority (TEA) continues to work on improving and expanding Career and Technical Education (CTE) within Kansas. As part of this effort the TEA has approved State Innovation Technology Grants and reviewed both FY2018 Carl Perkins and FY 2019 Adult Education program performance results. The grants and program results, along with next year's TEA Goals, are provided below.

The TEA appreciates the effort of the Board to fully fund Excel in CTE, Tiered Technical Education State Aid and Non-Tiered Credit Hour Grants and will continue to advocate for sufficient funds in these areas.

In addition to normal TEA activities, this year the TEA will continue its work reviewing existing CTE programs and refining associated criteria pursuant to K.S.A. 74-32,402, begin the review process of extraordinary costs within the cost model, support the creation of the WIOA and Carl Perkins state plans, and develop methodology and criteria relating to how apprenticeships are accounted for within our system.

State Innovative Technology Grant Awards

Coffeyville Community College – Construction Technology \$41,170

CCC is requesting grant funds to purchase a mobile Caterpillar heavy equipment simulator system for the program. The simulator is a cost-effective way to provide hands-on training in all weather conditions and terrains. It will allow the construction technology students to prepare for a variety of scenarios in the industry.

Business/Industry Partner: Crossland Construction – Columbus, KS

- \$52,017 total match
- \$25,000 of the total match will be used to purchase the excavator conversion kit for the simulator
- The match includes installation costs
- Crossland Construction will provide (in-kind) training for CCC faculty and staff

Hutchinson Community College – Computer Support Technology \$12,000

The college is requesting innovative technology funds to add the smartphone application development component to the web development, computer support technology and visual media design programs. The goal of the project is to meet the local industry need for smartphone/mobile application developers and to increase student interest and enrollment in these programs.

Business/Industry Partner: Data Center, Inc. (DCI) – Hutchinson, KS

- \$13,900 total match
- Data Center will donate laptops, desktop computers, and a server in support of this project

North Central Kansas Technical College – Nursing \$23,000

Grant funds are being requested for the purchase of a nursing communication simulator ALEX Plus, which will be shared by the allied health, pharmacy technician, registered nursing, and practical nursing students on the Beloit campus. This simulator is portable and will allow multiple programs to gain experience with patient communication in a wide range of scenarios.

Business/Industry Partner: Hays Medical Center – Hays, KS

- Match valued at \$40,000
- Hays Medical Center will provide 4 hospital beds, 4 over bed tables and 4 bedside cabinets for the simulation lab at NCK Tech
- Medical supplies will also be donated to allow students to practice on real-world medical materials

Northwest Kansas Technical College – Precision Agriculture **\$25,400**

Requested grant funds will be used to purchase an 8-row planter unit for the precision agriculture program. The comprehensive goal of this project is to sustain agricultural economic viability in western Kansas through workforce development focused on increased adoption of precision agriculture and innovative technologies.

Business/Industry Partners: Franklin Farms – Goodland, KS
Golden Plains Agricultural Technologies – Colby, KS
Fontanelle Hybrids – Lincoln, NE

- \$91,598 total match
- Franklin Family Farms will donate a FlexiCoil Sprayer
- Golden Plains Ag Tech will donate Outback Rebel guidance system and RTK base radio
- Fontanelle Hybrids will donate crop seed (milo, corn, soy beans)

Salina Area Technical College – Diesel Technology **\$30,000**

The college is requesting innovative technology grant funds to purchase a tractor in order to provide hands-on experience for the diesel technology program students. The new equipment will aid in improving the curriculum and training modules to uphold the high industry standards.

Business/Industry Partner: Central Power Systems and Services – Salina, KS

- \$135,000 match
- A VIS machine will be donated for the diesel technology program

Washburn University Institute of Technology – Locomotive Diesel Technology **\$19,500**

Washburn Tech is requesting grant funds to purchase a set of industry-standard tools for training diesel locomotive mechanics in Topeka, Kansas. The goal of the grant project is to provide students with exposure to locomotive engine repairs and to prepare mechanics for servicing a variety of locomotive systems.

Business/Industry Partner: BNSF Railway

- Match valued at \$34,280
- BNSF will provide tools and components for the training lab
- Washburn tech will receive NARS industry-standard Locomotive Mechanical curriculum

WSU Campus of Applied Sciences and Technology – Automotive Technology **\$29,500**

Requested grant funds will purchase seven sets of Hololens 2 augmented reality goggles to train students in the automotive technology program on how fluids affect various parts of an engine. This cost-effective teaching tool will allow the instructors to set up repair scenarios and will improve the students' problem-solving skills.

