

# **JANUARY 15-16, 2014**

**Kansas Board of Regents**

2013-2014  
Fred Logan, Chair  
Kenny Wilk, Vice Chair

## **KANSAS BOARD OF REGENT MEMBERS:**

Shane Bangertter

Ann Brandau-Murguia

Mildred Edwards

Tim Emert

Fred Logan

Ed McKechnie

Robba Moran

Helen Van Etten

Kenny Wilk

## **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 and updated in 2012, the plan sets long-range achievement goals that are measurable, reportable, and ensure the state's higher education system meets Kansans' expectations.

## INCREASE HIGHER EDUCATION ATTAINMENT

### Aspirations

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

### Measures

- ★ State demographics with higher education participation levels of Kansas citizens, including underrepresented groups.
- ★ Postsecondary attainment of Kansans, by age groups, to the United States.
- ★ In-state postsecondary participation rates by age groups—traditional students, adults between the ages of 25-39, and adults between the ages of 40-64.
- ★ Number of Adult Basic Education (ABE) participants.
- ★ Percent of ABE participants in postsecondary education.
- ★ First to second year retention rates at universities, community colleges and technical colleges.
- ★ Three-year graduation rate for community and technical colleges.
- ★ Six-year graduation rate for universities.
- ★ Number of certificates and degrees produced.
- ★ Number of adults with college credit returning to complete a certificate/credential, associate or bachelor degree.

Learn more about the Kansas Board of Regents and find additional *Foresight 2020* information at [www.kansasregents.org/foresight\\_2020](http://www.kansasregents.org/foresight_2020).

## IMPROVE ECONOMIC ALIGNMENT

### Aspirations

- ★ Meet business and industry expectations for core workplace skills in mathematics/analytical reasoning, communication and problem solving.
- ★ Reduce workforce shortages in selected high demand fields.
- ★ Meet expectations of quality in all technical programs.
- ★ Enhance understanding of the role of university research in supporting the economy.
- ★ Continue to exceed the regional average for percent of credentials awarded in STEM fields.

### Measures

- ★ Performance of students on institutional assessments in three areas:
  1. Mathematics/Quantitative/Analytical Reasoning
  2. Written and Oral Communication,
  3. Critical Thinking/Problem Solving.
- ★ Percent graduates employed in Kansas post graduation.
- ★ Average wages earned by graduates post graduation.
- ★ Performance of students on selected third-party technical program certificate/credential assessments.
- ★ Number of certificates and degrees awarded in selected high-demand occupations.
- ★ Percent of credentials awarded in STEM fields.

## ENSURE STATE UNIVERSITY EXCELLENCE

### Aspiration

- ★ Improve the regional and national reputations of state universities.

### Measures

- ★ Selected regional and national rankings and other quality measures of research universities compared to peers.
- ★ Institutional performance of regional universities on quality measures compared to peers.
- ★ Amount and proportion of federal research dollars awarded.
- ★ Private giving to universities.

# BOARD GOALS 2013-2014

*Approved by the Kansas Board of Regents*



## INCREASE HIGHER EDUCATION ATTAINMENT

1. As the Board pursues its strategic goal of increasing educational attainment in Kansas to 60 percent of resident adults having a credential or degree by 2020, it will develop a methodology for identifying the gap in what is currently produced and what is needed for tracking progress in reaching the goal. This new methodology will be included in the annual Foresight 2020 report in January of 2014.
2. The Board will continue its efforts to improve transfer and articulation of general education courses throughout the system (1) by approving a quality assurance policy submitted by the Transfer and Articulation Advisory Council and by the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee and (2) by approving the proposed list of 13 additional courses for transfer by no later than January of 2014, and any other courses forwarded to the Board for approval by the Transfer and Articulation Advisory Council. In addition, the Board directs the Transfer and Articulation Advisory Council to begin addressing transfer issues of academic disciplines and report on its progress.
3. The Board will initiate a study on developmental education in the higher education system in Kansas and receive a set of recommendations for redesigning developmental education across the system no later than June of 2014.

## IMPROVE ECONOMIC ALIGNMENT

4. With the assistance of university leaders, the Board will study how the universities and the state of Kansas can best take advantage of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility (NBAF) at Kansas State University, National Cancer Institute (NCI) designation at the University of Kansas, and other major initiatives at each of the governed universities.

## ENSURE STATE UNIVERSITY EXCELLENCE

5. The Board will receive a panel presentation report from the CEOs of each of the research universities on the rankings that they track for their respective universities, and on the progress that they are making in improving those rankings.
6. In 2012-13, the Board adopted a policy on post-tenure review and charged each of the university CEOs to have their campus policies in place by April of 2014, except those that may need longer due to faculty negotiations. The Board will receive a panel presentation report from the leaders of the universities on their campus post-tenure review policies by no later than May of 2014.

January 15-16, 2014

BOARD ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE  
2013-2014 AGENDA TOPICS

- BAASC 13-01: Continue to assess performance agreement format to promote alignment with Foresight 2020 goals and continue to review performance agreements annually
- BAASC 13-02: Review policy from Transfer and Articulation Council on quality assurance; discuss progress on transfer and articulation – **COMPLETED**
- BAASC 13-03: Consider issues raised by entering into reciprocity compact for approval of out-of-state higher education institutions – **COMPLETED**
- BAASC 13-04: Developmental education
- BAASC 13-05: Teacher preparation – **COMPLETED**
- BAASC 13-06: Academic Calendar
- BAASC 13-07: Academic Program Review Report
- BAASC 13-08: Accreditation Report
- BAASC 13-09: Performance Reports
- BAASC 13-10: Qualified Admissions Report
- BAASC 13-11: Distance Education Report
- BAASC 13-12: Student Learning Outcomes Report
- BAASC 13-13: Adult Education Report
- BAASC 13-14: New Degree Granting Authority (Private Postsecondary)
- BAASC 13-15: Additional Degree Granting Authority (Private Postsecondary)
- BAASC 13-16: Degree and Certificate Programs Submitted from Community and Technical Colleges
- BAASC 13-17: New Degrees at Public and Municipal Universities
- BAASC 13-18: Career and Technical Education Program Alignment
- BAASC 13-19: Board Policies

January 15-16, 2014

FISCAL AFFAIRS AND AUDIT STANDING COMMITTEE  
2013-2014 AGENDA TOPICS

- FAA 13-01 Review and adopt Committee Organization and Agenda Plan for the year – **COMPLETED**
- FAA 13-02 Review each of the state universities organizational (functional) financial reporting structures, and consider development of a policy that specifically requires the state university Chief Executive Officer to designate a Chief Financial Officer with a description of roles and responsibilities - **COMPLETED**
- FAA 13-03 Further review and discussion of university budget issues i.e. balances, reductions, reallocations, enhancement requests and, specifically, resource plans and their alignment with strategic plans - **COMPLETED**
- FAA 13-04 Review of FY 2015 KBOR Office operating budget – **COMPLETED**
- FAA 13-05 Consider a change in state university audit procedures – **COMPLETED**
- FAA 13-06 Update on KSU Veterinary Medical Center enhancement funding (2012 Session)
- FAA 13-07 Review and discuss changes to the capital budgeting process, including review of the Educational Building Fund - **COMPLETED**
- FAA 13-08 Review current policies and consider whether a specific debt policy is needed
- FAA 13-09 Receive Internal Audit plans and meet with state university Internal Auditors
- FAA 13-10 Review state universities Annual Financial Reports, including financial statistics and ratios
- FAA 13-11 Development of the FY 2016 and FY 2017 Unified State Appropriation Request (capital and operating)
- FAA 13-12 Discuss and develop guidance for the FY 2015 State Universities tuition proposals
- FAA 13-13 Review and approve Johnson County Educational Research Triangle (JCERT) budgets (KU, KUMC, KSU)
- FAA 13-14 Study of financial projections related to Foresight 2020

January 15-16, 2014

KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
2013-2014 AGENDA TOPICS

- GOV 13-01 Review Committee Charter and Adopt Agenda/Schedule for the year – **COMPLETED**
- GOV 13-02 Consider conceal carry legislation/process for studying – **COMPLETED**
- GOV 13-03 Review university campus security reports
- GOV 13-04 Discuss CEO performance review format
- GOV 13-05 Consider university CEO search and selection processes and policies – **COMPLETED**
- GOV 13-06 Develop university CEO compensation policy
- GOV 13-07 Review policy on Council of Government Relations Officers (COGRO) – **COMPLETED**
- GOV 13-08 Review policy on Concurrent Enrollment (faculty qualifications and 24 credit hour limit) - **COMPLETED**
- GOV 13-09 Review student success plans progress
- GOV 13-10 Review proposed revisions to policies
- Geographic Jurisdiction (create exception for courses delivered on military reservations pursuant to contract with federal government) – **COMPLETED**
  - Multiple Year Appointments (KU proposal to add Med Center Clinical Track and Med Center Educator Track to types of appointments that may be made on a multiple year basis) – **COMPLETED**
  - Advising (BAASC proposal on improving/updating advising policy) – **COMPLETED**
  - Others as needed
- GOV 13-11 Review proposed regulation amendments
- Coordinated Institution Regulations (update existing regulations)
  - KU Qualified Admissions (address *Fisher* case concerns)
  - Others as needed
- GOV 13-12 Review new board member orientation process
- GOV 13-13 Follow-up to Retreat Discussion on Board governance and ethics – **COMPLETED**
- GOV 13-14 Discuss government relations/communications issues

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Item</b>	<b>Page</b>
Meeting Information and Schedule .....	1
Board Agenda .....	3
Minutes of Previous Meeting .....	7
Wednesday Consent Agenda .....	19
Wednesday Discussion Agenda .....	28
Thursday Consent Agenda .....	44
Thursday Discussion Agenda .....	52
Other Agendas	
Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee .....	71
Board Fiscal Affairs and Audit Standing Committee .....	74
Governance Committee .....	75
System Council of Presidents .....	87
Council of Presidents .....	89
System Council of Chief Academic Officers .....	94
Council of Chief Academic Officers .....	97
Resources	
Board Meeting Schedule .....	101
Deadlines for Agenda Item Submission .....	101
Board of Regents Committee Listing .....	102

## MEETING INFORMATION AND SCHEDULE

Unless noted, all meetings take place at the Curtis State Office Building (CSOB) at 1000 SW Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka, Kansas, 66612 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, January 15, 2014

<b>Time</b>	<b>Committee/Activity</b>	<b>Location</b>
8:45 am - 10:00 am	Governance Committee	Conference Room B
8:45 am - 9:00 am	System Council of Chief Academic Officers	Kathy Rupp Room
9:00 am or Adjournment	Council of Chief Academic Officers	Kathy Rupp Room
10:00 am - Noon	Council of Faculty Senate Presidents	Kan-Ed Conference Room
10:00 am - Noon	Students' Advisory Committee	Conference Room C
10:00 am - 11:50 am	Fiscal Affairs & Audit Standing Committee	Board Room
10:30 am - Noon	Academic Affairs Standing Committee	Kathy Rupp Room
10:30 am - 11:00 am	System Council of Presidents	Suite 530
11:00 am or Adjournment	Council of Presidents	Suite 530
Noon - 1:15 pm	Lunch <i>Board of Regents &amp; President Tompkins</i>	Conference Room B
Noon - 1:15 pm	Lunch <i>Council of Chief Academic Officers</i>	Kathy Rupp Room
1:30 pm	Board of Regents Meeting	Board Room
6:00 pm	Governor's State of the State	Statehouse
7:30 pm or Adjournment	Dinner <i>Board of Regents and President Tompkins</i>	Blue Moose



**Thursday, January 16, 2014**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Committee/Activity</b>	<b>Location</b>
8:00 am	Breakfast <i>Board of Regents, President Tompkins, State University CEOs and Legislative Liaisons</i>	Suite 530
9:30 am	Board of Regents Meeting	Board Room
11:30 am	Lunch <i>Board of Regents &amp; President Tompkins</i>	Conference Room B

# MEETING AGENDA

The Kansas Board of Regents will meet in the Board Room located in the Curtis State Office Building at 1000 SW Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka, Kansas, 66612.

## Wednesday, January 15, 2014

- I. Call To Order** Regent Logan, Chair
  - A. *Approve Minutes*  
December 18-19, 2013 Meeting p. 7
  
- II. Introductions and Reports**
  - A. *Introductions*
  - B. *Report from the Chair* Regent Logan, Chair
  - C. *Report from the President & CEO* Andy Tompkins, President & CEO
  - D. *Report from Council of Presidents* President Shonrock
  - E. *Report from Council of Faculty Senate Presidents* Sheryl Lidzy
  - F. *Report from Students' Advisory Committee* Chris Roberts
  - G. *Report from Classified and Support Staff Council* Laurie Pitman
  - H. *Report from Unclassified Staff Council* Sharon Brown
  
- III. Standing Committee Reports**
  - A. *Academic Affairs* Regent Moran
  - B. *Fiscal Affairs & Audit* Regent McKechnie
  - C. *Governance* Regent Logan
  
- IV. Approval of Consent Agenda**
  - A. *Academic Affairs*
    - 1. Approve a Bachelor of Science in Personal Financial Planning (CIP 52.0804) – KSU Gary Alexander, VP, Academic Affairs p. 19
  - B. *Fiscal Affairs & Audit*
    - 1. Authorize Razing of Wheatshocker Apartments – WSU Eric King, Director of Facilities p. 26
    - 2. Amend FY 2014 Capital Improvement Requests to Include the Bill Snyder Stadium Master Plan Phase III – KSU p. 26
    - 3. Amend FY 2014 Capital Improvement Requests to Include Video-Sound Upgrades – KSU p. 27
    - 4. Authorize the Purchase of Property – KSU p. 27

**V. Consideration of Discussion Agenda**

<i>A. Governance</i>		Regent Logan	
1.	Receive Panel Presentation on How the Universities and the State of Kansas Can Best Take Advantage of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility (NBAF) at Kansas State University, National Cancer Institute (NCI) Designation at the University of Kansas, and the Technology Park at Wichita State University	President Schulz, KSU Chancellor Gray-Little, KU President Bardo, WSU	<i>p. 28</i>
<i>B. Academic Affairs</i>		Regent Moran	
1.	Accept Annual Report on Qualified Admissions	Gary Alexander, VP, Academic Affairs	<i>p. 29</i>
2.	Act on Amendments to the Board’s Academic Advising Policy		<i>p. 36</i>
<i>C. Fiscal Affairs &amp; Audit</i>		Regent McKechnie	
1.	Amend FY 2014 Capital Improvements Plan – KU	Eric King, Director of Facilities	<i>p. 38</i>
2.	Amend FY 2015 Capital Improvements Requests and Approve Program Statement for Technology II Facility Project – WSU		<i>p. 38</i>
<i>D. Other Matters</i>			
1.	Receive Update on Emporia State University’s Campus Master Plan and Strategic Plan	President Shonrock	<i>p. 39</i>
2.	Receive a Presentation on the Effects of Sequestration on University Research	Steve Warren, Vice Chancellor, Research & Graduate Studies University of Kansas	<i>p. 39</i>
3.	Act on Proposed Amendment to Memorandum of Agreement with PSU/KNEA – PSU	Theresa Schwartz, Associate General Counsel	<i>p. 40</i>
4.	Consider Request to Convert Classified Positions to Unclassified University Support Staff Positions – FHSU	Julene Miller, General Counsel	<i>p. 42</i>

**Thursday, January 16, 2014**

**VI. Introductions and Reports**

A. *Introductions*

B. *Report from System Council of Presidents*

President Heilman

**VII. Approval of Consent Agenda**

A. *Academic Affairs*

1. Act on Requests for Additional Degree Granting Authority for:

Gary Alexander,  
VP, Academic Affairs

*p. 44*

- a) Columbia Southern University
- b) University of Phoenix
- c) The Pennsylvania State University
- d) Georgetown University
- e) WellSpring School of Allied Health
- f) Michigan State University
- g) University of Southern California
- h) DeVry University

2. Act on Request for Degree and Certificate Program Submitted by North Central Kansas Technical College

Rita Johnson,  
Senior Director, Workforce  
Innovation

*p. 50*

**VIII. Consideration of Discussion Agenda**

A. *Presentation*

1. Receive Annual Foresight 2020 Progress Report

Andy Tompkins,  
President and CEO

*p. 52*

B. *Academic Affairs*

Regent Moran

1. Act on Performance Agreements

Gary Alexander,  
VP, Academic Affairs

*p. 53*

2. Act on Amendments to the Board's Concurrent Enrollment Policy

*p. 55*

3. Act on Request for Program Alignment

Rita Johnson,  
Senior Director, Workforce  
Innovation

*p. 64*

C. *Fiscal Affairs & Audit*

Regent McKechnie

1. Approve Distribution of State Funds for Governor's Technical Education

Diane Duffy,  
VP, Finance & Administration

*p. 67*

*D. Other Matters*

1. Receive Governor's Budget Recommendations and Act on Non-Budgetary Legislative Items p. 69  
Diane Duffy,  
VP, Finance & Administration  
Mary Jane Stankiewicz,  
Director, Government  
Relations & Communications

**IX. Adjournment**

# MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

## I. Call To Order

Regent Logan, Chair

### A. Approve Minutes

### KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

#### MINUTES

December 18-19, 2013

The December 19, 2013, meeting of the Kansas Board of Regents was called to order by Chairman Fred Logan 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:

Fred Logan, Chairman  
Kenny Wilk, Vice Chairman  
Shane Bangerter  
Ann Brandau-Murguia  
Mildred Edwards  
Tim Emert  
Ed McKechnie  
Robba Moran  
Helen Van Etten

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regent Moran moved that the minutes of the November 20-21, 2013 regular meeting and the December 6, 2013 special meeting be approved. Following the second of Regent Bangerter, the motion carried.

#### INTRODUCTIONS

President Schulz introduced Prema Arasu, CEO and Vice Provost of K-State Olathe; John Buckwalter, Dean of the College of Human Ecology; and Ryan Swanson, Associate Vice President for the Division of Facilities. President Schulz announced Cindy Bontrager has been named Kansas State University's new Vice President for Administration and Finance. Chancellor Gray-Little introduced the new Director of the University Press of Kansas, Chuck Myers.

#### GENERAL REPORTS

##### REPORT FROM PRESIDENT AND CEO

President Tompkins reminded everyone that the Board meeting dates for February and March have been changed to accommodate the universities' spring break. The meeting dates are as follows: Wednesday, February 12, Thursday, February 13, Wednesday, March 12, and Thursday, March 13. These dates were brought to the Board during the Board's August retreat. President Tompkins also announced the Governor's State of the State Address is scheduled for Wednesday, January 15.

##### REPORT FROM COUNCIL OF PRESIDENTS

President Shonrock presented the Council of Presidents' report. The Council received an update from the Council of Chief Academic Officers on the Tilford Conference. The Council of Business Officers gave an update regarding streamlining the capital construction and financing processes. This topic was also discussed in the Board's Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee. The CEOs received a legislative update and approved Kansas State University's Bachelor of Science in Personal Financial Planning (CIP 52.0804). This program will be forwarded to the Board for consideration. The Council of Presidents also discussed the processes involved

when utilizing tuition to pay debt service. A recommendation for any statutory changes to K.S.A. 76-742 will be presented to the Board at the January meeting.

#### REPORT FROM COUNCIL OF FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENTS

Sheryl Lidzy presented the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents' report. The Council discussed the prior learning initiative, dependent tuition waivers, shared governance, and post-tenure review. Dr. Lidzy reported the Council is disappointed with the timing, content, and the introduction of the proposed Board policy amendment regarding improper use of social media. The Council recommends the Board delay action on this item to allow faculty to respond and give input before the Board considers the amendment.

#### REPORT FROM STUDENTS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Taylor Gravett, Pittsburg State University's Student Body President, reported the Students' Advisory Committee continues to discuss the students' higher education day at the Statehouse. Higher education day is scheduled for February 11.

#### STANDING COMMITTEE AND OTHER REPORTS

##### ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Regent Moran presented the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) report. The Committee received an update on teacher preparation from Kansas State University's Education Dean, Debbie Mercer, and Wichita State University's Education Dean, Shirley Lefever-Davis. Regent Moran stated BAASC has heard from all the universities regarding teacher preparation and plans to provide the Board with an overview. BAASC continued its discussion on the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA). A recommendation regarding SARA will be presented to the Board at Thursday's meeting. Additionally, BAASC received staff updates on transfer and articulation and developmental education.

##### FISCAL AFFAIRS AND AUDIT

Regent McKechnie presented the Board Fiscal Affairs and Audit Standing Committee report. The Committee reviewed a draft policy requiring each state university CEO to designate a "Chief Financial Officer." The draft policy will be forwarded to the Council of Presidents for review before it is presented to the Board for consideration. The Committee also reviewed and discussed changes to the capital budgeting, construction, and financing processes. The changes described below will require statutory amendments and the Committee conceptually endorsed them. Regent McKechnie asked the Board to review the proposed changes. These items will be brought back at the January meeting for Board consideration. Regent McKechnie also reported the Committee will start its tuition and budgeting process discussions at the Committee's January and February meetings.

- a. **Increase the threshold to \$1.0 million for projects requiring formal procurement of architectural or engineering services (requires statutory change and the Board has previously approved).** Presently K.S.A. 75-1253 (and by extension projects authorized under K.S.A. 76-7,125 et. seq.) requires formal procurement of architectural or engineering services, when the project is expected to be more than \$750,000 in the case of architectural services or \$500,000 in the instance of engineering services. Increasing the thresholds in these statutes to \$1.0 million would streamline the process by permitting use of in-house or on-call professional services (which are competitively bid) for additional numbers of projects, thereby saving time and in some instances inflationary costs.
- b. **Streamline the Notice and Public Hearing Requirements for Alternative Construction Methods (requires statutory change).** Presently a separate Kansas Register posting and public hearing is held by the State Building Advisory Committee on each request for alternative project delivery (i.e. Construction Manager at Risk and Design/Build). The State Building Advisory

Committee has developed its own criteria and has considerably more experience at dealing with such requests, than was the case when the current law was approved in 2006. Further, public participation in such hearings has been negligible. The schedule for such approvals could be reduced by approximately six weeks if a Kansas Register posting and public hearing were collapsed into the process for bidders to submit Statements of Qualification.