Business/Industry Partner: BG Products, Inc. – Wichita, KS

- \$40,000 total match
- BG Products will develop applications for the goggles to match specific WSU Tech curriculum in brake systems and deliver all necessary upgrades to the goggle software

**FY2018 CARL PERKINS
POSTSECONDARY PERFORMANCE**

Enrollment of CTE Participants **23,129** (2017: 21,652)
(Students taking at least one CTE course)

Enrollment of CTE Concentrators **13,960** (2017: 13,177)
(Students with 12 hours or more)

- Agriculture, Food & Natural Resources 416
- Architecture & Construction 1792
- Arts, Audio/Video Technology & Communication 463
- Business Management & Administration 234
- Education & Training 44
- Finance 178
- Health Science 4371
- Hospitality & Tourism 433
- Human Services 647
- Information Technology 974
- Law, Public Safety, Corrections & Security 387
- Manufacturing 2207
- Marketing 104
- Transportation, Distribution & Logistics 1710

Perkins V Performance Indicator	Performance in Perkins V Scenario		
	2018	2017	2016
Student Placement	91%	90%	90%
Attainment of Credential, Certificate, Degree	N/A**	83%	89%
Non-traditional Program Concentration <i>(gender-based)</i>	10%	11%	11%

***Students have one year after program exit to attain a credential, certificate, or degree*

ADULT EDUCATION FY2019

Adult Learner Enrollment

English as a Second Language	2,499
Adult Basic Education	3,998
Adult Secondary Education	114
Total	6,611

Learner Status at Enrollment

Employed	3,525
Unemployed	1,766
Not in the Labor Force	1,311
Adults in Correctional System (Community corrections, county jails and other correctional facilities)	615

Learner Characteristics	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	79
Asian	550
Black or African American	856
Hispanic or Latino	2,434
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	12
White	2,372
More than one Race	308

Gender	
Female	3,510
Male	3,101

Age of Learners	
60+	256
45-59	865
25-44	2,920
19-24	1,447
16-18	1,123

Other Information

- 20 Adult education providers serving over 50 sites
- Adult education students logged over 740,000 classroom hours
- Adult education students GED® pass rate: 76%
- Cost per student \$666
- 708 students earned a postsecondary or industry-recognized credential
- 64% of adult education students achieved an educational gain, or transitioned to postsecondary education

TEA Goals 2019 – 2020

1. Support Board 2019-2020 goals and advocate for all public postsecondary institutions
2. Continue the review of all existing and new programs using updated criteria
3. Enhance the cost model by reviewing the Extraordinary Costs of the programs
4. Support Apprenticeship program model & process development by establishing criteria for how apprenticeships are accounted for and recognized
5. Support development efforts of the new Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) State Plan
6. Support development efforts of the new Carl D. Perkins (Perkins V) State Plan

3. Act on Building Naming – FHSU

President Mason

Summary

Fort Hays State University requests authorization to name the new Center for Art and Design. The Center for Art and Design is a 43,000 gross square foot, two story facility which provides lab space for Ceramics, Printing Making, Photography, Drawing, Painting, Interior Design and Graphic Design. The facility also includes departmental office space, classroom, wood shop, commons area, and kiln yard. The adjoining 5000 square foot former Power Plant now serves as gallery and preparation space. A new addition to the former Power Plant provides 2000 square feet of art collection storage space. The facility was occupied in July. Total project cost was \$14,200,000.

**4. Act on Request to Name the KU School of Law’s
Center for Diversity**

Chancellor Girod

Summary

The University of Kansas seeks approval to name the KU School of Law’s Center for Diversity. The KU School of Law Center for Diversity is a programmatic, co-curricular center that helps the school meet its mission and the changing needs of the legal profession by fostering and promoting diversity within the law school community. The Center encourages community engagement, while helping students adjust to the demands of law school.

VIII. Adjournment

AGENDA

**KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE
Pittsburg State University
Room 206
November 20, 2019
10:15 – Noon**

The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee will meet at Pittsburg State University, 1701 S. Broadway Street, Pittsburg, Kansas, 66762. We will meet in room 206 of the Overman Student Center.

I. Call to Order

Regent Schmidt

- A. Approve Minutes from the November 4, 2019 conference call

II. New Business

- A. Academic Advising Presentation

PSU

- B. **BAASC 20-01** Approve AY 2018 Performance Reports

*Samantha Christy-
Dangermond &
Institutional
Representatives*

- C. Transfer and Articulation Council Quality Assurance Report

Karla Wiscombe

- D. Discuss Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Faculty Qualifications

Karla Wiscombe

- E. Discuss College-Going Rate Data

Daniel Archer

- F. Direct Support Professionals Update

Regent Schmidt

III. Agenda Planning for December 2nd Teleconference Call

- Approve minutes from November 20th meeting at PSU
- Review Agenda for December 18th Board Meeting
- EPSCoR Proposals
- New Degree Proposals
- Date Reminders:
 1. Academic Calendars are due January 8, 2019

VI. Adjournment

MINUTES

**Kansas Board of Regents
Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee
MINUTES
Monday, November 4, 2019**

The November 4, 2019 meeting of the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee of the Kansas Board of Regents was called to order by Regent Schmidt at 11:15 a.m. The meeting was held by conference call.

In Attendance:

Members:	Regent Schmidt, Chair Regent Van Etten	Regent Harrison-Lee	Regent Kiblinger
Staff:	Daniel Archer Erin Wolfram Renee Burlingham	Crystal Puderbaugh Julene Miller Natalie Yoza	Samantha Christy-Dangermond Amy Robinson
Institutions:	ESU KU KSU PSU WSU Tech Dodge City CC	FHSU KUMC Independence CC Salina Area Tech Manhattan Tech Flint Hills Tech	Hutchinson CC Cowley CC Fort Scott CC Butler CC KCK CC Highland CC

Regent Schmidt welcomed everyone and roll call was taken.

Approval of Minutes

Regent Kiblinger moved to approve the minutes of the October 16, 2019 meeting. Regent Van Etten seconded the motion and the motion passed.

Consent Agenda

Crystal Puderbaugh provided a brief overview of the request for a new certificate of approval for concurrent enrollment at the University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC). Crystal clarified for Regent Van Etten that the high school students can be anywhere in Kansas. Regent Van Etten asked if specific institutions were supporting this request. Daniel Archer clarified the approval process for the Committee. He stated that requesting a new certificate of approval would fall under a regulatory process because UMKC is not a Kansas public institution, and legally there are statutorily defined parameters that have an approval process. If an institution meets these parameters, it will be allowed to offer courses in Kansas.

Daniel read the request to approve a Doctor of Philosophy in Biomedical engineering at WSU and the request to approve a Doctorate in Clinical Nutrition at KUMC. Daniel noted that the Council of Chief Academic Officers (COCAO) and the Council of Presidents (COPs) have previously approved both requests. No questions were presented from the Committee.

Regent Kiblinger moved to place these three items on the consent agenda for the next Board meeting. Regent Van Etten seconded the motion and the motion passed.

Discussion Agenda

Crystal Puderbaugh provided an overview of the proposed statutory changes to the Private and Out-of-State Post-Secondary Act.

Regent Van Etten asked for clarification on the current and proposed fines. KBOR does not currently have the ability to fine. The proposed changes would include a \$1,000 fine for the first violation, \$2,000 for the second violation, and \$3,000 for all fines after the second. Crystal commented that KBOR staff is looking at the possibility of tying the fine to a percentage of the institutions' renewal fee or their tuition revenue or some type of sliding scale that could be more impactful for larger institutions. Regent Schmidt asked to clarify if these changes have gone through the legal process and if there were more changes to be made. Crystal responded that the proposed changes have been worked on and reviewed by legal. Julene and Natalie will also provide a final review before it goes to Matt Casey to be submitted as a legislative request to the full board on November 20, 2019. Crystal stated that there is a little more work to be done within the fine section.

Regent Harrison-Lee moved to place the Act on Proposed Statutory Changes to Private Post-Secondary on the discussion agenda at the next Board meeting. Regent Van Etten seconded the motion and the motion passed.

Performance Reports

The Committee was presented performance reports from six institutions, each being recommended to receive 100% of any new funding for which they are eligible:

- University of Kansas
- University of Kansas Medical Center
- Flint Hills Technical College
- Manhattan Area Technical College
- Northwest Kansas Technical College
- Salina Area Technical College

Regent Schmidt asked for clarification on indicator #5 on the KUMC report, noting the metric is down about 4%. Matt Schuette responded for KUMC. He stated they are dependent on the denominator, which is the number of physicians that identified primary locations in Kansas based off a questionnaire. Matt stated the decrease could be a data anomaly.

Regent Schmidt asked Flint Hills Technical College to address the steady decrease in certificates and degrees awarded. Flint Hills Tech representative Lisa Kirmer responded that they have seen a decrease in post-secondary enrollment; however, their high school enrollment has increased significantly. They are starting to see an increase again in post-secondary enrollment due to recruiting and marketing efforts.

No further questions were presented by the Committee. Regent Kiblinger moved to approve the above institutions at full funding eligibility. Regent Van Etten seconded the motion and the motion passed.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be from 10:15-11:50 a.m., November 20, 2019 at Pittsburg State University in room 206 of the Overman Student Center. Tentative Agenda:

- Approve minutes from November 4th conference call
- Approval of Performance Reports for AY 2018
- Academic Advising Presentation – PSU
- Discuss Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Faculty Qualifications
- Transfer and Articulation Council Quality Assurance Report
- Discuss College-Going Rate Data
- Direct Support Professionals Update

- The executive session that was initially scheduled for the November 4 conference call will be conducted by the full board on November 20th.