- c. **Allow use of Educational Building Fund/ Rehabilitation and Repair allocations for short term debt service (requires statutory change.)** Presently relatively large rehabilitation and repair projects must be divided into separate projects so that they can fit within a university's annual rehabilitation and repair allocation. Improved efficiency and cost savings could be achieved through financing a single large project and using EBF/R&R revenue for debt retirement over a short term using short-term financing vehicles. The actual projects would continue to be subject to KBOR approval and KBOR approval would be required for each instance of such debt issuance. Legislative safeguards would continue to be through the Joint Committee on Building Construction, which annually receives updates from the campuses and annually reviews rehabilitation and repair projects. However, such an amendment would preclude seeking formal statutory legislative approval for each instance of temporary debt issuance. It is noteworthy KDOT presently has such blanket authority, through legislation approved approximately three years ago.

#### GOVERNANCE

Regent Logan reported the Governance Committee approved proposed amendments to the Board's Advising Policy and Concurrent Enrollment Policy. These policy amendments will be forwarded to the Board for consideration at the January meeting. The Committee also approved the proposed policy addressing improper use of social media, which the Board will consider later in the agenda. Additionally, the Governance Committee received the annual campus safety updates from Fort Hays State University and Kansas State University

#### APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Regent Wilk moved, with the second of Regent Edwards, that the Consent Agenda be approved. The motion carried.

#### Academic Affairs

##### WINDOW/DOOR REPLACEMENT FOR OLIVER HALL – KU

The University of Kansas received authorization to replace all of Oliver Hall's exterior windows, a storefront door system, and an exterior door. The estimated cost of the project is \$721,000, which will be funded with Housing System Repairs, Equipment and Improvement funds.

##### INSTALLATION OF A SPECIALIZED ENERGY CONTROL SYSTEM – KUMC

The University of Kansas Medical Center received authorization to install a specialized energy control system, which will reduce total energy consumption on campus. The estimated cost of the project is \$2.1 million. The project will be financed through the Kansas Development Finance Authority (KDFA) for a term not to exceed seven years.

##### FY 2014 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND REVISED PROGRAM STATEMENT FOR WIEST HALL REPLACEMENT PROJECTS – FHSU

Fort Hays State University received approval to amend its FY 2014 Capital Improvements requests for replacement of Wiest Hall. FHSU plans to change the number of beds from 405 to 497 for an estimated cost of \$37 million. The increase in cost is due to changing the room type from double occupancy to single bed rooms. FHSU is considering bonding the increased cost



of the projects, which is approximately \$20 million. FHSU also received approval of its revised Program Statement.

## **CONSIDERATION OF DISCUSSION AGENDA**

### *Presentations*

#### **UPDATE ON THE KANSAS BIOSCIENCE AUTHORITY**

Jerry Boettcher, former Regent and current Regents' appointee to the Kansas Bioscience Authority (KBA), presented an update on the KBA. The KBA was established by the Kansas Legislature in 2004 to help grow the bioscience sector. Mr. Boettcher reviewed the KBA's funding, which is used to invest in companies and universities working in bioscience. He stated the KBA is working to improve the return on invested funds and the new president and CEO is working hard to rebuild the confidence and trust of the KBA. President Schulz and Chancellor Gray-Little stated the KBA is important to help attract top faculty members to the state universities.

#### **UPDATE ON K-STATE 2025**

President Schulz presented an update on K-State 2025. The goal of Kansas State University is to be recognized as one of the nation's top 50 public research universities by 2025. KSU's plan includes seven themes: 1) Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Discovery, 2) Undergraduate Educational Experience, 3) Graduate Scholarly Experience, 4) Engagement, Extension, Outreach and Service, 5) Faculty and Staff, 6) Facilities and Infrastructure, and 7) Athletics. Under each of these themes are specific outcomes and activities. From 2011 to 2013 the following areas have grown at the University: total research awards, fundraising, enrollment, and alumni participation. President Schulz reviewed KSU's rankings compared to its peer institutions. In several areas KSU has seen an increase in ranking. President Schulz noted some of the next steps for 2025 are to link and strengthen budget/funding processes and performance reporting.

(PowerPoint filed with Official Minutes)

### **BREAK**

The Chairman called for a break at 2:41 p.m. and resumed the meeting at 2:51 p.m.

### *Academic Affairs*

#### **CONTINUANCE OF DR. JUERGEN A. RICHT AS REGENTS DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR – KSU**

Gary Alexander, Vice President of Academic Affairs, introduced Kansas State University's request to continue Dr. Juergen A. Richt's designation as a Regents Distinguished Professor. Board policy establishes the criteria for nomination of a distinguished professor, which includes a comprehensive performance evaluation every five years. Dr. Richt began serving as a Regents Distinguished Professor in August, 2008 and has completed the evaluation process. Regent Moran moved to approve, and Regent Emert seconded. The motion carried.

#### **REPORT ON THE STUDY OF RETENTION AND GRADUATION RATES OF STUDENTS ADMITTED AS EXCEPTIONS**

Vice President Alexander reported the Legislature adopted K.S.A. 76-717a in 2012, which requires the Board of Regents to "conduct a study regarding the retention and graduation rates of students who are accepted into state universities through the exceptions to the minimum admission standards prescribed in K.S.A. 76-717." Vice President Alexander stated the study compares the retention and graduation rates of first-time, full-time freshmen admitted as exceptions with those of first-time, full-time freshmen who met admission standards for selected years. It also compares transfer students admitted as exceptions with transfer students who met admission standards, and the number of credit hours passed by degree-seeking freshmen admitted as exceptions with degree-seeking freshmen who met admission standards. Vice President Alexander noted the state

universities admit a small number of students as exceptions to the regular admission standards, and the data shows these students have lower retention, graduation and course completion rates compared to students who met admission standards. This result is not surprising because many of these students, though not all, have gaps in their educational preparation. Dr. Alexander noted the requirement of student success plans, which the Board approved last year, is intended to improve the success of students admitted as exceptions. Regent Moran moved to accept the report and to present the findings to the Senate and the House Education Committees before January 13, 2014. Regent Edwards seconded, and the motion carried.

Regent McKechnie stated he is concerned about not meeting the Board’s Foresight 2020 goal regarding retention and graduation rates. He asked the Board to consider amending the Qualified Admissions statute to allow the Board to implement more rigorous admission standards more quickly. Currently the statute requires a four year implementation, and Regent McKechnie would like to amend it to two years.

FY 2015 HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICE RATE ADJUSTMENT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY STATE UNIVERSITIES

Diane Duffy, Vice President of Finance and Administration, presented the proposed FY 2015 housing and food service rate adjustments for final action. Regent McKechnie moved to approve. Following the second of Regent Moran, the motion carried.

(Complete Listing of Adjustments filed with Official Minutes)

ALLOCATION OF FY 2015 REHABILITATION AND REPAIR APPROPRIATION – SYSTEMWIDE

The FY 2015 proposed allocation of the Rehabilitation and Repair appropriation was presented by Eric King, Director of Facilities. He expects \$35,000,000 will be available from the Education Building Fund. Regent McKechnie moved that the project list for the FY 2015 rehabilitation and repair appropriation be approved. With the second of Regent Van Etten, the motion carried. The following summary reflects the authorized totals:

	<u>Allocation</u>
The University of Kansas	\$9,404,000
The University of Kansas Medical Center	3,938,000
Kansas State University	10,465,000
Wichita State University	3,843,000
Emporia State University	2,114,000
Pittsburg State University	2,583,000
Fort Hays State University	<u>2,653,000</u>
TOTAL	\$35,000,000

BOND RESOLUTION – CONSTRUCTION OF AND IMPROVEMENTS TO PERFORMING ARTS CENTER, INDOOR EVENTS CENTER, AND OVERMAN STUDENT CENTER; REDEEM TEMPORARY NOTES PREVIOUSLY ISSUED FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE HOUSING SYSTEM; AND ECONOMIC REFUNDINGS OF PRIOR DEBT – PSU

General Counsel Julene Miller introduced Pittsburg State University’s request for the issuance of revenue bonds in an aggregated amount not to exceed \$36,000,000 plus costs and reserves. The purpose of the bonds is to 1) acquire, construct and improve a performing arts center and an indoor events center, 2) make improvements and construct an addition to the Overman Student Center, 3) redeem temporary notes previously issued for improvements to the PSU housing system, and 4) refund certain outstanding revenue bonds relating to other facilities at the University. Generally available unencumbered funds of the University will be used to secure and debt service the bonds for the construction of and improvements to the performing arts center, indoor events center, and Overman Student Center. The repayment of the bond anticipation notes and the refunding bonds will also be secured and debt serviced with a pledge of generally available unencumbered funds of the

University. Regent McKechnie moved to approve and authorize the Chair and President and CEO to execute the Resolution, a Pledge of Revenue Agreement(s) and various other documents relating to the security and payment of such bonds. Regent Emert seconded, and the motion carried.

(Resolution filed with Official Minutes)

#### NAMING OF BUILDING – KU

Chancellor Gray-Little requested the Board name the University of Kansas' Computer Services Facility on the Lawrence campus in honor of G. Baley Price. Dr. Price was a distinguished professor emeritus and longtime chair of the Department of Mathematics who was primarily responsible for the creation of the computer center in 1956. Regent Emert moved to approve, and Regent McKechnie seconded. The motion carried. The Computer Services Facility will be named Price Hall.

#### Governance

#### AMEND EXISTING BOARD POLICY TO INCLUDE LANGUAGE REGARDING IMPROPER USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA

General Counsel Miller presented the proposed revision to the Board's Policy Manual to include language regarding improper use of social media. Board staff drafted the language to clarify the balance between university employees' free speech rights and the university employers' rights to efficiently and effectively operate the institution. The policy language was carefully drafted to acknowledge and respect the rights of employees to speak as private citizens on matters of public concern, while also recognizing the employers' right to take action in situations involving unprotected speech. The proposed policy lists instances of unprotected speech, as determined by the United States Supreme Court. Most of the language in the proposed policy was drawn directly from the United States Supreme Court free speech precedents. It has been limited to social media communications because that form of communication can so easily be disseminated widely and instantaneously. General Counsel Miller stated the Kansas Attorney General's Office reviewed the proposed policy and found it to be constitutionally sound on its face under a First Amendment analysis. Regent Logan asked that the following questions be noted along with General Counsel Miller's responses:

1. Was great care taken on this policy project? Yes, General Counsel Miller spent more time crafting and tweaking the language for this policy than she has on any other Board policy.
2. Is it fair to say in drafting this policy, we have been very careful to protect the First Amendment rights of university employees but also we have addressed the employees' responsibilities to the university? Yes.
3. It is a policy that applies to all university employees, is that correct? Correct.
4. It is not a policy that is focused just on faculty? Correct, it applies to all regular university employees but it would not apply to student hourly employees.
5. To be clear, the policy is prospective? Yes, it is prospective only. There is no intent to apply this policy to any incident that has already occurred.
6. In the way the Board has handled this, there is nothing unusual in terms of the way the policy has been developed or the timing in which it has been presented to the Board? No, other than the time it took to draft the language. The process for bringing the proposed policy to the Board is the same as any other policy. General Counsel Miller noted she has been with the Board Office since 2007 and this has been the process during her tenure with one exception. When the Board was reviewing sections of the Board's Policy Manual, which included 50 to 100 policies or pages at a time, those were brought for first and second read because of the volume.

7. Other than that special circumstance this is presented in the Board's usual course? Yes.
8. You worked with the Office of the Attorney General, is that correct? Yes.
9. And the assessment as I understand it is that the policy meets both First Amendment and procedural due process requirements? Correct.
10. With respect to procedural due process, language already in the policy contains grievance procedures, correct? Right, it is intended that any existing processes for an individual would remain intact. The university would use whatever process is already in place depending on which category of employee is at issue. There are different processes for different categories of employees.

Regent Logan asked General Counsel Miller to walk through the sections of the proposed policy and talk about the cases or statutory language that helped develop the policy language. The first paragraph defines "social media" and "improper use of social media." The first three romanettes are exceptions the U.S. Supreme Court carved out to identify types of language that is not protected speech. Romanette i. is what the Court calls the fighting words exception, which first came out of *Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire* in 1987. General Counsel Miller stated the language for this policy was kept content neutral as required by the Court in a later case (RAV).

Romanette ii. is an exception that came out of *Garcetti v. Caballos* in 2006 and deals with governmental employees making statements in the course of their official duties. In this context, the Court has held that they are not speaking as private citizens for First Amendment purposes and the Constitution does not insulate their communications from employer discipline.

Romanette iii. is an extension of ii. because it controls the employee's use of or handling of information that they acquire or have access to because of their official position.

Romanette iv. requires a balancing because it applies to speech that is made by an employee but not in the capacity as an employee. It applies to instances in which an employee is speaking as a private citizen on a matter of public concern. General Counsel Miller emphasized that typically this is protected speech but there are instances when that individual's right to speak has to be balanced against the university's or employer's right to be able to efficiently and effectively provide the service that it exists to provide. This language is drawn from *Rankin v. McPherson* (1987), *Pickering v. Board of Education* (1968), *Connick v. Myers* (1983) and *Waters v. Churchill* (1994).

The Board heard comments from the audience. Regent Wilk moved to approve the policy language. Regent Emert seconded, and the motion carried. The following amendments were approved:

**C. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, FACULTY AND STAFF**

...

**6. SUSPENSIONS, TERMINATIONS AND DISMISSALS**

a. Felony Offenses

- i Felony Conviction. The chief executive officer of a state university has the authority to discharge any employee, including a tenured faculty member, immediately upon conviction of any felony.

ii Felony Charge. The chief executive officer of a state university has the authority to discharge or place on leave without pay any employee, including a tenured faculty member, who has been charged with a felony offense. Prior to any such determination, the employee shall be given notice of the proposed action and an opportunity to respond.

b. Other

Faculty and staff may also be suspended, dismissed or terminated from employment for reasons of significant reduction in or elimination of the funding source supporting the position, program discontinuance, financial exigency, or for just cause related to the performance of or failure to perform the individual's duties or for violation of the reasonable directives, rules and regulations, and laws of the institution, the Board and the State of Kansas or the United States.

The chief executive officer of a state university has the authority to suspend, dismiss or terminate from employment any faculty or staff member who makes improper use of social media. "Social media" means any facility for online publication and commentary, including but not limited to blogs, wikis, and social networking sites such as Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter, Flickr, and YouTube. "Improper use of social media" means making a communication through social media that:

- i. directly incites violence or other immediate breach of the peace;
- ii. when made pursuant to (i.e. in furtherance of) the employee's official duties, is contrary to the best interests of the University;
- iii. discloses without authority any confidential student information, protected health care information, personnel records, personal financial information, or confidential research data; or
- iv. subject to the balancing analysis required by the following paragraph, impairs discipline by superiors or harmony among co-workers, has a detrimental impact on close working relationships for which personal loyalty and confidence are necessary, impedes the performance of the speaker's official duties, interferes with the regular operation of the university, or otherwise adversely affects the university's ability to efficiently provide services.

In determining whether the employee's communication constitutes an improper use of social media under paragraph (iv), the chief executive officer shall balance the interest of the university in promoting the efficiency of the public services it performs through its employees against the employee's right as a citizen to speak on matters of public concern, and may consider the employee's position within the university and whether the employee used or publicized the university name, brands, website, official title or school/department/college or otherwise created the appearance of the communication being endorsed, approved or connected to the university in a manner that discredits the university. The chief executive officer may also consider whether the communication was made during the employee's working hours or the communication was transmitted utilizing university systems or equipment. This policy on improper use of social media shall apply prospectively from its date of adoption by the Kansas Board of Regents.

c. Grievance Procedure

- i Each state university shall establish and publish grievance procedures for use by faculty and staff in appealing employment decisions of the institution. The procedures shall provide the employee with notice of the action to be taken, the reasons for the action where appropriate, and an opportunity to be heard. A copy of all institutional grievance procedures shall be provided to the institution’s general counsel for review prior to becoming effective.
- ii The decision of the chief executive officer, or the chief executive officer’s designee, concerning any grievance appealing employment decisions of the university shall be final and is not subject to further administrative review by any officer or committee of the university or by the Board of Regents.

Other Matters

FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTIAL PROFILE

President Tompkins presented the proposed advertisement for the Fort Hays State University presidential position. The advertisement lists characteristics and describes the application process. Regent Moran moved to approve, and Regent Bangerter seconded. The motion carried.

(Advertisement filed with Official Minutes)

**RECESS**

The Chairman recessed the meeting at 3:45 p.m.

**RECONVENE**

Chairman Logan reconvened the meeting at 9:15 a.m. on Thursday, December 19.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

- Fred Logan, Chairman
- Kenny Wilk, Vice Chairman
- Shane Bangerter
- Ann Brandau-Murguia
- Mildred Edwards
- Ed McKechnie
- Robba Moran
- Helen Van Etten

**MEMBER ABSENT:**

- Tim Emert

**INTRODUCTIONS**

David Reist, President of Highland Community College, presented each Regent with a bottle of wine from the first vintage of Highland’s Enology program.

**REPORTS**

**REPORT FROM SYSTEM COUNCIL OF PRESIDENTS**

President Heilman presented the System Council of Presidents’ report. The Council received a report from the System Council of Chief Academic Officers. The Academic Officers gave an update on transfer and articulation, the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA), and reverse transfer. The System Council of Presidents also discussed reverse transfer and reviewed a proposed policy presented by Board staff. The

CEOs discussed credit hour eligibility for reverse transfer and asked that opt-out language be included in the policy.

### **APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA**

Regent Moran moved, with the second of Regent Edwards, that the Consent Agenda be approved. The motion carried.

#### *Academic Affairs*

#### **ADDITIONAL DEGREE GRANTING AUTHORITY FOR COLUMBIA COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, WRIGHT CAREER COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI**

Columbia College received approval to offer a Master of Education in Educational Leadership.

The University of Maryland University College received authorization to offer the following degrees: 1) Bachelor of Science in Health Services Management, 2) Bachelor of Science in Public Safety Administration, 3) Bachelor of Science in Nursing (RN-BSN), 4) Master of Science in Data Analytics, and 5) Master of Science in Digital Forensics and Cyber Investigation.

Wright Career College received approval to offer a Master of Business Administration at its Overland Park campus.

Authorization was given to the University of Cincinnati to offer an Associate of Applied Science in Health Information Systems Technology, a Master of Arts in Speech Language Pathology, and a Master of Science in Health Informatics.

### **CONSIDERATION OF DISCUSSION AGENDA**

#### *Presentation*

#### **UPDATE ON ENGINEERING INITIATIVE**

Blake Flanders, Vice President of Workforce Development, presented an update on the University Engineering Initiative Act. The Legislation requires the Secretary of Commerce, the Kansas Board of Regents, Kansas State University, University of Kansas, Wichita State University, and private industries to develop a plan to ensure engineering industry partners find new talent, designs and techniques to fuel the economic growth and business success of Kansas. The goal is for the three universities to graduate 1,365 engineering students annually by 2021. Vice President Flanders stated in 2008, the universities graduated 875 engineering students. Using the 2008 number as a baseline, each university will need to graduate 164 additional students to meet the Legislative goal. Vice President Flanders discussed the importance of increasing enrollments, increasing engineering internships, and increasing scholarship dollars awarded to engineering students. He also reviewed the legislative appropriations and noted these appropriations require a dollar for dollar match from non-state sources. An analysis and report of the universities' progress and goal trajectory is due to the Legislature by the beginning of the 2017 regular session.

(PowerPoint filed with Official Minutes)

Academic Affairs

NEW DEGREE GRANTING AUTHORITY FOR OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

Gary Alexander, Vice President of Academic Affairs, presented Oregon State University's request to offer 33 online degrees. Regent Moran moved to approve, and Regent Van Etten seconded. The motion carried. The following online degree programs were approved:

- 1) Bachelor of Arts in Anthropology
- 2) Bachelor of Arts in Economics
- 3) Bachelor of Arts in German
- 4) Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies
- 5) Bachelor of Arts in Political Science
- 6) Bachelor of Arts in Psychology
- 7) Bachelor of Arts in Sociology
- 8) Bachelor of Arts in Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies
- 9) Bachelor of Science in Agricultural Science
- 10) Bachelor of Science in Anthropology
- 11) Bachelor of Science in Computer Science
- 12) Bachelor of Science in Economics
- 13) Bachelor of Science in Environmental Economics and Policy
- 14) Bachelor of Science in Environmental Science
- 15) Bachelor of Science in Fisheries and Wildlife
- 16) Bachelor of Science in General Horticulture
- 17) Bachelor of Science in Human Development & Family Sciences
- 18) Bachelor of Science in Liberal Studies
- 19) Bachelor of Science in Natural Resources
- 20) Bachelor of Science in Political Science
- 21) Bachelor of Science in Psychology
- 22) Bachelor of Science in Sociology
- 23) Bachelor of Science in Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies
- 24) Master of Education in K-12 Education
- 25) Master of Education in Adult Education
- 26) Master of Science in Counseling
- 27) Master of Science in Fisheries and Wildlife Administration
- 28) Master of Science in Health Physics
- 29) Master of Science in Math Education
- 30) Master of Science in Natural Resources
- 31) Master of Science in Science Education
- 32) Doctor of Education in Community College Leadership
- 33) Doctor of Philosophy in Counseling

APPOINTMENTS TO THE KANSAS PRIVATE POSTSECONDARY ADVISORY COMMISSION

Vice President Alexander presented three candidates to be appointed to the Kansas Private Postsecondary Advisory Commission. Linda Proctor is the Vice President of Global Compensation and Benefits and will represent health occupations. Robert Maxwell is Executive Vice President and Trust Officer of Kaw Valley Bank and will represent business and industry. Nicole Hughes is the owner/operator of 360 Barber College and will represent owner/operator for institutions under 125 in enrollment. These three individuals will replace Eryn Myrick, Gerald Lauber, and Irene Narvaez, whose terms expire on December 31, 2013. Vice President Alexander noted these are four-year terms that will start on January 1, 2014. Regent Moran moved to approve the appointments. Following the second of Regent Van Etten, the motion carried.