Adjournment

Regent Van Etten moved to adjourn the meeting. Regent Kiblinger seconded the motion and the motion passed. The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

AGENDA

Fiscal Affairs and Audit Standing Committee
Wednesday, November 20, 2019
10:15 AM - 11:45 AM
Meadowlark Room (220), Overman Student Center
Pittsburg State University

I. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Approve minutes of September 18, 2019 committee meeting
- B. Follow up on issues raised during the November 5 teleconference regarding FAA items on the Board's agenda and any other questions/clarifications about Board agenda items

II. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Approve minutes of September 18, 2019 committee meeting
- B. Follow up on issues raised during the November 5 teleconference call regarding FAA items on the Board's agenda and any other questions/clarifications
- C. **FAA 20-08** Review Cost Model for Two-Year Colleges
- D. Receive Update on Deferred Maintenance Initiative
- E. **FAA 20-01** Staff Overview of FY 2020 KBOR Agency Budget
- F. Receive KBOR Internal Audit – “Alumni Account”
- G. Regular Board agenda items under Fiscal Affairs and Audit (including First Reading of State Universities' Housing and Food Service Rates)
- H. Audits for committee review and discussion (standing item)
- I. Other Committee Business

OTHER COMMITTEE ITEMS

Next meeting dates:

December 3, 11:00 am, Agenda planning conference call
December 18, 10:15 am Committee Meeting, Board Office, Topeka

December 31, 11:00 am, Agenda planning conference call

**may change to January 7*

January 15, 10:15 am Committee Meeting, Board Office, Topeka

AGENDA

**System Council of Presidents
Kansas Board of Regents
10:15 a.m. – 10:45 a.m.
Overman Student Center
Sunflower Room 221**

1. Approve minutes of September 18, 2019 meeting
2. Receive the System Council of Chief Academic Officers Report
3. Receive a legislative update – Matt Casey
4. Receive an update on the Board’s strategic plan
5. Other matters

MINUTES

**System Council of Presidents
Kansas Board of Regents
September 18, 2019
10:00 a.m.**

Members present: President Allison Garrett, Emporia State University – Co-Chair
President Ken Trzaska, Seward County Community College – Co-Chair
Chancellor Douglas Girod, University of Kansas
President Tisa Mason, Fort Hays State University
Interim President Andy Tompkins, Wichita State University
President Richard Meyers, Kansas State University
President Steve Scott, Pittsburg State University
President Jerry Farley, Washburn University
President Jim Genandt, Manhattan Technical College
President Blake Flanders, Kansas Board of Regents

Members absent: Mike Calvert, Pratt Community College
Alysia Johnson, Fort Scott Community College
Dennis Rittle, Cowley County Community College

The meeting convened at 10:00 a.m. by President Trzaska – Co-Chair

1. Minutes from June 20, 2019 meeting – moved by President Girod, seconded by President Meyers, approved.
2. Report from System Council of Chief Academic Officers – Brad Bennett, Colby Community College
Items:
 - The Kansas Council of Instructional Administrators met September 17.
 - Karla Wiscombe provided an update on the system-wide transfer inventory.
 - The group heard an update on the OER project.
3. Update on qualified admissions for state universities
Dr. Flanders indicated that this item will be moved to the discussion agenda for the Board.
4. Program to program articulation
President Trzaska mentioned a desire to expand program-to-program articulation from community colleges to system universities. President Garrett noted that this is an important issue for all and needs further study.
5. New Board strategic plan
There is general consensus around the three pillars in the draft of the updated Strategic Plan. The dashboard metrics need further discussion. President Flanders encouraged the CEOs to provide feedback on the plan if they have not already done so.
6. Other matters
No other matters were discussed.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:34 a.m.

AGENDA

**Council of Presidents
Kansas Board of Regents
10:30 a.m. or adjournment of SCOPs
Overman Student Center
Sunflower Room 221**

1. Approve minutes of September 18, 2019 meeting
2. Report from Council of Chief Academic Officers: David Cordle
 - a. Programs approved by COCAO on October 16:
 - i. KSU Master of Industrial Design
 - ii. KSU AAS in Aviation Maintenance
 - iii. KSU AAS in Professional Pilot
 - iv. KUMC BS in Diagnostic Science
 - v. ESU BID in Ethnic, Gender, & Identity Studies
 - vi. KU MS in Business Analytics
3. Report from Council of Chief Business Officers: Diana Kuhlmann
4. Report from Council of Government Relations Officers: Don Hill
5. Report from Council of Chief Student Affairs Officers: Jim Williams
6. Review proposed amendments to the Board's Service and Sale of Alcohol in Non-Classroom Areas and Cereal Malt Beverages Policies: Julene Miller
7. Receive update on the Kansas Public University Passport: Blake Flanders
8. Other matters

MINUTES

**Council of Presidents
Kansas Board of Regents
September 18, 2019
10:00 a.m. – adjournment of SCOPS**

Members present: President Allison Garrett, Emporia State University
Chancellor Douglas Girod, University of Kansas
President Tisa Mason, Fort Hays State University
Interim President Andy Tompkins, Wichita State University
President Richard Meyers, Kansas State University
President Steve Scott, Pittsburg State University
President Blake Flanders, Kansas Board of Regents

The meeting convened at 10:44 a.m. by President Garrett

1. Minutes from June 20, 2019 meeting – moved by President Scott, seconded by Chancellor Girod, approved.
2. Report from Council of Chief Academic Officers - David Cordle, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Emporia State University

Items:

- New Program Proposals were heard for first readings of new programs.
- Second readings of two programs which were approved unanimously.
 - WSU – Doctor of Philosophy in Biomedical Engineering
 - KU Med – Doctoral – Clinical Nutrition
- Request approved to change the name of the Department of Geography to the Department of Geography and Geospatial Sciences.
- All programs are down to 120 credits, some housekeeping to be done.
- The 2019 Michael Tilford conference is upcoming – need to remind others to make plans to attend.

3. Report from Council of Chief Business Officers – Diana Kuhlmann, Vice President for Administration and Finance, Emporia State University

Items:

- A majority of COBO’s September 4th meeting was jointly held with the Regents Facilities Directors to discuss deferred maintenance information requested by KBOR staff. Nelda Henning indicated that the request was intended to have better insight to the deferred maintenance needs and associated costs for the campuses. The request was in response to discussion at the Board retreat around how to tackle the significant and costly issue of deferred maintenance, with a possible consideration of leveraging EBF and SGF funds to pay debt service on deferred maintenance projects. The CEOs will need to work to find a plan for moving forward.
- There was follow up discussion on the budget workshop with the conclusion being the proposal of requesting \$50 million for the 6 Regents institutions.
- A joint committee on IT met – the chair raised questions about Regents universities related to disaster recovery and movement to the cloud. Follow up will be that someone will present from the universities about the system. Uncertain at this point as to who will present. The Secretary of Administration has been designated as new CITO.

4. Report from Council of Government Relations Officer – Don Hill, Government Relations Liaison, Emporia State University
 - Items:
 - Government relations officers had a retreat in July and have weekly calls.
 - There are substantial needs to address with the Governor. What does Higher education thriving in Kansas look like?
 - Higher Education Day was toned down this year and the discussion regarding our return on investment continues. The State of the State is an opportunity to advocate for higher education with legislators.
5. Report from University Support Staff Council – Doug Cushenbery, Chair of University Support Staff Senate, Emporia State University
 - Items:
 - The Satisfaction Survey for the USS and Unclassified Staff revealed the following items. Pay/Compensation.
 - Many employees rely on a 2nd job or another means of income in order to better provide for their families.
 - Morale was a topic that was raised and is linked to Pay/Compensation with additional work duties assigned and no salary increases to even keep up with the cost of living.
6. Health care benefits is another item of concern where they feel less value for the costs to premiums.

Other matters

 - a. Report from Vice Presidents of Student Affairs – Vice President Jim Williams, Emporia State University
 - Items:
 - The Vice Presidents of Student Affairs will begin meeting during the scheduled KBOR dates moving forward.
 - Human trafficking for our students in terms of where they gather. Students are vulnerable due to mental illness, distress, and drugs and alcohol usage. Training will be developed for staff that see students in a variety of settings.
 - b. Benchmarks to student success is an item for discussion for the group along with open communication for student government.
President Garrett briefly introduced Dr. Aswad Allen, Emporia State’s new Chief Diversity Officer.
 - c. President Flanders shared that the board will be reviewing the current policy on selling alcohol. The language needs to be updated.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:34 a.m.

AGENDA

**KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS
SYSTEM COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS
Pittsburg State University
Room 206
November 20, 2019
8:30 am – 9:00 am**

The System Council of Chief Academic Officers will meet at Pittsburg State University, 1701 S. Broadway Street, Pittsburg, Kansas, 66762. We will meet in room 206 of the Overman Student Center. SCOCAO is co-chaired by Brad Bennett, Colby Community College and David Cordle, Emporia State University.