**KANSAS SYSTEM-WIDE TRANSFER APPEALS PROCESS**

Vice President Alexander presented the proposed Kansas System-Wide Transfer Appeals process. The Board directed the Transfer and Articulation Council to develop an appeals process for dealing with situations unresolved at the campus level. Vice President Alexander reviewed the conditions of appeal and the appeal procedures. Regent Moran moved to approve, and Regent Edwards seconded. The motion carried. The following process will be included in the *Kansas Transfer and Articulation Operating Procedures*:

**Kansas System-Wide Transfer Appeal Process****Conditions of Appeal**

The Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) established a Transfer and Articulation Council (TAAC) in 2011, to provide oversight and implementation of the Board's transfer and articulation policy. The TAAC's mission is to create structures and processes that facilitate student transfer and degree completion within Kansas higher education, while assuring quality and adherence to the agreed-upon learning outcomes of system-wide courses. A system-wide appeal process ensures equitable resolution of transfer concerns between institutions, and institutional appeal processes ensure students a clear path for petitioning disputes regarding transfer decisions on individual campuses. Cases may be appealed in which institutions are unable to resolve disagreements regarding transferring a course approved by the KBOR for system-wide transfer. In such cases, the sending institution may submit an appeal to the KBOR Vice President for Academic Affairs within 30 calendar days of notification of the transfer denial.

These conditions are required for system-wide appeals:

- (1) The course being appealed must have been approved for system-wide transfer,**
- (2) The parties must have exhausted the appeal processes at the institutional levels \*(refer to campus websites listed below containing campus level appeal processes), and**
- (3) The sending institution can provide evidence that the decision made by the receiving institution was inconsistent with the Kansas system-wide transfer policy.**

To initiate the statewide appeal process, a written request must be submitted to the KBOR Vice President for Academic Affairs. Each request must include the following documentation:

- Written documentation that the appeal processes and discussions for resolution have been exhausted at both the receiving and sending institutions
- Supporting documents, which could include course descriptions, course syllabi, course objectives, learning outcomes, transcripts or other relevant information
- Rationale from the sending institution as to why the appeal should be supported

**Appeal Procedures**

1. Appeals must be submitted by the Provost/Chief Academic Officer of the sending institution to the KBOR Vice President for Academic Affairs, who will refer the appeal to the Chair of the Quality Assurance Subcommittee of the TAAC.
2. The Quality Assurance Subcommittee will review arguments and evidence presented in the appeal at the next regularly scheduled meeting and make a recommendation to the full TAAC either to:

- a. Uphold the receiving institution’s decision to deny the transfer credit in question; or
  - b. Require the acceptance of the transfer credit in question by the receiving institution.
3. The TAAC then reviews the recommendation of the Quality Assurance Subcommittee and makes a decision to approve or deny the appeal. The TAAC will inform all parties involved within two weeks of its decision.
- a. If the receiving institution accepts the decision of the TAAC, the process ends; or
  - b. If the receiving institution disagrees with the decision of the TAAC, the Provost/Chief Academic Officer can appeal to the KBOR President and CEO, or designee.
4. The President and CEO, or designee, will convene an *ad hoc* Appeal Subcommittee composed of three members of the TAAC, with one of the members being a Regent. No member of the subcommittee may be from an institution involved in the appeal. The President and CEO, or designee, and the *ad hoc* Appeal Subcommittee will review all documentation provided through the statewide appeal process, and will make a final determination, to either:
- a. Uphold the decision of the TAAC and require the receiving institution to abide by that decision; or
  - b. Overturn the decision of the TAAC, in which the receiving institution is not required to implement the TAAC’s decision.

\*The following university websites list individual campus appeal procedures:

- <http://www.emporia.edu/regist/com/transferdb.html>
- <http://www.fhsu.edu/admissions/transfer-students/>
- <http://www.k-state.edu/admissions/#p=apply/transfer.html>
- <http://www.pittstate.edu/admission/undergraduate/transfer.dot>
- <http://admissions.ku.edu/credit/transfer/>
- <http://www.washburn.edu/admissions/undergraduate/transfer/transfer-guides.html>
- [http://webs.wichita.edu/?u=academicaffairs&p=/Transfer\\_and\\_Articulation/transferandarticulation/](http://webs.wichita.edu/?u=academicaffairs&p=/Transfer_and_Articulation/transferandarticulation/)

**RECOMMENDATION ON THE STATE AUTHORIZATION RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT (SARA) FROM THE BOARD ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE**

Vice President Alexander stated the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) recommends the State of Kansas consider becoming a member of the Midwest Higher Education Compact (MHEC) State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) for the benefit of Kansas students and the institutions of higher education. In order to allow such membership by the State, BAASC recommends the Board request the Kansas Legislature to: 1) amend the present Kansas statutes as necessary in order to allow the Board to sign and carry out the terms of the SARA agreement, including making the Board the “portal agency” with all necessary enforcement authority under the SARA agreement; and 2) provide necessary fee and cost recovery authority to the Board for functions related to participation in SARA, and the continued enforcement of the Private and Out-of-State Postsecondary Act, as it becomes necessary. Regent Moran stated BAASC spent a considerable amount of time discussing SARA and moved to approve the recommendation. Regent Van Etten seconded, and the motion carried.

**Other Matters**

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Mary Jane Stankiewicz, Director of Government Relations and Communications, presented the non-budgetary legislative items for the 2014 legislative session. Last year the Board approved the Emporia State University land sale bill and the University of Kansas land exchange with the KU Endowment Association bill. Both these bills did not make it through the legislative process last year but carry over and are still active for this session. Another bill that is still active from last year is the Midwest Higher Education Commission (MHEC) property insurance bill.

Ms. Stankiewicz also presented some new non-budgetary legislative items for the Board to consider. At the November Board meeting, some Board members were interested in codifying the Board's 60% attainment goal. The Regents discussed submitting a Concurrent Resolution that captures Foresight 2020 instead of codifying the 60% attainment goal. Regent Wilk and Regent Edwards will work with staff to draft a Concurrent Resolution for the Board to consider at the January Board meeting.

Ms. Stankiewicz stated the Council of Presidents approved amending the referendum statute to allow a CEO to utilize tuition to pay debt service on an academic building without going through the referendum process. Instead of conducting a referendum the CEOs would consult with the student body representatives. This amendment would give the CEOs more flexibility when it comes to funding new academic building projects. Ms. Stankiewicz noted the proposed amendment would still involve students but in a different manner. Several Board members raised concerns about limiting student involvement. There were also comments expressing a need to give the CEOs more flexibility especially in these difficult financial times. The Board will review the proposed language at the January Board meeting.

Regent McKechnie asked the Board to consider amending the Qualified Admission statute to allow the Board to implement more rigorous admission standards more quickly. He would like to continue this discussion at a future Board meeting.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 10:32 a.m. Regent Wilk moved, followed by the second of Regent Moran, that the Board of Regents recess into executive session for 60 minutes starting at 10:45 a.m. in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room to discuss personnel matters related to non-elected personnel. Participating in the executive session were members of the Board and President Tompkins. At 11:45 a.m. the meeting returned to open session.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m.

---

Andy Tompkins, President and CEO

---

Fred Logan, Chair

# CONSENT AGENDA

## II. Introductions and Reports

- A. *Introductions*
- B. *Report from the Chair* Regent Logan, Chair
- C. *Report from the President & CEO* Andy Tompkins, President & CEO
- D. *Report from Council of Presidents* President Shonrock
- E. *Report from Council of Faculty Senate Presidents* Sheryl Lidzy
- F. *Report from Students' Advisory Committee* Chris Roberts
- G. *Report from Classified and Support Staff Council* Laurie Pitman
- H. *Report from Unclassified Staff Council* Sharon Brown

## III. Standing Committee Reports

- A. *Academic Affairs* Regent Moran
- B. *Fiscal Affairs & Audit* Regent McKechnie
- C. *Governance* Regent Logan

## IV. Approval of Consent Agenda

- A. *Academic Affairs*
  - 1. **Approve a Bachelor of Science in Personal Financial Planning (CIP 52.0804) – KSU** **Gary Alexander,**  
**VP, Academic Affairs**

### Summary

*Universities may apply for approval of new academic programs following the guidelines in the Kansas Board of Regents Policies and Procedures Manual. Kansas State University has submitted an application for approval of a Bachelor of Science in Personal Financial Planning. The proposing academic unit has responded to all of the requirements of the program approval process. No other university utilizes this Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) code. Board staff concurs with the Council of Presidents and Chief Academic Officers in recommending approval.*

### Background

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Program Summary</b>
Program Identification CIP	52.0804
2. Academic Unit	College of Human Ecology, School of Family Studies & Human Services
3. Program Description	Currently, Personal Financial Planning is a sub-plan within the Family Studies and Human Services degree. The proposal is for a stand-alone major in Personal Financial Planning to meet the professional demands of solidifying Personal Financial Planning as an independent and growing program. Students take courses in general personal finance, insurance, taxes, investments, retirement planning, and estate planning. Furthermore, students take coursework to develop skills to connect with clients. The curriculum includes several business and economics courses to provide an understanding of the financial and economic world in which consumers reside. A final capstone course integrates all financial planning content and provides experience in writing and presenting a financial plan. Graduates find placement in comprehensive or small financial planning practices, insurance,

	<p>investments, retirement planning, as well as in banks, trust departments, and Cooperative Extension. There is a real need for financial planners in our society as people strive to manage their money and reach their financial goals, providing tremendous growth projections for the field.</p>
<p>Demand/Need for the Program</p>	<p>There are currently more internship and job opportunities available for undergraduate students than we have graduating students. With the aging population and growing demand for financial planners, this issue is not likely to disappear soon. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics projected 32% job growth for financial planners between 2010 and 2020. The Kansas Department of Labor projected even greater growth, at 43% for the same period.</p>
<p>5. Comparative/Locational Advantage</p>	<p>A 2011 <i>Financial Planning</i> magazine article ranked Kansas State University's Personal Financial Planning program as a top 10 financial planning program. In 2012, <i>Financial Planning</i> once again ranked Kansas State University's Personal Financial Planning program as one of the 25 great schools for future financial planners. Kansas State University's Personal Financial Planning program students have always been selected as finalists for the national Ameriprise/Financial Planning Association financial planning competition. They have won 5 of the 11 competitions, which is more than any other university. We maintain our accreditation with the Certified Financial Planning Board of Standards and a memorandum of understanding with the Association for Financial Counseling and Planning Education so that our students may take the rigorous exams of both associations. Fort Hays State University also has a financial planning program registered with the Certified Financial Planning Board of Standards; however their program is a concentration within the Bachelor of Business Administration degree, versus our proposed stand-alone degree.</p>
<p>6. Curriculum</p>	<p>The primary academic objectives are to provide students with the opportunity to: Solve real world problems; Apply their creativity in helping others meet challenges; Develop and refine communication skills; Work in multidisciplinary and diverse teams; Obtain an understanding of 21<sup>st</sup> century technologies; Learn through instruction by faculty committed to both teaching and research; Participate in professional groups and activities; Assume leadership positions in school and professionally; Understand and conduct scholarly research in personal financial planning; Be part of a growing program that is devoted to building the finest personal financial planning program in the nation while meeting the growing need for well-trained graduates.</p> <p>Other academic program objectives include: Providing courses that meet the criteria to maintain the program's registered status with the Certified Financial Planning Board of Standards, Inc. Students will be able to comprehensively integrate financial planning content areas into the development of financial plans and targeted financial planning recommendations that meet specific individual and family need sets; Provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the ability to apply verbal, written, and graphic communication and presentation skills to client presentations; Provide students with opportunities to integrate knowledge about family finance, relationships, and management issues in families that are experiencing financial distress through the development of a comprehensive assessment and plan of action based on possible alternatives; Provide opportunities for students to study abroad; Encourage students to participate in scholarly research; Encourage student participation in professional publishing activities; Encourage students to take and pass the national CFP Certification</p>

	<p>Examination.</p> <p>Specific courses are outlined on the following pages.</p>
7. Faculty Profile	<p>The Personal Financial Planning unit in the School has five Assistant Professors (three holding the AFC and/or CFP® designation) ) and one Professor working with the undergraduate degree program. The unit recently received approval to hire another tenure-track Assistant Professor to serve undergraduate and graduate student course needs.</p>
8. Student Profile	<p>The typical undergraduate student in personal financial planning is interested in helping people, but is also quantitatively inclined. Having interpersonal and strong quantitative skills is a unique combination; so we attract the very best students. The typical student would be considered a “traditional” undergraduate in terms of age and family composition. However, we do have some non-traditional students seeking a new career in financial planning.</p>
9. Academic Support	<p>The personal financial planning major’s development and growth will be supported by seven faculty members, all with terminal degrees in the field; three of them are Certified Financial Planners. Additionally, the School’s full-time academic advisor will provide support services and contribute to recruiting additional students.</p>
10. Facilities & Equipment	<p>No additional space requirements, facilities, renovations will be immediately needed. We intend to add computer stations to an existing classroom upon the attainment of sufficient external funding.</p>
11. Program Review, Assessment, Accreditation	<p>In FY 2019, the degree programs in the College of Human Ecology will go through a formal review process by the Kansas Board of Regents. In the last review of the program as contained within the School of Family Studies and Human Services degree, there were no issues identified with the Personal Financial Planning unit. An internal review occurs on an annual basis as required by the CFP Board since we maintain registration with the CFP Board to allow students to take the CFP Exam upon graduation.</p>

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

I. Identify the new degree: B.S. Personal Financial Planning

---

<b>Course Name &amp; Number</b>	<b>Credit Hours</b>
<a href="#"><u>COMM 105 Public Speaking IA</u></a>	2
or	
<a href="#"><u>COMM 106 Public Speaking I</u></a>	3
<a href="#"><u>ENGL 100 Expository Writing I</u></a>	3
<a href="#"><u>ENGL 200 Expository Writing II</u></a>	3
<a href="#"><u>ECON 110 Principles of Macroeconomics</u></a>	3
PSYCH 110 General Psychology	3
SOCIO 211 Introduction to Sociology	3
Humanities	6
Natural and physical sciences	7
<a href="#"><u>STAT 350 Business and Economic Statistics I</u></a>	3
<a href="#"><u>MATH 100 College Algebra</u></a>	3
or	
A college-level calculus course	3
<a href="#"><u>GNHE 210 Foundations of Human Ecology</u></a>	1
<a href="#"><u>FSHS 350 Family Relationships and Gender Roles</u></a>	3
or	
<a href="#"><u>GNHE 310 Human Needs</u></a>	3
Core Courses: FSHS 100 Family Financial Planning as a Career	1 (taken twice)
FSHS 110 Introduction to Human Development	3
FSHS 301 The Helping Relationship	3
FSHS 405 Advanced Personal Financial Planning	3
FSHS 595 Professional Seminar in Family Financial Planning	3
FSHS 756 Financial Counseling	3
FSHS 760 Families, Employment Benefits, and Retirement	3
FSHS 762 Investing for the Family's Future	3
FSHS 764 Estate Planning for Families	3
FSHS 772 Personal Income Taxation	3
ACCTG 231 Accounting for Business Operations	3
ACCTG 241 Accounting for Investing and Financing	3
ECON 120 Principles of Microeconomics	3
ECON 530 Money and Banking	3
FINAN 460 Insurance	3
or	
FSHS 766 Insurance Planning for Families	3
MANGT 390 Business Law I	3
MKTG 400 Introduction to Marketing	3
AGEC 513 Agricultural Finance	3
or	
FINAN 450 Principles of Finance	3
Electives: varies by student	23-24
Research: none required	
Practica: none required	
<b>Total: 120</b>	

**Fiscal Summary for Proposed Academic Program  
IMPLEMENTATION YEAR FY 2015**

**Institution: Kansas State University  
Proposed Program: Personal Financial Planning**

<b>Part I. Anticipated Enrollment</b>	Implementation Year		Year 2		Year 3	
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time
	40 B.S.	2 B.S.	50 B.S.	3 B.S.	60 B.S.	5 B.S.
B. Total SCH taken by all students in program		1,224 B.S.		1,536 B.S.		1,860 B.S.
<b>Part II. Program Cost Projection</b>						
D. In implementation year one, list all identifiable General use costs to the academic unit(s) and how they will be funded. In subsequent years, please include only the additional amount budgeted.						
	Fall, Implementation Year	Year 2		Year 3		
Costs:	0	0	0	0	0	
Salaries						
OOE	0	0	0	0	0	
Total	0	0	0	0	0	

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_



*B. Fiscal Affairs & Audit*

**1. Authorize Razing of Wheatshocker Apartments – WSU**

Wichita State University requests authorization to raze building #65, Wheatshocker Apartments. Wheatshocker Apartments has served as a student residence hall since its renovation in 1994. Originally constructed in 1965, it served as an independent housing complex for the community. Wichita State University purchased the building in 1994, and completely renovated the facility to serve as student housing. The facility, which is located on the Southeast edge of the main campus, is a 6-story building with a poured concrete support structure a first floor of brick veneer and the rest of the building covered in EFIS (Exterior Finish and Insulation System.)

The building condition value as of 2012 is 76, which places it in the deficient category and current renewal cost is \$ 37,785,504. Due to the buildings current configuration as a residence hall, and the high cost to renovate again to make it functional for University use, the University recommends that the building be razed, since it is not cost effective to repurpose the building. Adding to that, the site that Wheatshocker Apartments occupies has been designated in the University’s recently completed Master Plan prepared by Sasaki as the proposed site for the future “Innovation Campus” proposed by President Bardo.

It is anticipated that Wheatshocker Apartments will be razed upon completion of the new Residence Hall on or about August 6, 2014. Funding for the estimated \$1.5 million project will come from a bond issued by Wichita State University for the razing and several other projects.

**2. Amend FY 2014 Capital Improvement Requests to Include the Bill Snyder Stadium Master Plan Phase III – KSU**

K-State Athletics requests the addition of Bill Snyder Stadium Master Plan Phase III to the FY 2014 Capital Improvement plans. This phase would reconfigure the North end of Bill Snyder Family Stadium, provide new football operations and training facilities, provide new sports medicine facilities, provide new equipment receiving and storage facilities, provide new academic support space and facilitate game-day support. The budget is estimated to be \$50 million. The project will be privately funded and administered through the K-State Foundation. No State or University funds would be involved. Actual construction will start dependent upon scheduling complexities and fund-raising success.

**3. Amend FY 2014 Capital Improvement Requests to Include Video-Sound Upgrades – KSU**

K-State Athletics requests the addition of Video-Sound system upgrades to the FY 2014 Capital Improvement plans. This project would ultimately update the video boards and sound systems in Bill Snyder Family Stadium, Bramlage Coliseum and Tointon Family Stadium. The budget is estimated to be \$12 million. The project will be privately funded and administered through the K-State Foundation. No State or University funds would be involved. Individual components will be updated starting late in FY 2014 and continuing through FY 2017.

**4. Authorize the Purchase of Property – KSU**

Kansas State University requests approval to purchase the old hospital building located at 1105 Sunset Avenue Manhattan, Kansas 66502 from the Mercy Regional Health Center. The property was originally constructed as an acute care hospital but later closed as a hospital in early 2003.

Kansas State University began leasing part of the space in August 2003 for the student health care center known as Lafene Health Center and later added space for student tutoring offices and research lab space for Kinesiology. The three-story building comprises 89,036 gross square feet, is located on 5.482 acres and is in close proximity to the K-State campus. Two appraisals have been completed with the highest market value of \$7,200,000. Mercy Regional Health Center is requesting to retain approximately 25,000 square feet for two years. The University has agreed to purchase the building for \$6,825,000 and provide fifty percent of the closing costs. The building will be financed from a combination of University general fees and restricted fees cash balances and will be repaid using central resources. The funding for maintenance of the building will be provided from university resources. The legal description of the property follows:

*A tract of land located in the Southeast Quarter of Section 12, Township 20 South, Range 7 East of the Sixth Principal Meridian, city of Manhattan, Riley County Kansas.*

# DISCUSSION AGENDA

## V. Consideration of Discussion Agenda

### A. Governance

1. **Receive Panel Presentation on How the Universities and the State of Kansas Can Best Take Advantage of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility (NBAF) at Kansas State University, National Cancer Institute (NCI) Designation at the University of Kansas, and the Technology Park at Wichita State University**

Regent Logan

**President Schulz, KSU**  
**Chancellor Gray-Little, KU**  
**President Bardo, WSU**

### Summary

*One of the Board Goals for this year was to have a discussion on how to leverage the assets of the universities to benefit the universities and the state. The Governance Committee briefly discussed this issue with the presidents and chancellor at its November committee meeting and asked that the full panel presentations to the Board begin in January. The first panel discussion will include presentations by President Schulz at Kansas State University, Chancellor Gray-Little at the University of Kansas, and President Bardo at Wichita State University.*

*Topics will include NBAF at KSU, NCI at KU, and the Technology Park at WSU. It is anticipated that the Board will hear presentations from the regional university presidents in February.*

B. Academic Affairs

1. Accept Annual Report on Qualified Admissions

Regent Moran

Gary Alexander,  
VP, Academic Affairs

**Summary and Recommendation**

Annual reports on admission of the 2012-2013 freshmen class and 2012-2013 transfer students are mandated by K.S.A. 76-717. This statute requires the Board to submit to the Legislature information on the following categories of student admissions: (1) the number and percentage of freshmen class admissions permitted as exceptions to the minimum admissions standards and (2) the number and percentage of transfer student admissions permitted as exceptions to the minimum admissions standards. Staff recommends acceptance of this report for submission to the Legislature to fulfill K.S.A. 76-717 reporting requirements.