- I. Call To Order** Brad Bennett, Co-Chair
 - A. *Introductions*
 - B. *Approve Meeting Minutes from September 18, 2019*

- II. Transfer and Articulation Council Update** Jon Marshall

- III. Open Educational Resource (OER) Steering Committee update** Samantha Christy-Dangermond

- IV. Other Matters**
 - A. *KCIA Update* Brad Bennett
 - B. *CPL Task Force Update* Samantha Christy-Dangermond
 - C. *CPL Guidelines Review* Samantha Christy-Dangermond
 - D. *Performance Agreement Update* Samantha Christy-Dangermond
 - E. *Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Faculty Qualifications* Karla Wiscombe

 - F. *Proposal Changes to the Degrees Policy* Daniel Archer

- V. Adjournment**

MINUTES

System Council of Chief Academic Officers MINUTES Wednesday September 18, 2019

The September 18, 2019, meeting of the System Council of Chief Academic Officers was called to order by Co-Chair Brad Bennett at 8:30 a.m. The meeting was held in Suite 530 located in the Curtis State Office Building, 1000 S.W. Jackson, Topeka, KS.

In Attendance:

Members:	Brad Bennett, Colby CC	David Cordle, ESU	Lori Winningham, Butler CC
	Erin Shaw, Highland CC	Jill Arensdorf, FHSU	Charles Taber, K-State
	Carl Lejuez, KU	Matt Pounds, NWK Tech	Howard Smith, PSU
	Rick Muma, WSU	JuliAnn Mazachek, Washburn	Daniel Archer, KBOR
	Adam Borth, Fort Scott CC	Michael Fitzpatrick, Pratt CC	
Staff:	Karla Wiscombe	Sam Christy-Dangermond	Erin Wolfram
	Cynthia Farrier		
Others:	Jon Marshall, Allen CC	Elaine Simmons, Barton CC	Kim Krull, Butler CC
	Aron Potter, Coffeyville CC	Michelle Schoon, Cowley CC	Steve Loewen, FHTC
	Marc Malone, Garden City CC	Cindy Hoss, Hutchinson CC	Michael McCloud, JCCC
	Rick Moehring, JCCC	Brian Niehoff, K-State	Nathan Howe, K-State
	Tim de Noble, K-State	Jean Redeker, KU	Troy Brockway, K-State Polytechnic
	Robert Klein, KUMC	Debra Sullivan, KUMC	Andrew Smith, K-State Polytechnic
	Kevin Bracker, PSU	Mike Calvert, Pratt CC	Stanton Gartin, SATC
	Joe McCann, Seward CC	Jennifer Ball, Washburn	Linnea Glenmaye, WSU
	Larisa Genin, WSU	Coleen Pugh, WSU	Dennis Livesay, WSU
	Heather Morgan, KACCT		

Co-Chair Brad Bennett welcomed everyone and started the introductions.

Daniel Archer informed SCOCAO of personnel staff changes with Academic Affairs staff. Samantha Christy-Dangermond was promoted to Director, and Erin Wolfram was hired as Associate Director.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Charles Taber moved that the minutes of the June 19, 2019, meeting be approved. Following the second of Jill Arensdorf, the motion carried.

UPDATES

- Transfer and Articulation Council update was provided by Jon Marshall, Allen Community College. TAAC met Sept 11th and reviewed TAAC Policy, Operating Procedures, and the Quality Assurance Report in preparation for the Kansas Core Outcome Group (KCOG) conference on October 18th. KCOG will be held at the KU Edwards campus for the second year, and Wichita State University has volunteered to host KCOG for the next two years.

The SWT Transfer Courses one page document and the Selection and Approval document was distributed. Both documents are located on the KBOR website.

OTHER MATTERS

- KCIA update was provided by Brad Bennett. The Kansas Council of Instructional Administrators (KCIA) held a meeting on September 17th. Thank you to the KBOR staff whom attended the meeting and gave insightful information. Several topics were discussed and KCIA looks forward to discussing some of these issues further with SCOCAO members. Two of the Professional Development Award recipients gave a presentation and KCIA looks forward to the presentations from the other two recipients at the next meeting.
- System Wide Transfer Course Inventory update was provided by Karla Wiscombe, KBOR. A new initiative this year is to automate reports for System Wide Transfer (SWT). Thank you to Cindy Farrier and her DRP staff in making this a possibility and to Samantha Christy-Dangermond for the valuable input. By automating the process, real-time SWT course information or Course Equivalency Guides on the website will be available for students, counselors, and advisors.

The KRSN Course Inventory reports for the institutions were distributed. Institutions have been putting in the 13 preliminary courses for the KCOG conference. Please review the KRSN Course Inventory reports for accuracy. If you have any questions, please contact Karla Wiscombe.