**Background**

K.S.A. 76-717, which established admission criteria for state universities, requires the Board to submit an annual report that includes the following information on student admissions: (a) the number and percentage of **freshmen class admissions** permitted as exceptions to the minimum admissions standards (Table 1) and (b) the number and percentage of **transfer student admissions** permitted as exceptions to the minimum admissions standards (Table 6).

Though not required by statute, Tables 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8 are included to place admission, enrollment and denial information in a broader context. In addition, an addendum provides an overview of the current Qualified Admissions criteria.

**Freshmen Applicants**

Required Report #1. Number of Resident Freshmen Exceptions (Table 1)

K.S.A. 76-717 requires that, on or before January 31 of each year, the Board of Regents report to the legislature on the number and percent of resident freshmen admitted as exceptions. The statute specifies this information be disaggregated by institution. The number of resident freshmen admitted as exceptions is limited by statute to 10 percent of the university’s total freshmen admissions.

Table 1 presents the number and percent of resident freshmen students admitted under the 10% exception window, disaggregated by institution. No institution exceeded the 10% limit.

*Table 1: Number of Resident Freshmen Exceptions*

	Exceptions	Admits	Percent
<b>Emporia State University</b>	110	1,327	8.3%
<b>Fort Hays State University</b>	135	1,868	7.2%
<b>Kansas State University</b>	298	8,432	3.5%
<b>Pittsburg State University</b>	121	2,299	5.3%
<b>University of Kansas</b>	59	11,870	0.5%
<b>Wichita State University</b>	44	3,385	1.3%

*Voluntary Information on Freshmen Applicants (Optional Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5)*

Though not required by statute, Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 provide information on freshmen exceptions, admission by categories, enrollment rates and denial rates. The Board of Regents has decided to voluntarily include information in Tables 2 through 5 to provide a broader context for freshmen admissions.

Table 2 presents the number and percent of non-resident freshmen students admitted as exceptions, disaggregated by institution. The Board of Regents has set the maximum number of exceptions under this category as either 10 percent of the total number of admitted non-resident freshmen, or 50 students, whichever is greater. Kansas State University (K-State) exceeded the use of the exception window by 2.3% for this report (2012-2013) and by 1% on last year's report (2011-2012). Consequently, K-State has 85 fewer allowable exceptions in 2013-2014.

*Table 2: Number of Non-Resident Freshmen Exceptions*

	<b>Exceptions</b>	<b>Admits</b>	<b>10% Percent or 50 students, whichever is greater (the greater is shown)</b>
<b>Emporia State University</b>	21	143	21 students
<b>Fort Hays State University</b>	59	586	10.1%
<b>Kansas State University</b>	338	2,756	12.3%
<b>Pittsburg State University</b>	61	835	7.3%
<b>University of Kansas</b>	107	6,128	1.7%
<b>Wichita State University</b>	9	287	3.1%

Table 3 displays the aggregate number of students admitted under the ACT, class rank or precollege curriculum criteria. Students are counted only in the criterion on which they were admitted even though they may have met more than one criterion. Table 3 shows 74.6% of resident students under the age of 21 who graduated from high school were admitted under the test score criterion; 7.5% were admitted on the class rank criterion; and 9.3% were admitted on the curriculum criterion. Approximately one percent of resident freshmen applicants were admitted on the GED criterion and 3.3% of resident freshmen applicants gained admission by virtue of being at least 21 years of age with a high school diploma. Universities chose to admit as exceptions 4.2% of resident applicants and 5.5% of non-resident applicants who did not meet minimum admission criteria.

*Table 3: Freshmen Admitted by Categories*

	Resident		Non-Resident	
	State Totals	Percent of Admits	State Totals	Percent of Admits
<b>Test Score</b>	13,759	74.6%	7,244	67.5%
<b>Class Rank</b>	1,380	7.5%	1,055	9.8%
<b>Curriculum</b>	1,711	9.3%	1,456	13.6%
<b>GED</b>	224	1.2%	23	0.2%
<b>21+ H.S Diploma</b>	605	3.3%	362	3.4%
<b>Exception</b>	767	4.2%	595	5.5%

Table 4 and displays the “yield rate,” or the number of freshmen students admitted under the test score, class rank, precollege curriculum, GED or 21+ diploma criteria, or as exceptions, who actually enrolled.

*Table 4: Freshmen Admitted by Categories Who Enrolled*

	Resident		Non-Resident	
	Enrolled	Yield Rate <sup>1</sup>	Enrolled	Yield Rate <sup>1</sup>
<b>Test Score</b>	6,663	48.4 %	1,550	21.3 %
<b>Class Rank</b>	633	45.8 %	204	19.3 %
<b>Curriculum</b>	1,042	60.9 %	427	29.3 %
<b>GED</b>	171	76.3%	5	2.8%
<b>21+ Diploma</b>	390	64.5%	193	53.3%
<b>Exception</b>	482	62.8 %	226	37.9 %

<sup>1</sup>Yield Rate is the number of students who enrolled divided by the number of students who were admitted.

Table 5 shows the number of freshmen applicants denied admission to state universities.

*Table 5: Number of Freshmen Applicant Denials*

	Resident			Non-Resident		
	Denials	Applied	Percent	Denials	Applied	Percent
<b>Emporia State University</b>	18	1,202	1.5 %	2	145	1.4 %
<b>Fort Hays State University</b>	106	1,388	7.6 %	100	686	14.6 %
<b>Kansas State University</b>	20	5,696	0.4 %	8	2,764	0.3 %
<b>Pittsburg State University</b>	41	1,505	2.7 %	58	893	6.5 %
<b>University of Kansas</b>	177	5,919	3.0 %	513	6,641	7.7 %
<b>Wichita State University</b>	120	3,218	3.7 %	35	322	10.9 %

**Transfer Applicants**

Required Report #2: Transfer Students Admitted as Exceptions (Table 6)

K.S.A. 76-717 requires the Board of Regents to report the following to the legislature on or before January 31 of each year: (1) the number and percent of resident transfer students admitted as exceptions, and (2) the number and percent of non-resident transfer students admitted as exceptions. The statute specifies this information be disaggregated by institution. The number of resident transfer exceptions is limited to 10% of the university’s resident transfer admissions. The number of non-resident transfer exceptions is limited to 10% of the university’s non-resident transfer admissions.

Table 6 presents the number and percent of transfer students admitted by each state university under the 10% exception window. This information is disaggregated by institution and by residency status.

*Table 6: Number of Transfer Students Admitted as Exceptions*

	Resident			Non-Resident		
	Exceptions	Admits	Percent	Exceptions	Admits	Percent
<b>Emporia State University</b>	11	664	1.7%	2	76	2.6%
<b>Fort Hays State University</b>	82	1,819	4.5%	96	1,152	8.3%
<b>Kansas State University</b>	20	1,852	1.1%	6	974	0.6%
<b>Pittsburg State University</b>	8	599	1.3%	9	275	3.3%
<b>University of Kansas</b>	45	1,693	2.7%	8	668	1.2%
<b>Wichita State University</b>	52	2,261	2.3%	5	243	2.1%

*Voluntary Information on Transfer Student Admissions and Denials (Optional Tables 7 and 8)*

Table 7 and Table 8 are not required by statute. The information is voluntary and included because the tables provide information that contextualizes the number of transfer exceptions admitted. Table 7 displays the “yield rate,” or number of admitted transfer students who actually enrolled in the university. Transfer students meeting minimum admission requirements were admitted under the GPA criterion.

*Table 7: Admitted Transfer Students Who Enrolled*

	State Total: Resident			State Total: Non-Resident		
	Admitted	Enrolled	Yield Rate <sup>1</sup>	Admitted	Enrolled	Yield Rate <sup>1</sup>
<b>GPA</b>	8,670	6,264	72.2 %	3,262	1,766	54.1 %
<b>Exception</b>	218	169	77.5 %	126	93	73.8 %

<sup>1</sup>Yield Rate is the number of students who enrolled divided by the number of students who were admitted.

The number of transfer applicants denied admission to state universities is presented in Table 8.

*Table 8: Number of Transfer Applicant Denials*

	Resident			Non-Resident		
	Denials	Applied	Percent	Denials	Applied	Percent
<b>Emporia State University</b>	0	664	0.0%	0	76	0.0%
<b>Fort Hays State University</b>	6	1,825	0.3%	18	1,170	1.5%
<b>Kansas State University</b>	17	1,869	0.9%	69	1,043	6.6%
<b>Pittsburg State University</b>	6	605	1.0%	7	282	2.5%
<b>University of Kansas</b>	69	1,762	3.9%	79	747	10.6%
<b>Wichita State University</b>	95	2,356	4.0%	14	257	5.4%



## Addendum

### Admission Criteria for Freshmen Applicants

K.S.A. 76-717 requires resident and non-resident freshmen applicants under the age of 21 to meet one of the following criteria to gain admittance to a state university: (1) graduate from an accredited high school and earn a minimum ACT score of 21; (2) graduate from an accredited high school and in the top one-third of the class; (3) graduate from an accredited high school and complete the precollege curriculum with a GPA of at least 2.0 for residents and 2.5 for non-residents; or (4) graduate from an unaccredited high school and earn a minimum ACT score of 21; or (5) earn a GED with the prescribed minimum scores (Kansas residents only).

When making admission decisions for freshmen applicants under the age of 21 who graduate from an accredited high school, state universities review student materials in the following order: ACT score, class rank and precollege curriculum. The process works as follows:

1. Students with a composite ACT score of 21 or higher (or a SAT score of 980 or higher) are admitted under the test score criterion.
2. If the student's ACT test score is below 21, the university reviews the student's high school class rank. Students graduating in the top one-third of their high school class are admitted under the class rank criterion.
3. If the student's ACT test score is below 21 and the student ranks in the bottom two-thirds of the high school class, the university reviews the student's GPA in the precollege curriculum. Kansas residents with a 2.0 GPA (or higher) on the precollege curriculum are admitted under the curriculum criterion; non-residents with at least a 2.5 GPA on the precollege curriculum are admitted under the curriculum criterion.

Kansas residents 21 and older must meet one of the following criteria to gain admittance to a state university as freshmen: (1) graduate from an accredited high school; (2) graduate from an unaccredited high school; or (3) earn a GED with the prescribed minimum scores. Non-resident freshmen applicants 21 and older must meet one of the following criteria to be considered for admission to a state university: (1) graduate from an accredited high school or (2) earn a GED with prescribed minimum scores.

### *Exceptions to the Minimum Admission Standards*

State universities may, at their discretion, admit applicants who do not meet the minimum freshmen admissions criteria. The number of resident freshmen admitted as exceptions is limited by statute to 10 percent of the university's total freshmen admissions. The number of non-resident freshmen exceptions is limited to either 10 percent of the total number of admitted non-resident freshmen, or 50 students, whichever is greater. Each state university has a written policy to guide decisions about exceptions.

### Admission Criterion for Transfer Applicants

State universities are required to admit resident transfer applicants who have earned at least 24 credit hours of transferable coursework with a cumulative grade point average of at least 2.0 on a 4.0 scale. State universities may admit non-resident transfer applicants who have met these minimum criteria, but are not required to do so. State universities may adopt additional and/or more stringent standards to admit non-resident transfer applicants.

*Exceptions to the Minimum Admission Standards*

State universities may admit transfer applicants who have earned less than a 2.0 on 24 or more transferable credit hours, but the number of these exceptions is limited by statute. The number of resident transfer exceptions is limited to 10% of the university's resident transfer admissions. The number of non-resident transfer exceptions is limited to 10% of the university's non-resident transfer admissions. Admitting applicants as exceptions is at the discretion of the state university.

**2. Act on Amendments to the Board’s Academic Advising Policy**

**Summary and Recommendations**

*At its May 16, 2013 meeting, the Board revised its policy on academic advising, eliminating the requirement of an annual report. The Council of Chief Academic Officers was asked to recommend a new procedure for campuses to report on their advising systems. The policy proposed in this document has been reviewed by BAASC and the Council of Presidents, and, upon the recommendation of the Board Governance Committee, is now presented to the Board for its consideration.*

**Background**

As Foresight 2020 illustrates, student success is a strong component of institutional success. Student success depends on attention to such issues as retention and graduation rates, enrollment, persistence, relationship building, leadership development, career preparedness, and character development. These are all critical for students to succeed academically, personally, and professionally.

Academic advising is just one of many factors that contribute to student success and in turn institutional success—albeit a critical one. Because the needs of students vary, institutions tailor academic advising to meet the needs of individual students who may fall into one or more of the following categories: at-risk students, first-year students, first-generation students, returning adult students, students with children, veterans, students in the military, students with disabilities, international students, transfer students, students of color, high-achieving students, students at a distance, etc. Academic advising is further customized for those completing the general education curriculum, those who are completing the discipline-specific requirements, and those who are transitioning from general education to discipline-specific courses.

Because of the complexity of academic advising, institutions employ professional advisors and faculty advisors, with support from, and referrals made to, offices that offer such services as counseling, career and employment services, tutoring, study abroad opportunities, disability services, wellness services, money management services, research opportunities, service learning opportunities, etc. Its complexity makes it difficult to capture the character and impact of academic advising in a single annual report. Therefore, the Council of Chief Academic Officers recommends institutions provide a brief report every three years, beginning in spring 2016, as described in section d. of the proposed revised policy on Academic Advising.

**Proposed Revision to Current Policy**

The policy on academic advising was revised May 16, 2013, to eliminate the section requiring an annual report on academic advising, with the understanding that the Council of Chief Academic Officers (COCAO) would recommend a procedure for campuses to report on their advising systems. COCAO recommends the following revision to the Board policy on Academic Advising.

10. ACADEMIC ADVISING

- a. Effective academic advising is central to the educational mission of the Board of Regents. To ensure that all students have access to high quality advising, each state university shall establish an Academic Advising System, which shall provide the following:
  - i. Goal Setting: Each Academic Advising System should help students to set both short-term and long-term educational goals.
  - ii. Information: Each Academic Advising System should be able to accurately inform students of graduation requirements of their department. It should be sensitive to the importance of strategic course selections so as to minimize the number of semesters required for graduation.

Additionally, the System should be able to inform students of career opportunities in their field of study.

- iii. Transitions: Each Academic Advising System should inform students how to change colleges and/or departments. Furthermore, the System should provide information to explain the process students follow to enroll in their curriculum and to drop or add courses during the semester.
  - iv. Accessibility: Each Academic Advising System should have reasonable hours and methods of availability for students. Additionally, students should be able to set up appointments within the System for an adequate amount of time to make curricular selections and career choices.
  - v. Referral to Campus Resources: Each Academic Advising System should be able to refer students to various campus resources including, but not limited to: university counseling services, student activities, and career and employment services.
- b. Each Academic Advising System shall provide information to students to inform them of their responsibilities in the Academic Advising process.
  - c. Each Academic Advising System shall be responsible for the necessary training of academic advisors to assist them in meeting the responsibilities of this policy.
  - d. Every three years, beginning in spring 2016, each campus shall submit to the Board's Vice President for Academic Affairs a written report, no more than two pages in length, describing how its Academic Advising System advances the Board's strategic goals pertaining to retention and graduation. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall summarize the campus reports in a single document and provide it to the Board President and Chief Executive Officer for transmission to the Board at the President and Chief Executive Officer's discretion.

C. *Fiscal Affairs & Audit*

Regent McKechnie

**1. Amend FY 2014 Capital Improvements Plan – KU**

**Eric King,  
Director of Facilities**

The University of Kansas requests authorization to amend its FY 2014 capital improvements request to include a project to construct an apartment building near Allen Fieldhouse. Fieldhouse Apartments will provide an apartment living environment unique among current offerings at the University of Kansas. The apartments will be fully furnished, private bedroom apartments. The Fieldhouse Apartments, which will be constructed in phases, will house approximately 66 students some of whom will be student-athletes. The apartments will be operated and managed under the division of Student Housing.

The project will contain approximately 49,500 square feet and is estimated to cost \$17.5 million. The project will be funded with a combination of private funds and bond proceeds. The debt service on the bonds will be funded with revenues generated from the facility. The bonds will be secured with a pledge of generally available unrestricted revenues and will be issued by the Kansas Development Finance Authority.

**2. Amend FY 2015 Capital Improvements Requests and Approve Program Statement for Technology II Facility Project – WSU**

Wichita State University requests permission to amend its FY 2015 capital improvements request for the Technology Transfer and Experiential Learning Building (now referred to as Technology II Facility). The most recent request was for a project of 140,000 square feet at a cost of \$30 million. The program statement for this facility has been completed and the project scope refined. The estimated base cost of the 5-story, 140,000 square foot facility is \$37.8 million with an option to add an additional story to the building to increase the Technology Transfer square footage. This option would bring the total square footage to 161,800 square feet and increase the overall facility to an estimated cost of \$42.4 million.

As per the previously submitted capital improvement request, the university plans to issue revenue bonds for an amount of \$37.8 million or \$42.4 million (depending on which option above is needed) to complete the project. Plans include an amortization schedule of twenty years. The debt service will be paid through tenant agreements with companies in the Technology Transfer portions of the building as well as through local funding sources. Wichita State University is seeking approval from the board of its plan to bond the project.

Associated with the request to amend the capital improvements, the university seeks approval of the Technology II Facility program statement. The new, freestanding building will house the Technology Transfer and Experiential Learning programs and will be the first building within the new Innovation Campus as outlined in the university master plan. The building will be located on the current Wheatshocker Apartments site (*contingent on the Board's approval to raze the apartments*) and will have minimal impact on the Braeburn Golf Course which will remain as an 18-hole course.

Total costs for the facility include site preparation, architectural fees, construction, moveable equipment, and contingencies. The goal is to have the facility open for the fall semester of 2016.

D. *Other Matters*

**1. Receive Update on Emporia State University's  
Campus Master Plan and Strategic Plan**

**President Shonrock**

**Summary**

*Emporia State University has been working on a campus master plan and a strategic plan this year. Gould Evans has been assisting with development of the campus master plan. A campus-wide process has been used in development of a strategic plan. President Shonrock requested time on the agenda to give the Board an update on ESU's progress on both of these important initiatives.*

**2. Receive a Presentation on the Effects of  
Sequestration on University Research**

**Steve Warren,  
Vice Chancellor, Research &  
Graduate Studies  
University of Kansas**

**Summary**

*As you know, one of the measures we use to assess progress in university excellence is the increase in university research. In fact, this has certainly been an area of growth especially for our research universities. In a recent conversation with Dr. Steve Warren at KU, he discussed the impact of sequestration on university research and the challenge that research universities will now face. Based on that conversation, it became clear that the Board needed to hear about this and have an opportunity to discuss this critical challenge.*

**3. Act on Proposed Amendment to Memorandum of Agreement with PSU/KNEA – PSU**

**Theresa Schwartz,  
Associate General Counsel**

**Summary and Staff Recommendation**

*Pittsburg State University (PSU) asks that the Board of Regents approve and execute an Amendment to the existing Memorandum of Agreement between PSU, the Kansas Board of Regents and the PSU chapter of the Kansas National Education Association (KNEA). PSU and KNEA have met and conferred and reached agreement on a proposed amendment to the Agreement. The proposed change to the existing Agreement adds a Tobacco Status Non Discrimination provision. Board staff has reviewed the proposed amendment for compliance with Board policy as well as state and federal law. Staff recommends Board approval of the Amendment and granting the Chair authority to sign any document related to such Board approval.*

**Background**

The Public Employer-Employee Relations Act (PEERA) (pursuant to which State agencies are required to meet and confer with their employees’ recognized bargaining units over terms and conditions of employment) first took effect in 1972. In 1974, the Kansas Public Employee Relations Board (PERB) certified the Kansas National Education Association (KNEA) as the exclusive representative under the Act for the purpose of meeting and conferring on behalf of faculty at Pittsburg State University (PSU). In 1983, the Kansas Supreme Court held that the Board of Regents is the appropriate governing body for purposes of PEERA and therefore “must approve any proposed agreement in order to make it binding and effective.”<sup>1</sup> Thus, for many years, the Board has performed the role of approving agreements that are negotiated between the University and the certified faculty representative, after they have completed the meet and confer process.

In 2011, PSU and PSU/KNEA reached a three-year Memorandum of Agreement (Agreement), which concludes at the end of fiscal year 2014. In response to a Spring 2012 student referendum, PSU President Steve Scott formed a Tobacco Policy Task Force to explore the feasibility of making the campus tobacco-free. The Task Force’s work concluded in May of 2013 with a recommendation to implement a tobacco-free policy for the PSU campus. Following the Task Force’s recommendation, the PSU/KNEA President Browyn Conrad, made a request that PSU meet and confer on the proposed tobacco-free implementation and the University acceded to that request. PSU and PSU/KNEA have now completed the meet and confer process over the tobacco issue and offer the below agreed-to amendment to the Board for consideration and approval.

The proposed amendment would add the following provision to the existing Agreement:

**XXXI. Tobacco Status Non-Discrimination**

It is impermissible to discharge any faculty or otherwise discriminate against an individual with respect to compensation, terms, conditions or privileges of employment because the individual is a tobacco user or non-user; to limit, segregate or classify faculty in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive them of opportunities or otherwise adversely affect their status as faculty because they are a tobacco user or non-user; or to require as a condition of employment that any faculty abstain from smoking or using tobacco products as long as the individual complies with applicable state law.

**Conclusion and Recommendation**

Pittsburg State University requests that the Board approve the negotiated and proposed “Tobacco Status Non-Discrimination” amendment to the Agreement. Board staff have reviewed the amendment, determined that it is consistent with Board Policy and does not violate state or federal laws. Staff recommends that the Board

<sup>1</sup> *Kansas Board of Regents and Pittsburg State University v. Pittsburg State University Chapter of KNEA and PEERB*, 233 Kan. 801, 812 (1983).

approve the amendment and authorize the Chair to execute all necessary documents associated with Board approval of the Amendment to the Agreement.



**4. Consider Request to Convert Classified Positions to Unclassified University Support Staff Positions – FHSU** **Julene Miller, General Counsel**

**Summary and Staff Recommendation**

*K.S.A. 2011 Supp. 76-715a, enacted by the 2005 Kansas Legislature, allows the state universities, with the approval of the Board of Regents, to convert classified staff positions from the state civil service system to unclassified positions known as “University Support Staff.” The statute sets out the procedure to be followed and some of the characteristics of any newly created University Support Staff system as well as providing certain protections to classified employees whose positions are converted. Fort Hays State University seeks to convert the classified positions at that campus to University Support Staff positions. The employees have voted in favor of such conversion, 187-44. Board staff has reviewed the Handbook, Proposal and other information submitted by the University and recommends that the Board approve the University’s request.*

**Background**

K.S.A. 76-715a, enacted by the 2005 Kansas Legislature, provides authority for the Board of Regents to allow any state university to convert all, or any portion of, classified staff employee positions to the unclassified service of state employment. The statute was intended to remove constraints of the state classified system that operate to, among other things, prevent the University from paying competitive wages in the classified job categories and impose needless and inefficient bureaucracy.

K.S.A. 76-715a establishes a procedure to be followed to effectuate such a conversion. Summarized, the statute provides for the following process by which classified positions can be converted:

- The university is required to "develop a plan for a system for administration," including personnel policies and procedures, of all aspects of employment, other than health and flexible benefits and leave and retirement benefits provided under the state classified employee system, for the converted employees.
- The development of the plan is required to be subject to input from the affected employees both prior to and after a vote by those employees on the proposal.
- A majority of the voting members of the affected employees must vote to approve the conversion of the classified staff employee positions affected by the proposal to unclassified positions.
- Finally, "each such system of administration shall be subject to approval by the state board of regents."

The statute also specifies several aspects of the "system for administration" of the converted employees:

- The employees must retain all health and flexible benefits and leave and all retirement benefits provided to them under the state classified employee system.
- The conversion may not result in a salary reduction for or the layoff of any classified employee.
- The system must contain personnel policies and procedures that include a disciplinary and grievance process, and that process must provide for due process procedures and a right to appeal.

On November 19, 2013, a vote was held on the Fort Hays campus and by mail-in ballot for those not able to be on campus asking for approval of the proposal to convert. The vote was 187 approving of the conversion with 44 against. Total staff eligible to vote was 308.

Fort Hays State University has submitted a Handbook and Proposal describing the aspects of a system for administration of the University Support Staff for that campus. The proposal and handbook are the result of work by a committee appointed by the Classified Senate of representatives of the classified staff along with

representatives of HR and administration assisting as advisors. Work began some months ago with completion of the documents occurring prior to the vote on November 19, 2013. Both have been reviewed and approved by University administration.

The Handbook and Proposal describe employment policies and processes with respect to recruitment, selection, and hiring; performance appraisal and appeals; disciplinary, grievance and job protection (layoff) processes and appeals; salaries; salary administration; and a number of other policies and procedures. Many of the policies and processes described are already in existence on the campus, administered by the University's Department of Human Resources, and will continue unchanged in substance and process following conversion. The University's request for approval of these documents indicates that there will be no salary reductions or layoffs as a result of the implementation of the University's plan for conversion of certain classified positions.

Work will continue for the remainder of this fiscal year to create job descriptions to replace those that exist now as a part of the current classified system, which will also include salary ranges for each job description. Another important task to be undertaken will be the development of the performance evaluation tool to replace the existing tool created by the State Personnel System. A committee, again appointed by the Classified Senate, will work with University Human Resources staff to accomplish these tasks.

**Recommendation**

Staff has reviewed the material submitted by Fort Hays State University in support of its request to convert classified positions to unclassified USS. The University has provided evidence that it has satisfied the requirements of K.S.A. 76-715a. Staff recommends that the Board approve Fort Hays State University's system for administration of the University Support Staff effective July 1, 2014.

# CONSENT AGENDA

## VI. Introductions and Reports

A. *Introductions*

B. *Report from System Council of Presidents*

President Heilman

## VII. Approval of Consent Agenda

A. *Academic Affairs*

### 1. Act on Requests for Additional Degree Granting Authority for:

Gary Alexander,  
VP, Academic Affairs

- a) **Columbia Southern University**
- b) **University of Phoenix**
- c) **The Pennsylvania State University**
- d) **Georgetown University**
- e) **WellSpring School of Allied Health**
- f) **Michigan State University**
- g) **University of Southern California**
- h) **DeVry University**

### Staff Recommendation

*The following institutions request approval for additional degree granting authority: (1) Columbia Southern University, (2) University of Phoenix, (3) The Pennsylvania State University, (4) Georgetown University, (5) WellSpring School of Allied Health, (6) Michigan State University, (7) University of Southern California, and (8) DeVry University. After a thorough review of staff qualifications, record keeping systems, coursework, materials, website platforms, extended studies and campuses, the listed institutions demonstrate they meet and maintain compliance with all of the statutorily imposed requirements described below. Staff recommends approval for additional degree granting authority.*

### 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) in order 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 on-line 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 schools 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), 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 KBOR staff. Schools are also required to provide descriptions of their programs and courses, including class syllabi, clinical or externship contracts, instructor credentials; a statement of the objectives of the programs; and qualifications of administrators and owner information.

**Institution Requests:****Columbia Southern University**

The Kansas Board of Regents first approved Columbia Southern University in November of 2011. Columbia Southern University was established in 1993 in Orange Beach, AL. It is an online, for profit institution. Today Columbia Southern University provides online programs at the associate, bachelor, master and doctoral level in a variety of fields including fire science, criminal justice, business management and administration, information technology, human resource management and occupational safety and health. Undergraduate and graduate certificate programs are also available to provide focused training in specialized areas. Columbia Southern University is currently approved by KBOR to offer 38 programs at the associate, bachelor, master and doctoral level.

Graduation rate data are based on undergraduate students who enrolled full-time and have never enrolled in college before. This may not represent all undergraduates who attend this institution. The U.S. Department of Education reports a graduation rate for Columbia Southern University of 47% for full-time, first-time students who began their studies in the 2006-2007 school year and a 2010 student loan default rate of 7.9%.

Columbia Southern University is an accredited member of the Distance Education and Training Council (DETC). The Accrediting Commission of the DETC is listed by the U.S. Department of Education as a nationally recognized accrediting agency. This accreditation, according to K.S.A. 74-32,168 of the Postsecondary Educational Institution Act, may be accepted as evidence of compliance with the statutory standards for approval.

**Degree Requested by Columbia Southern University for Approval:**

- Master of Public Administration

**University of Phoenix**

The Kansas Board of Regents first approved the University of Phoenix in March of 2005. The University of Phoenix was founded in 1976 and is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Apollo Group, Inc. It is designed around the learning characteristics and life situations of the adult learner population, offering undergraduate and graduate degree programs at more than 200 locations, as well as online in most countries around the world. The University of Phoenix has two locations in Kansas: Wichita and Lenexa. These degrees will be offered at the Lenexa campus location. Currently, University of Phoenix – Lenexa campus is approved by KBOR to offer 67 programs at the associate, bachelor and master level.

Graduation rate data are based on undergraduate students who enrolled full-time and have never enrolled in college before. This may not represent all undergraduates who attend this institution. The U.S. Department of Education reports a graduation rate for University of Phoenix of 13% for full-time, first-time students who began their studies in the 2006-2007 school year and a 2010 student loan default rate of 26%.

The University of Phoenix is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission and is a member of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. This accreditation, according to K.S.A. 74-32,168 of the Postsecondary Educational Institution Act, may be accepted as evidence of compliance with the statutory standards for approval.

**Degrees Requested by University of Phoenix for Approval:**

- Bachelor of Arts in English
- Bachelor of Science in Human Services

**The Pennsylvania State University**

The Pennsylvania State University (Penn State) was first approved by the Kansas Board of Regents in February of 2012. Penn State was chartered in 1855 by the Pennsylvania Commonwealth at the request of the Pennsylvania State Agricultural Society with the intention of applying scientific principles to farming. Penn State has been offering distance education courses for more than 100 years. In 1892, Penn State founded one of the nation’s first correspondence courses and in 1998, was one of the first major accredited universities to provide online education. Penn State World Campus, the online division of Penn State, graduated its first class in 2000 and currently serves students from all 50 states, more than 40 countries and 7 continents. Penn State World Campus is currently approved by the Kansas Board of Regents to offer 40 programs at the associate, bachelor and master level.

Graduation rate data are based on undergraduate students who enrolled full-time and have never enrolled in college before. This may not represent all undergraduates who attend this institution. The U.S. Department of Education reports a graduation rate for The Pennsylvania State University World Campus of 25% for full-time, first-time students who began their studies in the 2006-2007 school year and a 2010 student loan default rate of 8%.

The Pennsylvania State University is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. The Middle States Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. This accreditation, according to K.S.A. 74-32,168 of the Postsecondary Educational Institution Act, may be accepted as evidence of compliance with the statutory standards for approval.

**Degrees Requested by The Pennsylvania State University for Approval:**

- Bachelor of Arts in Advertising and Public Relations
- Bachelor of Arts in Economics
- Bachelor of Science in Economics
- Bachelor of Science in Labor Studies and Employment Relations
- Bachelor of Science in Organizational Leadership
- Bachelor of Science in Psychology
- Bachelor of Science in Security and Risk Analysis
- Master of Engineering in Acoustics
- Master of Health Administration
- Master of Professional Studies in Enterprise Architecture
- Master of Professional Studies in Renewable Energy & Sustainable Systems
- Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering
- Master of Science in Nursing

**Georgetown University**

The Kansas Board of Regents first approved Georgetown University in September of 2011. Established in 1789, Georgetown University is the nation’s oldest Catholic and Jesuit University. The School of Nursing and Health Studies was founded in 1903 and offers undergraduate and graduate programs at the main campus in Washington, D.C., as well as in Italy, Turkey and Qatar. The Master of Science in Nursing program online enrolled its first students in February 2011. Currently, Georgetown University has more than 12,000 undergraduate and graduate students and employs more than 5,000 faculty and staff members. Georgetown University is currently approved by the Kansas Board of Regents to offer one program at the master level.

Graduation rate data are based on undergraduate students who enrolled full-time and have never enrolled in college before. This may not represent all undergraduates who attend this institution. The U.S. Department of

Education reports a graduation rate for Georgetown University of 93% for full-time, first-time students who began their studies in the 2006-2007 school year and a 2010 student loan default rate of 1.3%.

Georgetown University is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. The Middle States Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. This accreditation, according to K.S.A. 74-32,168 of the Postsecondary Educational Institution Act, may be accepted as evidence of compliance with the statutory standards for approval.

**Degrees Requested by Georgetown University for Approval:**

- Master of Professional Studies in Emergency and Disaster Management
- Master of Professional Studies in Real Estate
- Master of Professional Studies in Technology Management

**WellSpring School of Allied Health**

WellSpring School of Allied Health was approved by the Kansas Board of Regents to offer certificate programs in April of 2004. The Kansas Board of Regents approved the school's first Associate of Occupational Science degree in September of 2012. WellSpring School of Allied Health, founded in 1988, is located in Kansas City, MO. The school also operates a branch location in Lawrence, KS. The new degree program will be offered at both the Kansas City and Lawrence locations.

Graduation rate data are based on undergraduate students who enrolled full-time and have never enrolled in college before. This may not represent all undergraduates who attend this institution. This institution did not admit full-time, first-time undergraduate level students; therefore graduation rate information is not available. The U.S. Department of Education reports a 2010 student loan default rate of 21%.

Wellspring School of Allied Health is accredited by the Accrediting Bureau of Health Education Schools, a United States Department of Education approved accrediting agency. This accreditation, according to K.S.A. 74-32,168 of the Postsecondary Educational Institution Act, may be accepted as evidence of compliance with the statutory standards for degree granting approval.

**Degrees Requested by WellSpring School of Allied Health for Approval:**

- Associate of Occupational Science in Exercise, Nutrition and Wellness

**Michigan State University**

The Kansas Board of Regents first approved Michigan State University in November of 2012. Michigan State University is a public land-grant university established in 1855. The university was a prototype for 69 land-grant institutions established under the Morrill Act of 1862 and was the first institution of higher learning in the United States to teach scientific agriculture. Today Michigan State University offers undergraduate, graduate, and professional study programs to nearly 49,000 students in all 50 states and more than 130 countries. The University participates in The Great Plains Interactive Distance Education Alliance (GPIDEA), offering programs with all course work delivered via the Internet/World Wide Web by faculty from multiple land-grant universities: Michigan State University, Kansas State University, University of Missouri, North Dakota State University, Texas Tech University, and the University of Nebraska. Currently Michigan State University is approved by the Kansas Board of Regents to offer 17 programs at the bachelor and master level.

Graduation rate data are based on undergraduate students who enrolled full-time and have never enrolled in college before. This may not represent all undergraduates who attend this institution. The U.S. Department of Education reports a graduation rate for Michigan State University of 79% for full-time, first-time students who began their studies in the 2006-2007 school year and a 2010 student loan default rate of 5.9%.

Michigan State University is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. The Higher Learning Commission is recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. This accreditation, according to K.S.A. 74-32,168 of the Postsecondary Educational Institution Act, may be accepted as evidence of compliance with the statutory standards for approval.

**Degrees Requested by Michigan State University for Approval:**

- Master of Arts in Family Community Services
- Master of Arts in Youth Development
- Master of Science in Judicial Administration
- Master of Science in Management, Strategy and Leadership

**University of Southern California**

The University of Southern California (USC) attained its first Certificate of Approval to operate in Kansas in August, 2009. USC was established in 1880 and is located in the heart of Los Angeles, CA. Today, USC serves more than 33,000 students and is home to nearly 3,200 full time faculty. Since 1969, USC has been a member of the Association of American Universities, a consortium of the 63 leading North American research universities. Currently, USC is approved by the Kansas Board of Regents to offer 29 programs at the master level.

Graduation rate data are based on undergraduate students who enrolled full-time and have never enrolled in college before. This may not represent all undergraduates who attend this institution. The U.S. Department of Education reports a graduation rate for the University of Southern California of 90% for full-time, first-time students who began their studies in the 2006-2007 school year and a 2010 student loan default rate of 2.2%.

The University of Southern California is accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. This accreditation, according to K.S.A. 74-32,168 of the Postsecondary Educational Institution Act, may be accepted as evidence of compliance with the statutory standards for degree granting approval.

**Degrees Requested by the University of Southern California for Approval:**

- Master of Education in School Leadership

**DeVry University**

DeVry University was previously approved by the Kansas Department of Education in August of 1987. This certification continued under the Kansas Board of Regents with the enactment of Senate Bill 345 placing control of “proprietary school” under the Kansas Board of Regents. DeVry University was founded in 1931 by motion picture technology innovator Dr. Herman DeVry. It has more than 90 locations in metro areas across the United States and Canada and on-line. Currently, the following DeVry University campuses are approved: Phoenix, AZ, Westminster, CO, 2 locations in Kansas City, MO, Irving, TX and the online division operated in Naperville, IL. The degree’s requested will be offered at all campus locations. DeVry University is approved by KBOR to offer programs at the associate, bachelor, and master level.

Graduation rate data are based on undergraduate students who enrolled full-time and have never enrolled in college before. This may not represent all undergraduates who attend this institution. The U.S. Department of Education reports 11% of entering DeVry University students were counted as full-time, first-time in 2012. DeVry University’s graduation rate for full-time, first-time students who began their studies in the 2006-2007 school year is reported at 27%. A 2010 student loan default rate of 23.4% is also reported.

DeVry University is accredited by The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. This accreditation, according to K.S.A. 74-32,168 of the Postsecondary Educational Institution Act, may be accepted as evidence of compliance with the statutory standards for approval.

**Degrees Requested by the DeVry University for Approval:**

- Bachelor of Science in Health Information Management
- Master of Science in Educational Technology
- Master of Science in Finance



**2. Act on Request for Degree and Certificate Program  
For North Central Kansas Technical College**

**Rita Johnson,  
Senior Director, Workforce  
Innovation**

**Summary and Staff Recommendation**

*Each month community colleges and technical colleges submit requests for the approval of new certificate and degree programs. The Board office received a request from North Central Kansas Technical College to offer an associate of applied science degree and a technical certificate in Digital Marketing. The program submitted addressed all criteria requested and was subject to the 14 day comment period required by policy. The program was reviewed by the Technical Education Authority and is recommended for approval.*

**Background**

Community colleges and technical colleges submit requests for new certificate and degree programs each month utilizing forms approved by staff. Criteria addressed during the application process include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Student and employer demand for the program
- Current and projected job openings and anticipated wages
- Level of program duplication across institutions, based on Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) code, and any efforts to collaborate to provide the needed program
- Rationale for why collaboration is not a viable option and/or need for a duplicative program
- Program description and designation of required and elective courses
- Measurable program outcomes and course competencies
- Process and frequency for review of program content, level of program success, and process for addressing any areas of concern
- Any specialized accreditation required and/or available for the proposed program
- Faculty qualifications and proposed student to faculty ratio
- Description of facilities and equipment needed and available
- Projected program costs and designation of adequate resources
- Membership of a steering/advisory committee for the program
- Approval by institutional academic committee and local governing board

**Description of Proposed Programs**

**North Central Kansas Technical College** requests approval for the following program:

Digital Marketing (52.1499)—AAS degree/68 credit hours; Technical Certificate/37 credit hours.

The proposed Digital Marketing program prepares students for a career in the specialized field of social and digital media marketing. Upon completion, students will be able to efficiently run several digital media platforms, create digital media marketing plans and analyze the success of each plan. Students will receive training in marketing, social media applications, web development, privacy and security issues, ethics and trends in this field. Students completing the associate degree will also gain practical experience in creating and executing social media marketing campaigns during internships.

The proposed program was developed in response to discussions with local business leaders concerning their own ability to remain current with the rapidly advancing field of digital marketing, including its many forms, as well as finding qualified employees to assist businesses in these efforts. The Marketing field is growing more and more specialized to include outreach and marketing mediums such as email, social media, search engine and website alternatives. This trend is primarily due to the low cost associated with social media and digital marketing when compared to the high return on investment from these efforts. Many organizations are adding specialists, well versed in particular marketing areas, to support marketing managers.

A survey of current college students and seniors from Beloit High School indicates a desire of at least 16 students to enroll in the proposed program. It is anticipated the number of high school students and graduates enrolling in the program will increase significantly once local and statewide articulation agreements are finalized connecting this program to the established marketing pathway. Letters of support received from local business and industry and economic/community development entities include commitments to send current employees to the college for training; hiring of program graduates; developing and providing internship opportunities, assisting with curriculum development, including sharing of actual case studies; and providing monetary support for equipment.

Although this marketing specialty is relatively new, a national search done on Careerbuilder.com indicates over 5,000 job listings for Digital Marketing and over 5,000 listings for Social Media Marketing with salaries from \$30,000 to \$60,000 nationally. The Kansas Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook projects a growth rate of approximately 9% and average wages ranging from \$20 to \$30 per hour for Advertising, Marketing, Promotions and Public Relations occupations (those most closely associated with the proposed program).

Marketing programs (under the traditional 51.1401 CIP code) are currently being offered at seven colleges in the system—Allen County Community College, Butler Community College, Garden City Community College, Johnson County Community College, Kansas City Kansas Community College, Neosho Community College, and Seward County Community College. None of the existing programs are located in the north central region of the state nor are these programs focused on digital marketing strategies.

The college will hire one additional full-time faculty member and utilize existing space with the sufficient infrastructure to accommodate the computer needs for this program. During the implementation year, the college estimates a minimal cost of \$38,000 (for instructor salary—186 day contract). Support for these costs will be provided through student tuition and the college's general operating budget.

The proposed program was subject to the 14-day comment period during which one letter of comment was received from Barton County Community College. The comment and the response from North Central Kansas Technical College were presented and discussed by the Technical Education Authority.

**Staff Recommendation**

The new program request submitted by North Central Technical College for an AAS degree and technical certificate in Digital Marketing was reviewed by the Technical Education Authority during the December 12, 2013 meeting and is recommended for approval.