- Karla Wiscombe discussed the New CLEP exam, Spanish with Writing. The Spanish with Writing Exam information and the Credit by Examination policy were included in the agenda.
- Updating the CPL website information was provided by Samantha Christy-Dangermond, KBOR. The revised Credit by Examination policy was approved June 2019. Please ensure you have the correct information on your institution's website. Thank you ESU, FHSU, and WSU for already updating the information on your websites.
- Samantha Christy-Dangermond provided updates for Performance Reports and Performance Agreements.
 - Performance Reports
 - Seven institutions were approved for 100% funding at the BAASC September 3rd conference call.
 - Next group will be presented at the October BAASC conference call. Those institutions will be notified once the agenda is approved.
 - Other institutions will be presented at the November and possibly December conference calls.
 - If your institution did not receive 100% funding, an appeal process is available. Those institutions who wish to appeal will present their case at the December BAASC face to face meeting.
 - AY2020-2021 Bridge Performance Agreements Update
 - Thank you for your patience as we work through the AY2020-2021 Bridge Performance Agreements.
 - All Bridge Performance Agreements have been sent to the institutions.
 - Anticipate all the Bridge Performance Agreements will be finalized by October 18th.
- Open Educational Resource (OER) update was provided by Erin Wolfram. The OER statewide steering committee met for the first time on September 13th. Brian Lindshield, K-State, has agreed to chair the committee. The group conducted introductions and started where their institution is in the OER process. The group determined they will meet monthly electronically and face to face once per

semester. The group will further review the Student Advisory Councils action plan, and fine tune the definitions as well as the action items within the plan.

- Apply Kansas information was provided by Daniel Archer. October is Apply Kansas month, and this is a statewide campaign to increase the number of students who apply to college. KACRAO oversee the program and more information is available at: <https://www.kacrao.org/applyks>.

ADJOURNMENT

Rick Muma moved to adjourn the meeting. Following the second of Carl Lejuez, the motion passed. The Co-Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:48 a.m.

AGENDA

KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS
COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS
Pittsburg State University
Room 206
November 20, 2019
9:00 am – 9:50 am
or upon adjournment of SCOCAO
reconvene at noon

The Council of Chief Academic Officers will meet at Pittsburg State University, 1701 S. Broadway Street, Pittsburg, Kansas, 66762. We will meet in room 206 of the Overman Student Center.

I. Call To Order David Cordle, Chair

- A. *Approve minutes from October 16, 2019*

II. Requests

A. *Second Readings*

- 1. Master of Science in Business Analytics KU
- 2. Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies in Ethnic, Gender, and Identity Studies ESU

B. *Other Requests*

- 1. Act on Request for Approval of Name Change of the Bachelor of Science in Interior Architecture & Design KU
- 2. Act on Request for Approval of Name Change of the Master of Science in Business and Organizational Leadership KU
- 3. Act on Request for Approval of Name Change of the Master of Science in Business SCM KU
- 4. Creating a New School in College of Fine Arts WSU
- 5. Act on Request to Consolidate Bachelor of Science in Education with a Major in Physics and Bachelor of Science in Physics PSU
- 6. Act on Request to Create the School of Professional Studies at the KU Edwards Campus KU
- 7. Act on Request for Approval of Name Change of the Department of Apparel, Textiles, and Interior Design KSU

III. Council of Faculty Senate Presidents Update Greg Schneider, ESU

IV. Other Matters

- A. *Discuss Opportunities (new degree programs, partnerships, strategic initiatives, etc.) that Universities are Considering or Planning to Pursue in the Future* COCAO Members
- B. *Midwest Student Exchange Program (MSEP) Update* Samantha Christy-Dangermond
- C. *Discuss Recent ACT changes* Daniel Archer
- D. *Discuss Qualified Admissions Changes* Daniel Archer
- E. *Discuss Academic Affairs-Related Board Goals:* Daniel Archer
 - 1. Explore Positive pathways to help students who do not meet qualified admissions standards achieve success.
- F. *2 PLUS 2 Program Status Update* Daniel Archer
- G. *2019 Tilford Conference Update* KU
- H. *Elimination of NACAC Rule Preventing the Recruitment of Other Institutions' Students*
- I. *Date Reminders:*
 - 1. Program review Report Deadline is February 14, 2020

V. Adjournment

MINUTES

Council of Chief Academic Officers MINUTES Wednesday, October 16, 2019

The October 16, 2019 meeting of the Council of Chief Academic Officers was called to order by Chair David Cordle at 9:00 a.m. The meeting was held by conference call.