# DISCUSSION AGENDA

## VIII. Consideration of Discussion Agenda

### A. Presentation

#### 1. Receive Annual Foresight 2020 Progress Report

**Andy Tompkins,  
President and CEO**

#### **Summary**

*In 2010, the Board approved its initial version of Foresight 2020, a strategic agenda for higher education in Kansas. This was the culmination of two years of work by the KBOR staff and Board. Subsequently, several revisions have been made to bring greater clarity and focus to the goals. In January of 2012, the Board received its first report on Foresight 2020 and so this is the third annual report that the Board has received. As noted in the forward, data for three and, in some instances, four years is now available which will help in identifying trends. Also, in order to provide a more complete picture of student pathways in attending the institutions, a student success index has been included for the first time. Additionally, a complete report with appendices will be available. Breeze Richardson has overseen the layout and writing of this report with the support of nearly every staff member in the agency. A special thanks needs to be given to the data, research, and planning team for their thoroughness in collecting and vetting the data.*

B. Academic Affairs

1. Act on Performance Agreements

Regent Moran

Gary Alexander,  
VP, Academic Affairs

**Summary and Recommendations**

*In accordance with K.S.A. 74-3202d and the Board’s Performance Agreement Guidelines and Procedures, thirty-four performance agreements are presented to the Board for action. The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) recommends approval.*

**Background**

K.S.A. 74-3202d provides that “the state board shall have authority to review and approve institutional improvement plans, and, on the basis of each plan, shall develop and implement a performance agreement with each postsecondary educational institution.” In addition, “each postsecondary educational institution’s receipt of new state funds shall be contingent on achieving compliance with its performance agreement.”

At its March 2013, meeting, the Board approved a new performance agreement model to fulfill the requirements of K.S.A. 74-3202d. All public institutions in Kansas developed a performance agreement based on the new model. The agreements institutions developed are the result of an extensive review process that included substantial communication between Board staff and the individual schools. Major steps in the process include an initial review and subsequent analysis by a team of Academic Affairs directors and communication with each institution on how to strengthen the agreement. Proposed agreements were also reviewed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President/CEO, before being sent to BAASC.

Because of the volume, the proposed agreements were electronically provided to the Board.

**Recommendation**

BAASC reviewed the 34 performance agreements at meetings held in October, November and December of 2013, and recommends approval of agreements for institutions listed below:

<b>Institution</b>
Emporia State University
Fort Hays State University
Kansas State University
Pittsburg State University
University of Kansas
University of Kansas Medical Center
Wichita State University
Allen Community College
Barton Community College
Butler Community College
Cloud County Community College
Coffeyville Community College
Colby Community College
Cowley Community College
Dodge City Community College

Fort Scott Community College
Garden City Community College
Highland Community College
Hutchinson Community College
Independence Community College
Johnson County Community College
Kansas City Kansas Community College
Labette Community College
Neosho County Community College
Pratt Community College
Seward Community College
Flint Hills Technical College
Manhattan Area Technical College
North Central Kansas Technical College
Northwest Kansas Technical College
Salina Area Technical College
Wichita Area Technical College
Washburn University
Washburn Institute of Technology

**2. Act on Amendments to the Board’s Concurrent Enrollment Policy**

**Summary and Recommendation**

*The proposed revised Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Policy has been reviewed by SCOCAO, BAASC and SCOPS. Upon recommendation of the Board Governance Committee, it is now presented to the full Board for its consideration. In addition to having been edited for continuity, the proposed revision includes two substantive revisions: (1) revising qualifications for high school faculty teaching college-level, non-tiered Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses; and (2) eliminating the limit of 24 semester credit hours that may be earned in concurrent enrollment partnership classes.*

**Background**

KBOR asked to approve the revised Concurrent Enrollment Partnership (CEP) policy provided below. It has been edited for continuity and includes two proposed substantive revisions:

- (1) The first proposed revision eliminates specifying degrees and credit hours as qualification for high school faculty teaching college-level, non-tiered Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses. Rather, it uses the criteria and assumed practices for faculty qualifications of the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association as the standard for teaching non-tiered CEP courses.
- (2) The second proposed revision eliminates the limit of 24 semester credit hours that may be earned in concurrent enrollment partnership classes. KBOR has no way of tracking this number. In addition, students may take any number of dual credit courses outside the formal CEP partnerships.

**Proposed Revised Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Policy**  
Chapter III.

A. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

...

**11. CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN ELIGIBLE PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS THROUGH CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT PARTNERSHIPS**

It is the policy of the Kansas Board of Regents to encourage high school students to take advantage of postsecondary education opportunities by enrolling in postsecondary courses while still in high school or participating in home schooling. K.S.A. 72-11a01 through 72-11a05 provide for these opportunities through the Kansas Challenge to Secondary School Pupils Act. The act commonly is known as concurrent enrollment of high school students in eligible postsecondary institutions. Statutory language provides conditions under which secondary schools and eligible postsecondary institutions may establish cooperative agreements, defined as a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership (CEP).

~~Different types of concurrent enrollment can be included under the statute. In one type, a high school student may enroll at a postsecondary institution at any time without any formal agreement between the high school and the postsecondary institution. (This type of concurrent enrollment would include 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup>-grade students enrolling pursuant to K.A.R. 88-263, as amended, and any non-degree seeking student.) In another type, a high school teacher~~

~~teaches a college-level course to high school students at the high school during the regular high school day. The latter must conform to section b. of this policy.~~

While various forms of dual enrollment may be offered under the statute, this policy applies only to Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships formed between a high school and eligible postsecondary education institution in which a high school faculty member teaches a college-level course to high school students at the high school during the regular high school day. These partnerships must conform to paragraph b. of this policy.

Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships do NOT include the following: (1) programs in which the high school student travels to the college campus to take courses prior to graduation during the academic year or during the summer; (2) programs in which college faculty travel to the high school to teach separate courses to high school students; and (3) the College Board Advanced Placement Program and the International Baccalaureate Program, which use standardized tests to assess the student’s knowledge of a curriculum developed by a committee consisting of both college and high school faculty.

a. Purposes of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships

As established by the Kansas Board of Regents, the system-wide purposes of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships are ~~fourfold~~ threefold:

~~i. To Develop Seamlessness in the Kansas Public Postsecondary Education System~~

~~“Seamlessness” is defined in the Transfer and Articulation provisions of this policy manual.~~

~~(ii) i. To Enhance Efficiency Reduce Time-to-Degree and Lower Costs~~

~~Efficiency is enhanced by exposing as many qualified students as possible to a college-level experience, allowing students to get a “jump” Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships enable students to get an early start on their college education, by thus potentially reducing the time required to complete a degree and lowering the costs borne by parents, students and taxpayers.~~

~~(iii) ii. To Challenge High School Students and Promote College-Level Success~~

~~This goal is Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships are aimed at providing a college-level learning experience for qualified students by enhancing the amount, level and diversity of learning in high school beyond the traditional secondary curriculum. First year experience courses, performing and visual arts courses and advanced science, mathematics and language offerings not available in high school are especially encouraged.~~

~~(iv) iii. To Foster Improved Relationships Between Kansas Public Postsecondary Education Institutions and Kansas Secondary Schools~~

~~The Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (CEP) are intended to foster improved relationships among stakeholders by clarifying expectations, roles, and responsibilities.~~

~~Statutory language provides conditions under which secondary schools and eligible postsecondary institutions may establish cooperative agreements, or what has been defined as a CEP.~~

- b. ~~Procedures and Standards of Quality for Cooperative Agreements and Delivery of for Implementing Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships CourseWork~~
  - i ~~Definitions of Concurrent Enrollment~~

For purposes of this policy:

~~(1) “Concurrent Enrollment Partnership ~~pupil student~~” means a person who is in grades 10, 11, or 12, or who is gifted and is in grade 9 (see paragraph b.v.(2)); has been admitted to an eligible postsecondary education institution as a degree-seeking or non-degree seeking student; and is enrolled in ~~classes—courses~~ at a high school at which approved high school teachers ~~faculty~~ teach college credit ~~classes—courses~~ during the normal school day. who is in grades 10, 11, or 12, or who is gifted and is in grade 9 (see section b.(5) (e)(b)), and is acceptable or has been accepted for enrollment at an eligible postsecondary education institution.~~

~~(2) “Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreement” means a written memorandum of understanding between an eligible postsecondary institution and a school district for the purpose of offering college-level learning to students who are eligible to enroll in college courses offered at a high school at which approved high school faculty teach said college courses during the normal school day.~~

~~(2) (3) “Eligible postsecondary education institution” means any state educational institution—university, community college, technical college, municipal university or affiliated institute of technology.~~

~~(3) “State educational institution” means any state university as defined in K.S.A. 76-711, and amendments thereto.~~

~~(4) “Community college” means any community college organized and operating under the laws of this state.~~

~~(f)(e) “Municipal university” means a municipal university established under the provisions of article 13a of chapter 13 of Kansas Statutes Annotated.~~

~~(g)(f) “Technical college” means any technical college established under the laws of this state as described in K.S.A.74-3201b.~~

~~(7) “Concurrent Enrollment Partnership (CEP)” agreement means a written memorandum of understanding between an eligible postsecondary institution and a school district for the purpose of offering college level learning to students who have been accepted for concurrent enrollment partnership in off-campus classes at a high school at which approved high school teachers teach college credit classes during the normal school day.~~

~~The CEP agreement must contain, at a minimum, the names and contact information of the liaisons for both parties, term and termination of the agreement, an overview of the partnership’s purpose and benefits, the individual and joint responsibilities of both parties, information, guidelines and necessary directions for curriculum, faculty, students, assessment, professional development activities and a listing of principles for assuring~~



~~quality in programming. CEPs must include attachments that address issues of compensation, awarding of credit and course listings for each party.~~

~~CEP arrangements shall include collaborative faculty development programming such as pedagogy, instructional design, course management, instructional delivery skill improvement, curricular reform initiatives, qualified admissions considerations (if applicable), and student success assessment strategies.~~

~~Although courses in some CEPs may have some elements or characteristics of the programs stated below, CEPs do not include the following programs:~~

- ~~(i) Programs in which the high school student travels to the college campus to take courses prior to graduation during the academic year or during the summer.~~
- ~~(ii) Programs in which college faculty travel to the high school to teach separate courses to the high school students.~~
- ~~(iii) The College Board Advanced Placement Program and the International Baccalaureate Program where standardized tests are used to assess students' knowledge of a curriculum developed by a committee consisting of both college and high school faculty.~~

ii Agreement between Eligible Postsecondary Institutions and School Districts

A CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreement ~~must~~ shall be established between the eligible postsecondary institution and the school district. Such agreement ~~must minimally~~ shall satisfy the requirements of ~~statute~~ K.S.A. 72-11a04 and contain the essential elements provided in this policy. The agreement shall contain, at a minimum:

~~General provisions of the statute relative to CEP agreements are as follows:~~

(1) the names and contact information of the liaisons for both parties, term of the agreement and any provisions for early termination, the individual and joint responsibilities of both parties, information, guidelines and necessary directions for curriculum, faculty, students, assessment, and a listing of principles for assuring quality in programming;

(2) an implementation plan for ensuring high school faculty teaching concurrently enrolled partnership students are integrated into the postsecondary partner institution through orientation, professional development, seminars, site visits, annual evaluations and ongoing communication with the postsecondary partner institution's faculty;

(3) a clause addressing issues of compensation, awarding of credit and course listings for each party;

~~(1)~~(4) acknowledgement that the academic credit is to shall be granted for course work successfully completed by the ~~pupil~~ student at the ~~eligible~~ eligible postsecondary ~~partner~~ partner institution, which shall qualify as college credit and may qualify as both high school and college credit;

~~(2)~~(5) acknowledgement that such course work must shall qualify as credit applicable toward the award of a degree or certificate at the ~~eligible~~ eligible postsecondary ~~partner~~ partner institution;

~~(3)~~(6) acknowledgement that the pupil student shall pay to the postsecondary partner institution the negotiated amount of tuition, fees and related costs charged by the institution for enrollment of the pupil student except in the case of tiered technical courses. Secondary students admitted to postsecondary tiered technical courses conducted by a community college, technical college or institute of technology may be charged fees, but shall not be charged tuition;

(7) a plan for ensuring that courses offered through a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership are annually reviewed by college faculty in the discipline at the postsecondary partner institution according to the criteria described in iii.(5); and

(8) a statement indicating the Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreement shall be reviewed at least every five years by the postsecondary partner institution to assure compliance and quality considerations as outlined in this policy.

iii ~~Curriculum Standards and Content of Courses in which Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Students are Enrolled,~~ Course Content/Materials, and Assessment of Students

(1) Courses administered through a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership shall be university/college catalogued courses with the same departmental id, course descriptions, numbers, titles and credits. Courses must have been approved through the curriculum approval process of the postsecondary partner institution.

(2) The high school and college-level prerequisites, the content of courses, course goals and objectives, must be the same as those for the same courses offered to students at any location or by any delivery method.

(3) Materials such as textbooks ~~used~~ must be comparable to those used in the same course throughout the postsecondary partner institution. Procedures for selection of textbooks and related material by high school faculty who teach concurrently enrolled students must follow ~~adopted~~ the postsecondary partner's institutional policies.

(4) If a course has been approved by Board staff as competency-based, the competencies for the courses must be the same as those for courses not taught to concurrently enrolled students.

(5) College faculty at the postsecondary partner institution shall annually review Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses in their discipline to ensure that:

(a) Concurrent Enrollment Partnership students are held to the same grading standards and standards of achievement as those expected of students in on-campus sections;

(b) Concurrent Enrollment Partnership students are being assessed using the same methods (i.e., papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs) as students in on-campus sections;

(c) high school faculty are utilizing the same final examination for each Concurrent Enrollment Partnership course as is given in a representative section of the same course taught at the public postsecondary institution awarding the course credit; and

(d) high school faculty are applying the same scoring rubric for the assigned course as is used in the on-campus course; and that course management, instructional delivery and content meet or exceed those in regular on-campus sections.

~~(6) Remedial/developmental course work or course work that does not apply to a Board of Regents' approved degree program at the postsecondary partner institution in a CEP agreement is not considered appropriate for college level credit. shall not be offered as a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership course.~~

iv High School Faculty/Instructors

(1) Qualifications

~~(a) High school faculty teaching college-level, non-tiered Concurrent Enrollment Partnership (CEP) courses must shall attain instructional eligibility by meeting the standards established by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association, as stated in that body's *Criteria for Accreditation and Assumed Practices regarding faculty roles and qualifications.* or (2) demonstrate possession of a bachelors degree, with at least 24 credit hours in the assigned course content and utilize the same final examination as given in a representative section of the course taught at the institution awarding the course credit and apply the same scoring rubric for the assigned course as that used in the on campus class. Institutions may set higher standards. Teaching evaluations must be conducted. The postsecondary institution shall provide instructors with orientation and ongoing professional development.~~

(b) Faculty teaching college-level tiered technical courses through a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership (CEP) ~~must shall~~ attain instructional eligibility by meeting the academic standards addressed above or possess a valid/current industry- recognized credential and a minimum of 4,000 hours of work experience in the specific technical field ~~and utilize the same final examination as given in a representative section of the course taught at the institution awarding the course credit and apply the same scoring rubric for the assigned course as that used in the on campus class. Institutions may set higher standards. Teaching evaluations must be conducted. The postsecondary institution shall provide instructors with orientation and ongoing professional development.~~

(c) Postsecondary partner institutions may set higher standards.

(2) Orientation, Professional Development and Evaluation

(a) Before approving high school faculty the instructors to teach college-level CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses, the postsecondary partner institution must shall provide the high school instructors faculty with orientation and training in course curriculum, assessment criteria, course philosophy, and CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership administrative requirements.

(b) The postsecondary partner institution shall provide the high school faculty with ongoing professional development opportunities.

(c) Orientation and/or professional development activities shall include collaborative faculty development programming such as pedagogy, instructional design, course management, instructional delivery skill improvement, curricular reform initiatives, and student success assessment strategies.

(d) The postsecondary partner institution shall annually conduct evaluations of high school faculty teaching Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses to ensure compliance with the state expectations for Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses.

~~(e) Each CEP must include an implementation plan for ensuring that instructors teaching concurrently enrolled partnership students are part of a continuing collegial interaction through professional development, seminars, site visits, and ongoing communication with the postsecondary institution's faculty and administration of the partnership.~~

v Student Eligibility for Enrollment, Advising and Student Guides

~~(1) Concurrently enrolled students must meet institutional enrollment requirements; follow institutional procedures regarding assessment/placement; and satisfy course prerequisites. High school students enrolled in courses administered through a CEP may Concurrent Enrollment Partnership shall be enrolled as degree or non-degree/—or—non-matriculated students of at the sponsoring postsecondary partner institution. Each Concurrent Enrollment Partnership student must meet the postsecondary partner institution's requirements for admission as a degree-seeking or non-degree/non-matriculated student. Concurrently enrolled students shall have met institutional enrollment requirements; satisfied course prerequisites; and followed institutional procedures regarding assessment/placement. In order to enroll in a CEP course, students shall achieve the same score or subscore on a standardized placement test as is required for students enrolled in the same on-campus course. To meet the “academic challenge” purpose of this policy, CEP students must have an acceptable achieve the score or subscore on a standardized placement test in order to enroll in a CEP course. Postsecondary partner institutions may establish higher standards.~~

(2) Students who are enrolled in grade 9 and are classified by a school district as “gifted” according to the State Department of Education’s definition, K.A.R. 91-40-1(bb), as amended, may be admitted as concurrently enrolled students provided all other applicable requirements as outlined above are satisfied.

(3) The student must be authorized by the high school principal to apply for enrollment.

~~(4) Students must be provided with a student guide created as part of the CEP that outlines their rights and responsibilities in the learning experience as well as a description of how courses may be transferred in the Kansas public postsecondary education system. Advising of students who desire to enroll in CEP classes Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses must be carried out by both the high school and postsecondary institution.~~

(5) Students shall be provided with a student guide created as part of the Concurrent Enrollment Partnership that outlines their rights and responsibilities as university/college students. The student guide shall also provide a description of how courses may be transferred in the Kansas public postsecondary education system.

~~(3) Students who are enrolled in grade 9 and are classified by a school district as “gifted” according to the State Department of Education’s definition, K.A.R. 91-40-1(cc), as amended, may be admitted as concurrently enrolled students provided all other applicable requirements as outlined above are satisfied.~~

~~(4) The student must be authorized by the school principal to apply for enrollment.~~

vi CEP Courses ~~which~~ that Include Students Enrolled for Secondary and/or Postsecondary Credit

A course may include students enrolled for postsecondary and/or secondary credit. The postsecondary partner institution is responsible for ensuring that academic standards (course requirements and grading criteria) are not compromised.

~~(7) Accountability/Assessment Standards~~

~~(a) Courses offered through a concurrent enrollment partnership must be reviewed annually by faculty in the discipline at the postsecondary partner to assure that grading standards (i.e., papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs), course management, instructional delivery and content meet or exceed those in regular on-campus sections.~~

~~(b) Each CEP must be reviewed at least every five years by the eligible postsecondary institution to assure compliance and quality considerations as outlined in this policy.~~

~~(c) The Board office will track students who have participated in concurrent enrollment partnerships and other forms of concurrent enrollment.~~

~~(8) Collegiate Learning~~

~~CEP classes are not intended to replace a substantial portion of the academic experience on a college/university campus. Up to 24 semester credit hours may be earned in concurrent enrollment partnership classes, excluding credit hours earned in tiered technical courses.~~

c. Reporting of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships ~~Courses~~

i Institutions will report the following as a part of the regular Kansas Postsecondary Database collection:

- (1) Directory information for each high school student enrolled;
- (2) Credit hours generated by each high school student;
- (3) Credentials of faculty teaching ~~CEP~~ Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses; and
- (4) ~~CEP~~ Concurrent Enrollment Partnership credit hours generated by each high school student.

ii By January 31 of odd-numbered years, each public postsecondary institution ~~will~~ shall provide to Board staff a list of high schools ~~involved in formal CEP~~ with which it has Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreements. For each institution, Board staff will select no more than two high schools for reporting. For each high school selected, each institution will submit the following to the Board office:

- (1) Copy of the ~~CEP~~ Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreement ~~including (but not limited to)~~ that includes the criteria described in b.ii.;

~~(2) Implementation plan for professional development of instructors of CEP students (as described in b. i.(7) and b. iv.(3))~~

~~(b) Student Guide for CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership students (as described in b.v.(2) b.v.(5); and~~

~~(2) (3) Report resulting from the annual review of CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses by postsecondary partner institution faculty ~~and dates of most recent review of all CEP courses~~, aggregated by discipline (as described in section ~~b.vii.(1) b.iii.(5)~~).~~

iii By January 31 of odd-numbered years, each institution shall ~~will~~ forward to the Board office a copy of ~~the~~ all reports resulting from the five-year institutional review of CEPs Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (as described in ~~b.vii.(2) b.ii.(8)~~).

iv All reports shall be reviewed for compliance and the results will be reported to the Board President and Chief Executive Officer.

d. ~~Implementation~~

~~This policy shall become effective at the beginning of the fall semester one calendar year after approval. (5-18-05)~~

### 3. Act on Request for Program Alignment

**Rita Johnson,  
Senior Director,  
Workforce Innovation**

#### **Summary**

*After thorough review and discussion, the Technical Education Authority (TEA) endorses the proposed Electrical Technology program alignment and map (dated 12/12/13) as the best available solution to preserve the four objectives of the alignment process while providing colleges with maximum institutional flexibility. The TEA recommends approval of the aligned Electrical Technology program.*

#### **Background**

##### **Program Alignment Objectives**

- Business/industry identification of common program exit points
- Business/industry identification of industry-recognized credentials
- Identification of common courses and competencies as well as institutional program flexibility
- Established common program length for all aligned programs

##### **Program Alignment Process**

###### **Phase I—Research and Business/Industry Input**

Survey local college advisory committees and employers in the field  
Complete research on current programs at colleges and industry-based credential options  
State business and industry representatives establish recommendations  
14 day comment period for college presidents

###### **Phase II—Program and Course Alignment**

Statewide program faculty curriculum meeting #1  
Administrative Review #1  
14 day comment period for college presidents  
Statewide program faculty curriculum meeting #2  
Administrative Review #2  
14 day comment period for college presidents  
State business and industry review and endorsement  
14 day comment period for college presidents

###### **Phase III—Approval of Aligned Program**

Technical Education Authority Program/Curriculum Committee review and recommendation  
Technical Education Authority review and recommendation  
Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee review and recommendation  
Kansas Board of Regents approval

###### **Phase IV—Implementation of Aligned Program**

Institutions make program/curricular modifications to implement the aligned program

###### **Phase V—Review of Aligned Programs**

Periodic review of previously aligned programs to ensure programs/courses continue to meet business and industry needs as well as program accreditation and/or licensing requirements.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The following ten institutions currently offer Electrical Technology (46.0302) programs at the technical certificate and/or associate of applied science degree levels: Coffeyville Community College, Highland Community College, Hutchinson Community College, Johnson County Community College, Kansas City Kansas Community College, North Central Kansas Technical College, Northwest Kansas Technical College, Pratt Community College, Salina Area Technical College, and Washburn Institute of Technology.