In Attendance:

Members:	David Cordle, ESU	Jill Arensdorf, FHSU	Charles Taber, K-State
	Jean Redeker, KU	Rick Muma, WSU	Daniel Archer, KBOR

Staff:	Karla Wiscombe	Sam Christy-Dangermond	Erin Wolfram
	Cynthia Farrier	Amy Robinson	

Others:	Lori Winningham, Butler CC	Chris Claterbos, KU	Dee Steinle, KU
	Jennifer Ball, Washburn	Professor Wintoki, KU	

Chair David Cordle welcomed everyone and roll call was taken for university members.

Approval of Minutes

Rick Muma moved to approve the minutes of the September 18, 2019 meeting. Chuck Taber seconded the motion and the motion passed.

First Program Readings

- Jide Wintoki, KU Professor of Finance and Director of Analytics, Information & Operations Management, presented a program overview for the Master of Science in Business Analytics from the University of Kansas. They currently have a successful Bachelor’s Degree in Business & Analytics and started with a dozen majors and have over 200 now. They have received input from students and industry and believe this major will be just as successful. No questions were presented to Professor Wintoki. Rick Muma, WSU, commented that they are looking at similar degree options.

If there are further questions or comments, Jean Redeker can be contacted. The second reading will go on the November COCAO agenda.

- David Cordle presented information for the proposed Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies in Ethnic, Gender, and Identity Studies at Emporia State University. This is going to be built on the existing minor, so the framework is already in place. Because the program is already being taught, there are no startup costs or new faculty needed. Rick Muma, WSU, commented that they are in the process of changing the name of their Women’s Studies Department to the same title ESU is proposing. Jean Redeker, KU, stated they have a similar program with some overlap, and their Area Director is supportive of the program. Jill Arensdorf, FHSU, stated their Sociology Department which houses a minor and certificate in this area, is supportive of ESU moving forward with this degree program. David Cordle asked if FHSU is having any conversations about building a major on this foundation. Jill responded that she is not aware of any.

If there are further questions or comments, David Cordle can be contacted. The second reading will go on the November COCAO agenda.

Second Program Readings

- The Committee reviewed and voted on the three programs for Kansas State University: Associate of Applied Science in Aviation Maintenance, Associate of Applied Science in Professional Pilot and Master of Industrial Design. The Committee also reviewed and voted on the Bachelor of Science in Diagnostic Science for KUMC. No further comments were presented from COCAO members since their first readings on September 18th.

By unanimous consent on each, COCAO approved the above programs for KSU and KUMC. They will now go on the COPS agenda for November.

OTHER MATTERS

- The next COCAO meeting is being held at PSU on November 20, 2019.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:20 a.m.

CURRENT FISCAL YEAR MEETING DATES

Fiscal Year 2020

<u>Meeting Dates</u>	<u>Agenda Material Due to Board Office</u>
August 8-10, 2019	
September 18-19, 2019	August 28, 2019 at noon
October 16-17, 2019 (WSU Campus Visit)	
November 20, 2019 (PSU)	October 30, 2019 at noon
December 18-19, 2019	November 26, 2019 at noon
January 15-16, 2020	December 26, 2019 at noon
February 19-20, 2020	January 29, 2020 at noon
March 18, 2020 (KUMC)	February 26, 2020 at noon
April 15, 2020 (KSU)	March 25, 2020 at noon
May 20-21, 2020	April 29, 2020 at noon
June 17-18, 2020	May 27, 2020 at noon

TENTATIVE MEETING DATES

Fiscal Year 2021

Meeting Dates

- TBD – Budget Workshop/Retreat
- September 16-17, 2020
- October 14-15, 2020
- November 18-19, 2020
- December 16-17, 2020
- January 20-21, 2021
- February 17-18, 2021
- March 17-18, 2021
- April 14-15, 2021
- May 19-20, 2021
- June 16-17, 2021

COMMITTEES (2019-2020)

Shane Bangerter, Chair
Bill Feuerborn, Vice Chair

Standing Committees

Academic Affairs

Allen Schmidt – Chair
 Shelly Kiblinger
 Cheryl Harrison-Lee
 Helen Van Etten

Fiscal Affairs and Audit

Mark Hutton – Chair
 Ann Brandau-Murguia
 Bill Feuerborn
 Jon Rolph

Governance

Shane Bangerter – Chair
 Mark Hutton
 Allen Schmidt
 Bill Feuerborn

Regents Retirement Plan

Shane Bangerter – Chair

Board Representatives and Liaisons

Education Commission of the States	Ann Brandau-Murguia
Postsecondary Technical Education Authority	Mark Hess Mike Johnson Rita Johnson
Midwest Higher Education Compact (MHEC)	Helen Van Etten Blake Flanders
Washburn University Board of Regents	Helen Van Etten
Transfer and Articulation Advisory Council	Shane Bangerter
Governor’s Education Council	Allen Schmidt Helen Van Etten