During Phase I of the alignment process, business and industry representatives from the electrical technology field met, in February 2013, and emphasized the need to gauge the skill level of all potential employees. This group recommended the Journey Worker Licensure Exam as the most appropriate tool for this purpose. Industry representatives noted that varying amounts of actual work experience are required for an individual to acquire the actual Journey Worker License; however, the recommendation from business and industry is that students exiting an aligned Electrical Technology program (at either the technical certificate or AAS level) take and pass the examination portion of the licensing process. In addition, business and industry representatives recommended general work-related competencies (as identified in the “Notes” section of the alignment map) to be incorporated within the aligned curriculum for this program.

During Phase II of the alignment process, a statewide curriculum committee, comprised of faculty from approved Electrical Technology programs and two representatives from the state business and industry committee, met on May 3, 2013, to bring further definition to the alignment map by clarifying value-added exit points, common courses and agreed upon competencies. After lengthy discussion, two exit points were designated. Committee members agreed the first exit point needed to be a Certificate B (30-44 credit hours), the minimum amount of instruction needed for students to be employable and to test for the Journey Worker Exam. The committee also concluded that an AAS degree (maximum 68 credit hours) was an appropriate exit point.

The proposed alignment map dated 11/19/13, reflecting the recommendations of the state business and industry committee and the state curriculum committee, was issued for presidential comment from 10/01/13 to 10/23/13. No comments were received.

The Electrical Technology program alignment was reviewed and discussed by members of the Technical Education Authority Program/Curriculum committee on November 19, 2013 and by the full TEA on December 12, 2013. The Technical Education Authority endorses and recommends approval of the Electrical Technology program alignment and map as presented.



<b>Electrical Technology Program Alignment – Kansas Board of Regents</b> <b>CIP: 46.0302</b>	2013 12/12/2013
---	--------------------



*Required Courses within Program*

<i>Common Courses</i>	<i>23-25 credits:</i>
<i>National Electrical Code I</i>	<i>4 credits</i>
<i>National Electrical Code II</i>	<i>4 credits</i>
<i>AC/DC Circuits I</i>	<i>4 credits</i>
<i>Print Reading</i>	<i>2 credits</i>
<i>Commercial Wiring I</i>	<i>4 credits</i>
<i>Residential Wiring I</i>	<i>4 credits</i>
<i>Safety (OSHA 10 or 30)</i>	<i>1-3 credits</i>

*Course list sequence has no implication on course scheduling by colleges.*

*Institutions may add additional competencies based on local demand.*

**Notes**

Specifics pertaining to Electrical Technology programs:

1. Passing the Journey Worker Exam does not qualify a student to be a licensed Journeyman. Electricians are “licensed” to practice following acquisition of passing the licensure exam AND validation of the required on-the-job work experience (typically two years).
2. OSHA 10 or 30 card is required.
3. Competencies identified within the 23-25 credit hours of common courses represent opportunities for articulation with K-12.
4. Additional recommended competencies to be incorporated within the Electrical Technology curriculum: listening skills, oral communication skills, human relations skills, decision-making skills, problem-solving, teamwork, time & resource management, work ethics, & career planning.

C. *Fiscal Affairs & Audit*

Regent McKechnie

**1. Approve Distribution of State Funds for Governor’s Technical Education Program**

**Diane Duffy,  
VP, Finance & Administration**

**Summary and Kansas Postsecondary Technical Education Authority Recommendation**

*Senate Bill 155 became law in FY 2013, providing free college tuition for high school students in postsecondary technical education courses and incentives to school districts for students earning industry-recognized credentials in high-demand occupations. For FY 2014, the second year of the initiative, expenditures are estimated to be in the range of \$19.5 million, of which \$18 million will cover the calculated costs (no tuition charged to students) and \$1.5 million will provide incentive payments to school districts. The Board will make two distributions of appropriated state funds to community and technical colleges. Each colleges’ amount is based on actual student enrollments and the calculated costs according to the KBOR cost model. The first distribution occurs in January and the second in June. The FY 2014 Tuition for Technical Education (SB 155) First Distribution Report, along with the FY 2013 Reconciliation Report was approved by the Technical Education Authority (TEA) on December 12, 2013. The Authority recommends this first distribution for final action by the Kansas Board of Regents at it January 15-16, 2014; and distribution of funds to occur shortly thereafter.*

**Background**

In 2012, Senate Bill 155 became law, providing free college tuition for high school students in postsecondary technical education courses and incentives to school districts for students earning industry-recognized credentials in high-demand occupations. In the first full year, an estimated 6,100 secondary students enrolled in college-level technical education courses, generating over 43,312 credit hours. Following graduation in June 2013, the program awarded 711 secondary students industry-recognized credentials in high demand occupations. Actual FY 2013 expenditures totaled \$12.7 million, of which \$12.0 million was expended on tuition (a calculated rate to cover the total cost) and \$694,168 on credential attainment incentives. The initiative has received national recognition as a “Top Ten Innovations to Watch” from the Brookings Institute.

Academic year 2012-2013 (FY 2013) was the start-up year for SB 155. Due to the short amount of time between passage of the bill and actual implementation of the activities, short-term provisions for data collection and disbursement of appropriated funding were put into place. KBOR staff working with the Process Management Committee, comprised of college leaders, initiated a process to collect secondary student enrollment information by course from the colleges for enrollments between July 1, 2012 and the fall census date. A second data collection was then designed for institutions to submit the estimated secondary student information for course enrollments after the fall census day through the spring census day. Funding for these tiered technical education courses was calculated using the same KBOR cost model used for tiered technical education state aid calculations. Secondary student credit hours were multiplied by the course rate for each course (per the KBOR cost model) to determine the amount for each college. For the secondary tuition program, the course rate is financed 100% by state funding. Institutions cannot charge eligible secondary students tuition and there is no local support assumed. Based on the estimated secondary student enrollment information submitted by the colleges, the Board approved and the staff disbursed \$12,018,419 in appropriated funds to the institutions in June 2013. In September 2013 individual student records were submitted to the Board office and the costs associated with the actual secondary student postsecondary credit hour enrollments for the entire 2012-2013 academic year were calculated for each institution. The 2013 Tuition for Technical Education (SB 155) Reconciliation Report reconciles the funding each institution received in June 2013 with the funding each institution is eligible to receive based on actual secondary student credit hour enrollments in tiered technical courses submitted in the AY 2013 data submission.

For academic year 2013-2014 (FY 2014) two data submission dates have been established for institutions to submit individual student records to report actual secondary student credit hour enrollments in postsecondary tiered technical courses. The first submission includes those secondary credit hours earned during the 2013

summer and fall semesters as of October 21, 2013, the closing of the first submission. The 2014 Tuition for Technical Education (SB 155) First Submission/First Disbursement Report provides the unduplicated headcount, secondary student registration/credit hour information, the KBOR calculated costs associated with these actual secondary credit hours, the reconciliation adjustment to the FY 2013 distribution and the proposed first distribution (January 2014) for the Tuition for Technical Education current year appropriation, as is posted at this link.

Institutions will have until March 31, 2014 to make additional data submissions updating the secondary student enrollment/credit hour information from which subsequent 2014 Tuition for Technical Education disbursements would be made in June. All funding received by each institution will be reconciled after the AY 2014 data submission has been locked and certified, the following Fall.

**TEA Recommendation**

The TEA recommends the Kansas Board of Regents approve the following as the first of two distributions of FY 2014 appropriated state funds for the calculated costs associated with actual enrollments.

Institution Name	January 2014 Proposed First Distribution
Allen County CC	\$191,932
Barton County CC	280,071
Butler CC	257,637
Cloud County CC	161,858
Coffeyville CC	318,050
Colby CC	19,248
Cowley County	194,244
Dodge City CC	129,655
Flint Hills TC	215,531
Fort Scott CC	161,359
Garden City CC	211,446
Highland CC	244,092
Hutchinson CC	1,565,667
Independence CC	38,747
Johnson County CC	343,621
Kansas City Kansas CC	260,819
Labette CC	129,951
Manhattan Area TC	3,217
Neosho County CC	390,424
North Central Kansas TC	110,828
Northwest Kansas TC	107,485
Pratt CC	286,054
Salina Area TC	294,665
Seward County CC	309,131
Washburn Institute of Technology	1,304,705
Wichita Area TC	849,304
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$8,379,741</b>

D. Other Matters

1. Receive Governor’s Budget Recommendations and Act on Non-Budgetary Legislative Items

Diane Duffy,  
VP, Finance & Administration  
Mary Jane Stankiewicz,  
Director, Government Relations & Communications

The following are non-budgetary legislative items that may be discussed in the 2014 legislative session and other issues that relate to the legislative session.

**Non-budgetary Legislative Issues**

- 1. **60% attainment.** A resolution setting forth the 60% attainment goal and asking that the legislature support the Kansas board of regents strategic plan for achieving postsecondary education attainment, as set forth in Foresight 2020, and specifically the goal of increasing to 60% by the year 2020 the number of Kansas adults who have a certificate, associate degree or a bachelor degree.
- 2. **Referendum.** COPs passed out favorably the concept of eliminating the need for a referendum when using tuition dollars to be used for debt service on health and academic buildings. Instead the universities would discuss the tuition for debt service topic with the student group that reviews and discusses tuition increases currently. A referendum would still be required when using fees for the purpose of paying for academic buildings or health facilities.
- 3. **Increase the threshold to \$1.0 million for projects requiring formal procurement of architectural or engineering services and streamline the Notice and Public Hearing requirements for alternative construction methods.** Presently K.S.A. 75-1253 (and by extension projects authorized under K.S.A. 76-7,125 et. seq.) require formal procurement of architectural or engineering services, when the project is expected to be more than \$750,000 in the case of architectural services or \$500,000 in the instance of engineering services. Increasing the thresholds in these statutes to \$1.0 million would streamline the process by permitting use of in-house or on-call professional services for additional numbers of projects, thereby saving time and in some instances inflationary costs.

Presently a separate Kansas Register posting and public hearing is held by the State Building Advisory Committee on each request for alternative project delivery (i.e. Construction Manager at Risk and Design/Build). The State Building Advisory Committee has developed its own criteria and has considerably more experience at dealing with such requests, than was the case when the current law was approved in 2006. Further, public participation in such hearings has been negligible. The schedule for such approvals could be reduced by approximately six weeks if a Kansas Register posting and public hearing were collapsed into the process for bidders to submit Statements of Qualification.

- 4. **Allow use of Educational Building Fund/ Rehabilitation and Repair allocations for short term debt service.** Presently relatively large rehabilitation and repair projects must be divided into separate projects so that they can be fit within the annual rehabilitation and repair allocation. Improved efficiency and cost savings could be achieved through bonding a single large project and using EBF/R&R financing for debt retirement over a short term. COBO recommends that Legislation be requested allowing up to 50 percent of the EBF fund balance to be committed to debt service for this type of short term financing. If a maximum term on the debt service needs to be set in legislation, COBO recommends a maximum of seven years be requested although COBO anticipates that 3-5 years duration would be more typical. The actual projects would continue to be subject to KBOR approval and KBOR approval would be required for each instance of such debt issuance. Legislative safeguards would continue to be through the Joint Committee on Building Construction, which annually receives

updates from the campuses and annually reviews rehabilitation and repair projects. However, such an amendment would preclude seeking formal statutory legislative approval for each instance of temporary debt issuance. It is noteworthy KDOT presently has such blanket authority, through legislation approved approximately three years ago.

**IX. Adjournment**

# AGENDA

KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS  
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE

January 15, 2014

10:30 a.m.

- I. Approve December 18, 2013 Minutes
- II. Agenda Planning
  1. Consent Agenda
    - b. Act on Requests for Additional Degree Granting Authority for:
      - Columbia Southern University
      - University of Phoenix
      - The Pennsylvania State University
      - Georgetown University
      - WellSpring School of Allied Health
      - Michigan State University
      - University of Southern California
      - DeVry University
    - c. Act on Request for Degree and Certificate Programs Submitted from Community Colleges and Technical Colleges
    - d. Request for Approval of a Bachelor of Science in Personal Financial Planning (CIP 52.0804) – KSU
  2. Discussion Agenda
    - a. Act on Request for Program Alignment
    - b. Accept Annual Report on Qualified Admissions
- III. Other Business
  1. Status of Transfer Courses
  2. Report on Midwest Higher Education Commission/State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement Meeting

# MINUTES

**Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee  
Wednesday, December 18, 2013  
10:00 a.m.  
Crumbine Conference Room  
Curtis State Office Building  
Topeka, Kansas**

The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee met in the Crumbine Conference Room of the Curtis State Office Building, Topeka, Kansas, at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, December 18, 2013.

Members Present: Robba Moran, Chair  
Mildred Edwards  
Tim Emert  
Helen Van Etten

Board Staff: Gary Alexander, Karla Wiscombe, Susan Fish, Jacqueline Johnson, Jean Redeker, Kirk Haskins, and Theresa Marcel Schwartz

Others Present: Sara Rosen, University of Kansas; Rick Muma, Wichita State University; Ruth Dyer, Kansas State University; Karla Fisher, Butler County Community College; Gene George, Butler County Community College; Tony Vizzini, Wichita State University; Debbie Mercer, Kansas State University; Shirley Lefever-Davis, Wichita State University; Ken Weaver, Emporia State University; and Sara Harris, Independence Community College

## **Approve December 3, 2013 Minutes**

The December 3, 2013 Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee Conference Call minutes stand approved as submitted.

## **Butler County Community College Revised Performance Agreement**

BAASC expressed appreciation to Butler College Community College for submitting its revised performance agreement with the addition of the seventh indicator.

## **BAASC 13-05, Teacher Preparation**

Kansas State University Education Dean, Debbie Mercer, made a presentation regarding KSU's College of Education and Wichita State University Education Dean, Shirley Lefever-Davis, gave a presentation regarding Wichita State University's College of Education. These presentations included information on what the institutions are doing well, innovations, how they respond to changing demographics, and how they incorporate the Common Core Standards.

BAASC will report to the full Board on teacher preparation as per the presentations received in its meetings.

## **BAASC 13-03, State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA): Gary Alexander**

Gary Alexander sent materials out to Board members and a recommendation. An estimated fiscal impact report was included.

The Standing Committee agrees by consensus to bring the recommendation to the Board for approval.

**BAASC 13-02, Transfer and Articulation**

Karla Wiscombe apprised the Standing Committee that courses may not be ready for approval at the January 2014 Board meeting because last month's meeting was shortened due to inclement weather. There are six more courses to review and three courses were returned to faculty for clarification. It was noted it is better for the Board to act on courses in early Spring so proper advising can occur. Therefore, depending on how many courses are approved at the Thursday, December 19, 2014 Transfer and Articulation Council meeting, approved courses could be presented to the Board in either January or February.

Quality Assurance was discussed. In the future, data will be available to analyze students' ability to do the course work at the institution to which they have transferred.

**BAASC 13-04, Developmental Education Update**

Susan Fish gave BAASC an update on the progress of the Developmental Education Working Group. At its November 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting, the Group reviewed Neosho County Community College President, Dr. Brian Inbody's presentation to the Kansas Board of Regents; chairs were appointed for the subgroups (Math, Language Arts, and Advising), and the subgroups decided how they would proceed to get their work done. The Working Group agreed to do a survey of the colleges not represented on the developmental education group to find out what they are doing with developmental education. A webinar was conducted regarding available data and what data is needed. Each subgroup will report its findings. The Math and Advising subgroups will report at the Working Group's January meeting.

**Informational Item**

Jean Redeker provided a brief overview of the study regarding retention/graduation rates of students admitted as exception to minimum admission standards as prescribed in K.S.A. 76-717. Students who are less prepared do not perform as well. The study was requested by the Legislature in its 2012 session.

**Other Business**

There was no other business.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:56 a.m.



# AGENDA

Board Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee  
Wednesday, January 15, 2014  
10:00am-11:50am, Board Room

1. Follow up questions from January 7, 2014 conference call
  - a. Authorization To Amend 2014 Capital Improvements Plan - KU
  - b. Authorization To Raze Building And Authorization To Amend FY 2015 Capital Improvement Requests And Approve Program Statement For Technology II Facility Project – WSU.
  - c. Authorization To Amend FY 2014 Capital Improvement Requests To Include The Bill Snyder Stadium Master Plan Phase III And Authorization To Amend FY 2014 Capital Improvement Requests To Include Video-Sound Upgrades – KSU.
  - d. Authorization To Purchase Property – KSU.
2. Questions/clarifications about any of the FAA items on the Board’s January 15-16 agenda
3. Audits for committee review and discussion (standing item)
  - a. FAA 13-09 Receive Internal Audit Plans and meet with state university internal auditors  

Brian Denton, Emporia State University  
Chris Cavanaugh, Wichita State University  
John Curran, University of Kansas  
Anna Debes, Fort Hays State University  
LaDonna Flynn, Pittsburg State University  
Vacant, Kansas State University
4. FAA 13-06 Update on KSU Veterinary Medical Center enhancement funding  

Ralph C. Richardson, DVM, Dipl ACVIM (Oncology, Internal Med), Dean, College of Veterinary Medicine, KSU
5. FAA 13-12 Discuss and develop guidance for the FY 2015 State Universities tuition proposals – begin the discussion with further discussion in February
6. Possible visit with Kansas Development Finance Authority and Moody’s
7. Other topics
8. Future Committee Business
  - a. Next meeting dates
    - i. AGENDA CALL, Tuesday, January 28, Noon, Teleconference
    - ii. NEXT REGULAR MEETING, Wednesday, February 12, 10:00am-11:50am, Board Room

# AGENDA

Board Governance Committee  
Wednesday, January 15, 2014  
8:45-10:00, Conference Room B

**I. APPROVE MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 18, 2013**

**II. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. GOV 13-10, Review proposed revisions to policies
  - 1. Proposed reverse transfer policy
- B. GOV 13-04, Discuss CEO performance review format
- C. GOV 13-03, Review state universities' annual updates on campus security
  - 1. Pittsburg State University
  - 2. Wichita State University

**III. OTHER COMMITTEE ITEMS**

- A. Next meeting dates
  - 1. February 12
  - 2. March 12

# MINUTES

## GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE December 18, 2013 Minutes

The Kansas Board of Regents' Governance Committee met on Wednesday, December 18, 2013. Chairman Fred Logan called the meeting to order at 8:45 a.m. Proper notice was given according to law.

Members Present: Fred Logan, Chair  
Kenny Wilk  
Tim Emert

Others Present: President Shonrock, ESU; President Bardo, WSU; President Hammond, FHSU; Andy Tompkins, KBOR; Gary Alexander, KBOR; Mary Jane Stankiewicz, KBOR; Julene Miller, KBOR; Renee Burlingham, KBOR

### MINUTES

Regent Emert moved to approve the November 20, 2013 minutes. Regent Wilk seconded, and the motion carried.

### ACADEMIC ADVISING POLICY

Gary Alexander, Vice President for Academic Affairs, introduced proposed revisions to the Board's Academic Advising policy. The new language requires the universities to submit a report to the Board office every three years, beginning in spring 2016, on academic advising. Regent Wilk moved to forward the proposed amendments to the Board, and Regent Emert seconded. The motion carried. The following policy will be forwarded to the Board for consideration:

#### 10. ACADEMIC ADVISING

- a. Effective academic advising is central to the educational mission of the Board of Regents. To ensure that all students have access to high quality advising, each state university shall establish an Academic Advising System, which shall provide the following:
  - i. Goal Setting: Each Academic Advising System should help students to set both short-term and long-term educational goals.
  - ii. Information: Each Academic Advising System should be able to accurately inform students of graduation requirements of their department. It should be sensitive to the importance of strategic course selections so as to minimize the number of semesters required for graduation. Additionally, the System should be able to inform students of career opportunities in their field of study.
  - iii. Transitions: Each Academic Advising System should inform students how to change colleges and/or departments. Furthermore, the System should provide information to explain the process students follow to enroll in their curriculum and to drop or add courses during the semester.
  - iv. Accessibility: Each Academic Advising System should have reasonable hours and methods of availability for students. Additionally, students should be able to set up appointments within the System for an adequate amount of time to make curricular selections and career choices.

- v. Referral to Campus Resources: Each Academic Advising System should be able to refer students to various campus resources including, but not limited to: university counseling services, student activities, and career and employment services.
- b. Each Academic Advising System shall provide information to students to inform them of their responsibilities in the Academic Advising process.
- c. Each Academic Advising System shall be responsible for the necessary training of academic advisors to assist them in meeting the responsibilities of this policy.
- d. Every three years, beginning in spring 2016, each campus shall submit to the Board’s Vice President for Academic Affairs a written report, no more than two pages in length, describing how its Academic Advising System advances the Board’s strategic goals pertaining to retention and graduation. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall summarize the campus reports in a single document and provide it to the Board President and Chief Executive Officer for transmission to the Board at the President and Chief Executive Officer’s discretion.

**CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT POLICY**

Vice President Alexander presented the proposed amendments to the Board’s Concurrent Enrollment policy. The policy amendments include two specific proposed revisions: 1) revising qualifications for high school faculty teaching college-level, non-tiered Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses; and 2) eliminating the limit of 24 semester credit hours that may be earned in concurrent enrollment partnership classes. Following discussion, Regent Emert moved to forward the proposed amendments to the Board. Regent Wilk seconded, and the motion carried. The following policy revisions will be forwarded to the Board for consideration:

Chapter III.  
A. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

...

**11. CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN ELIGIBLE PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS THROUGH CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT PARTNERSHIPS**

It is the policy of the Kansas Board of Regents to encourage high school students to take advantage of postsecondary education opportunities by enrolling in postsecondary courses while still in high school or participating in home schooling. K.S.A. 72-11a01 through 72-11a05 provide for these opportunities through the Kansas Challenge to Secondary School Pupils Act. The act commonly is known as concurrent enrollment of high school students in eligible postsecondary institutions. Statutory language provides conditions under which secondary schools and eligible postsecondary institutions may establish cooperative agreements, defined as a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership (CEP).

~~Different types of concurrent enrollment can be included under the statute. In one type, a high school student may enroll at a postsecondary institution at any time without any formal agreement between the high school and the postsecondary institution. (This type of concurrent enrollment would include 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students enrolling pursuant to K.A.R. 88-26-3, as amended, and any non-degree-seeking student.) In another type, a high school teacher teaches a college level course to high school students at the high school during the regular high school day. The latter must conform to section b. of this policy.~~

While various forms of dual enrollment may be offered under the statute, this policy applies only to Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships formed between a high school and eligible postsecondary education institution in which a high school faculty member teaches a college-level course to high school students at the high school during the regular high school day. These partnerships must conform to paragraph b. of this policy.

Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships do NOT include the following: (1) programs in which the high school student travels to the college campus to take courses prior to graduation during the academic year or during the summer; (2) programs in which college faculty travel to the high school to teach separate courses to high school students; and (3) the College Board Advanced Placement Program and the International Baccalaureate Program, which use standardized tests to assess the student’s knowledge of a curriculum developed by a committee consisting of both college and high school faculty.

a. Purposes of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships

As established by the Kansas Board of Regents, the system-wide purposes of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships are ~~fourfold~~ threefold:

~~ii.~~ To Develop Seamlessness in the Kansas Public Postsecondary Education System

~~“Seamlessness” is defined in the Transfer and Articulation provisions of this policy manual.~~

~~(ii) i.~~ To Enhance Efficiency Reduce Time-to Degree and Lower Costs

~~Efficiency is enhanced by exposing as many qualified students as possible to a college level experience, allowing students to get a “jump”~~ Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships enable students to get an early start on their college education, by thus potentially reducing the time required to complete a degree and lowering the costs borne by parents, students and taxpayers.

~~(iii) ii~~ To Challenge High School Students and Promote College-Level Success

~~This goal is~~ Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships are aimed at providing a college-level learning experience for qualified students by enhancing the amount, level and diversity of learning in high school beyond the traditional secondary curriculum. First year experience courses, performing and visual arts courses and advanced science, mathematics and language offerings not available in high school are especially encouraged.

~~(iv) iii~~ To Foster Improved Relationships Between Kansas Public Postsecondary Education Institutions and Kansas Secondary Schools

~~The~~ Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (~~CEP~~) are intended to foster improved relationships among stakeholders by clarifying expectations, roles, and responsibilities.

~~Statutory language provides conditions under which secondary schools and eligible postsecondary institutions may establish cooperative agreements, or what has been defined as a CEP.~~

b. Procedures and Standards ~~of Quality for Cooperative Agreements and Delivery of~~ for Implementing Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships CourseWork

i Definitions of ~~Concurrent Enrollment~~

For purposes of this policy:

(1) ~~“Concurrent Enrollment Partnership pupil student”~~ means a person who is in grades 10, 11, or 12, or who is gifted and is in grade 9 (see paragraph b.v.(2)); has been admitted to an eligible postsecondary education institution as a degree-seeking or non-degree seeking student; and is enrolled in classes/courses at a high school at which approved high school teachers/faculty teach college credit classes/courses during the normal school day. who is in grades 10, 11, or 12, or who is gifted and is in grade 9 (see section b.(5)(e)(b)), and is acceptable or has been accepted for enrollment at an eligible postsecondary education institution.

(2) ~~“Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreement”~~ means a written memorandum of understanding between an eligible postsecondary institution and a school district for the purpose of offering college-level learning to students who are eligible to enroll in college courses offered at a high school at which approved high school faculty teach said college courses during the normal school day.

~~(2)~~ (3) ~~“Eligible postsecondary education institution”~~ means any state ~~educational institution~~ university, community college, technical college, municipal university or affiliated institute of technology.

(3) ~~“State educational institution”~~ means any state university as defined in K.S.A. 76-711, and amendments thereto.

(4) ~~“Community college”~~ means any community college organized and operating under the laws of this state.

~~(f)(e)~~ ~~“Municipal university”~~ means a municipal university established under the provisions of article 13a of chapter 13 of Kansas Statutes Annotated.

~~(g)(f)~~ ~~“Technical college”~~ means any technical college established under the laws of this state as described in K.S.A. 74-3201b.

(7) ~~“Concurrent Enrollment Partnership (CEP)” agreement~~ means a written memorandum of understanding between an eligible postsecondary institution and a school district for the purpose of offering college-level learning to students who have been accepted for concurrent enrollment partnership in off-campus classes at a high school at which approved high school teachers teach college credit classes during the normal school day.

~~The CEP agreement must contain, at a minimum, the names and contact information of the liaisons for both parties, term and termination of the agreement, an overview of the partnership’s purpose and benefits, the individual and joint responsibilities of both parties, information, guidelines and necessary directions for curriculum, faculty, students, assessment, professional development activities and a listing of principles for assuring quality in programming. CEPs must include attachments that address issues of compensation, awarding of credit and course listings for each party.~~

~~CEP arrangements shall include collaborative faculty development programming such as pedagogy, instructional design, course management, instructional delivery skill improvement, curricular reform initiatives, qualified admissions considerations (if applicable), and student success assessment strategies.~~

~~Although courses in some CEPs may have some elements or characteristics of the programs stated below, CEPs do not include the following programs:~~

~~(i) Programs in which the high school student travels to the college campus to take courses prior to graduation during the academic year or during the summer.~~

~~(ii) Programs in which college faculty travel to the high school to teach separate courses to the high school students.~~

~~(iii) The College Board Advanced Placement Program and the International Baccalaureate Program where standardized tests are used to assess students' knowledge of a curriculum developed by a committee consisting of both college and high school faculty.~~

ii Agreement between Eligible Postsecondary Institutions and School Districts

A CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreement ~~must~~ shall be established between the eligible postsecondary institution and the school district. Such agreement ~~must minimally~~ shall satisfy the requirements of statute K.S.A. 72-11a04 and contain the essential elements provided in this policy. The agreement shall contain, at a minimum:

~~General provisions of the statute relative to CEP agreements are as follows:~~

(1) the names and contact information of the liaisons for both parties, term of the agreement and any provisions for early termination, the individual and joint responsibilities of both parties, information, guidelines and necessary directions for curriculum, faculty, students, assessment, and a listing of principles for assuring quality in programming;

(2) an implementation plan for ensuring high school faculty teaching concurrently enrolled partnership students are integrated into the postsecondary partner institution through orientation, professional development, seminars, site visits, annual evaluations and ongoing communication with the postsecondary partner institution's faculty;

(3) a clause addressing issues of compensation, awarding of credit and course listings for each party;

~~(4)~~(4) acknowledgement that the academic credit is to shall be granted for course work successfully completed by the pupil student at the eligible postsecondary partner institution, which shall qualify as college credit and may qualify as both high school and college credit;

~~(2)~~(5) acknowledgement that such course work must shall qualify as credit applicable toward the award of a degree or certificate at the eligible postsecondary partner institution;

~~(3)~~(6) acknowledgement that the pupil student shall pay to the postsecondary partner institution the negotiated amount of tuition, fees and related costs charged by the institution for enrollment of the pupil student except in the case of tiered technical courses. Secondary students admitted to postsecondary tiered technical courses conducted by a community college, technical college or institute of technology may be charged fees, but shall not be charged tuition;

(7) a plan for ensuring that courses offered through a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership are annually reviewed by college faculty in the discipline at the postsecondary partner institution according to the criteria described in iii.(5); and

(8) a statement indicating the Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreement shall be reviewed at least every five years by the postsecondary partner institution to assure compliance and quality considerations as outlined in this policy.

iii Curriculum Standards and Content of Courses in which Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Students are Enrolled, Course Content/Materials, and Assessment of Students

(1) Courses administered through a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership shall be university/college catalogued courses with the same departmental id, course descriptions, numbers, titles and credits. Courses must have been approved through the curriculum approval process of the postsecondary partner institution.

(2) The high school and college-level prerequisites, the content of courses, course goals and objectives, must be the same as those for the same courses offered to students at any location or by any delivery method.

(3) Materials such as textbooks ~~used~~ must be comparable to those used in the same course throughout the postsecondary partner institution. Procedures for selection of textbooks and related material by high school faculty who teach concurrently enrolled students must follow ~~adopted~~ the postsecondary partner's institutional policies.

(4) If a course has been approved by Board staff as competency-based, the competencies for the courses must be the same as those for courses not taught to concurrently enrolled students.

(5) College faculty at the postsecondary partner institution shall annually review Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses in their discipline to ensure that:

(a) Concurrent Enrollment Partnership students are held to the same grading standards and standards of achievement as those expected of students in on-campus sections;

(b) Concurrent Enrollment Partnership students are being assessed using the same methods (i.e., papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs) as students in on-campus sections;

(c) high school faculty are utilizing the same final examination for each Concurrent Enrollment Partnership course as is given in a representative section of the same course taught at the public postsecondary institution awarding the course credit; and

(d) high school faculty are applying the same scoring rubric for the assigned course as is used in the on-campus course; and that course management, instructional delivery and content meet or exceed those in regular on-campus sections.

(6) Remedial/developmental course work or course work that does not apply to a Board of Regents' approved degree program at the postsecondary partner institution in a CEP agreement is not considered appropriate for college-level credit. shall not be offered as a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership course.

iv High School Faculty/Instructors

(1) Qualifications

(a) High school faculty teaching college-level, non-tiered Concurrent Enrollment Partnership (CEP) courses ~~must~~ shall attain instructional eligibility by meeting the standards established by the Higher



Learning Commission of the North Central Association, as stated in that body's *Criteria for Accreditation and Assumed Practices* regarding faculty roles and qualifications. ~~or (2) demonstrate possession of a bachelors degree, with at least 24 credit hours in the assigned course content and utilize the same final examination as given in a representative section of the course taught at the institution awarding the course credit and apply the same scoring rubric for the assigned course as that used in the on-campus class. Institutions may set higher standards. Teaching evaluations must be conducted. The postsecondary institution shall provide instructors with orientation and ongoing professional development.~~

(b) Faculty teaching college-level tiered technical courses through a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership ~~(CEP) must shall~~ attain instructional eligibility by meeting the academic standards addressed above or possess a valid/current industry- recognized credential and a minimum of 4,000 hours of work experience in the specific technical field ~~and utilize the same final examination as given in a representative section of the course taught at the institution awarding the course credit and apply the same scoring rubric for the assigned course as that used in the on-campus class. Institutions may set higher standards. Teaching evaluations must be conducted. The postsecondary institution shall provide instructors with orientation and ongoing professional development.~~

(c) Postsecondary partner institutions may set higher standards.

(2) Orientation, Professional Development and Evaluation

(a) Before approving high school faculty the instructors to teach college-level CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses, the postsecondary partner institution must shall provide the high school instructors faculty with orientation and training in course curriculum, assessment criteria, course philosophy, and CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership administrative requirements.

(b) The postsecondary partner institution shall provide the high school faculty with ongoing professional development opportunities.

(c) Orientation and/or professional development activities shall include collaborative faculty development programming such as pedagogy, instructional design, course management, instructional delivery skill improvement, curricular reform initiatives, and student success assessment strategies.

(d) The postsecondary partner institution shall annually conduct evaluations of high school faculty teaching Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses to ensure compliance with the state expectations for Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses.

~~(e) Each CEP must include an implementation plan for ensuring that instructors teaching concurrently enrolled partnership students are part of a continuing collegial interaction through professional development, seminars, site visits, and ongoing communication with the postsecondary institution's faculty and administration of the partnership.~~

v Student Eligibility for Enrollment, Advising and Student Guides

~~(1) Concurrently enrolled students must meet institutional enrollment requirements; follow institutional procedures regarding assessment/placement; and satisfy course prerequisites. High school students enrolled in courses administered through a CEP may Concurrent Enrollment Partnership shall be enrolled as degree or non-degree/ or non-matriculated students of at the sponsoring postsecondary partner institution. Each Concurrent Enrollment Partnership student must meet the postsecondary partner institution's requirements for admission as a degree-seeking or non-degree/non-matriculated student. Concurrently enrolled students shall have met institutional enrollment requirements; satisfied course prerequisites; and followed~~

~~institutional procedures regarding assessment/placement. In order to enroll in a CEP course, students shall achieve the same score or subscore on a standardized placement test as is required for students enrolled in the same on-campus course. To meet the “academic challenge” purpose of this policy, CEP students must have an acceptable achieve the score or subscore on a standardized placement test in order to enroll in a CEP course. Postsecondary partner institutions may establish higher standards.~~

~~(2) Students who are enrolled in grade 9 and are classified by a school district as “gifted” according to the State Department of Education’s definition, K.A.R. 91-40-1(bb), as amended, may be admitted as concurrently enrolled students provided all other applicable requirements as outlined above are satisfied.~~

~~(3) The student must be authorized by the high school principal to apply for enrollment.~~

~~(4) Students must be provided with a student guide created as part of the CEP that outlines their rights and responsibilities in the learning experience as well as a description of how courses may be transferred in the Kansas public postsecondary education system. Advising of students who desire to enroll in CEP classes Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses must be carried out by both the high school and postsecondary institution.~~

~~(5) Students shall be provided with a student guide created as part of the Concurrent Enrollment Partnership that outlines their rights and responsibilities as university/college students. The student guide shall also provide a description of how courses may be transferred in the Kansas public postsecondary education system.~~

~~(3) Students who are enrolled in grade 9 and are classified by a school district as “gifted” according to the State Department of Education’s definition, K.A.R. 91-40-1(cc), as amended, may be admitted as concurrently enrolled students provided all other applicable requirements as outlined above are satisfied.~~

~~(4) The student must be authorized by the school principal to apply for enrollment.~~

vi CEP Courses ~~which that~~ Include Students Enrolled for Secondary and/or Postsecondary Credit

A course may include students enrolled for postsecondary and/or secondary credit. The postsecondary partner institution is responsible for ensuring that academic standards (course requirements and grading criteria) are not compromised.

~~(7) Accountability/Assessment Standards~~

~~(a) Courses offered through a concurrent enrollment partnership must be reviewed annually by faculty in the discipline at the postsecondary partner to assure that grading standards (i.e., papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs), course management, instructional delivery and content meet or exceed those in regular on-campus sections.~~

~~(b) Each CEP must be reviewed at least every five years by the eligible postsecondary institution to assure compliance and quality considerations as outlined in this policy.~~

~~(c) The Board office will track students who have participated in concurrent enrollment partnerships and other forms of concurrent enrollment.~~

~~(8) Collegiate Learning~~

~~CEP classes are not intended to replace a substantial portion of the academic experience on a college/university campus. Up to 24 semester credit hours may be earned in concurrent enrollment partnership classes, excluding credit hours earned in tiered technical courses.~~

c. Reporting of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships Courses

i Institutions will report the following as a part of the regular Kansas Postsecondary Database collection:

- (1) Directory information for each high school student enrolled;
- (2) Credit hours generated by each high school student;
- (3) Credentials of faculty teaching CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses; and
- (4) CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership credit hours generated by each high school student.

ii By January 31 of odd-numbered years, each public postsecondary institution ~~will~~ shall provide to Board staff a list of high schools ~~involved in formal CEP~~ with which it has Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreements. For each institution, Board staff will select no more than two high schools for reporting. For each high school selected, each institution will submit the following to the Board office:

- (1) Copy of the CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreement ~~including (but not limited to)~~ that includes the criteria described in b.ii.;
- (2) ~~Implementation plan for professional development of instructors of CEP students (as described in b.i.(7) and b. iv..(3))~~

~~(b)~~ Student Guide for CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership students-(as described in b.v.(2) b.v.(5); and

~~(2)~~ (3) Report resulting from the annual review of CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses by postsecondary partner institution faculty and dates of most recent review of all CEP courses, aggregated by discipline (as described in section b.vii.(1) b.iii.(5)).

iii By January 31 of odd-numbered years, each institution shall ~~will~~ forward to the Board office a copy of ~~the all reports~~ resulting from the five-year institutional review of CEPs Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (as described in ~~b.vii.(2) b.ii.(8)~~).

iv All reports shall be reviewed for compliance and the results will be reported to the Board President and Chief Executive Officer.

d. ~~Implementation~~

~~This policy shall become effective at the beginning of the fall semester one calendar year after approval. (5-18-05)~~

IMPROPER USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA

General Counsel Julene Miller introduced proposed policy language regarding improper use of social media. Currently the Board Policy Manual does not have any provisions specifically dealing with the use of social media. General Counsel Miller stated the policy language was carefully drafted to acknowledge and respect the

rights of employees to speak as private citizens on matters of public concern, while also recognizing the employers’ right to take action in situations involving unprotected speech. Most of the language in the proposed policy was drawn directly from the United States Supreme Court free speech precedents. General Counsel Miller reviewed the U.S. Supreme Court cases, and stated the Kansas Attorney General’s Office reviewed the policy and found it to be constitutionally sound on its face under a First Amendment analysis. Regent Emert moved to forward the proposed amendments to the Board, and Regent Wilk seconded. The motion carried. The following policy will be forwarded to the Board for consideration:

**C. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, FACULTY AND STAFF**

...

**6. SUSPENSIONS, TERMINATIONS AND DISMISSALS**

**a. Felony Offenses**

- i Felony Conviction. The chief executive officer of a state university has the authority to discharge any employee, including a tenured faculty member, immediately upon conviction of any felony.
- ii Felony Charge. The chief executive officer of a state university has the authority to discharge or place on leave without pay any employee, including a tenured faculty member, who has been charged with a felony offense. Prior to any such determination, the employee shall be given notice of the proposed action and an opportunity to respond.

**b. Other**

Faculty and staff may also be suspended, dismissed or terminated from employment for reasons of significant reduction in or elimination of the funding source supporting the position, program discontinuance, financial exigency, or for just cause related to the performance of or failure to perform the individual’s duties or for violation of the reasonable directives, rules and regulations, and laws of the institution, the Board and the State of Kansas or the United States.

The chief executive officer of a state university has the authority to suspend, dismiss or terminate from employment any faculty or staff member who makes improper use of social media. “Social media” means any facility for online publication and commentary, including but not limited to blogs, wikis, and social networking sites such as Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter, Flickr, and YouTube. “Improper use of social media” means making a communication through social media that:

- v. directly incites violence or other immediate breach of the peace;
- vi. when made pursuant to (i.e. in furtherance of) the employee’s official duties, is contrary to the best interests of the University;
- vii. discloses without authority any confidential student information, protected health care information, personnel records, personal financial information, or confidential research data; or

- viii. subject to the balancing analysis required by the following paragraph, impairs discipline by superiors or harmony among co-workers, has a detrimental impact on close working relationships for which personal loyalty and confidence are necessary, impedes the performance of the speaker's official duties, interferes with the regular operation of the university, or otherwise adversely affects the university's ability to efficiently provide services.

In determining whether the employee's communication constitutes an improper use of social media under paragraph (iv), the chief executive officer shall balance the interest of the university in promoting the efficiency of the public services it performs through its employees against the employee's right as a citizen to speak on matters of public concern, and may consider the employee's position within the university and whether the employee used or publicized the university name, brands, website, official title or school/department/college or otherwise created the appearance of the communication being endorsed, approved or connected to the university in a manner that discredits the university. The chief executive officer may also consider whether the communication was made during the employee's working hours or the communication was transmitted utilizing university systems or equipment. This policy on improper use of social media shall apply prospectively from its date of adoption by the Kansas Board of Regents.

c. Grievance Procedure

- i Each state university shall establish and publish grievance procedures for use by faculty and staff in appealing employment decisions of the institution. The procedures shall provide the employee with notice of the action to be taken, the reasons for the action where appropriate, and an opportunity to be heard. A copy of all institutional grievance procedures shall be provided to the institution's general counsel for review prior to becoming effective.
- ii The decision of the chief executive officer, or the chief executive officer's designee, concerning any grievance appealing employment decisions of the university shall be final and is not subject to further administrative review by any officer or committee of the university or by the Board of Regents.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 9:10 a.m., Regent Wilk moved, followed by the second of Regent Emert, to recess into executive session for 45 minutes to discuss matters relating to security measures pursuant to K.S.A. 75-4319(b)(13). Participating in the executive session were members of the Governance Committee, President Tompkins, General Counsel Julene Miller, and designated university staff. At 9:55 a.m., the meeting returned to open session.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 a.m.

# AGENDA

System Council of Presidents  
Kansas Board of Regents Office  
1000 S.W. Jackson  
Topeka, KS  
January 15, 2014  
10:30 a.m.  
Suite 530

1. Approve minutes of December 18, 2013.
2. Report from System Council of Chief Academic Officers
3. Continue discussion on reverse transfer
4. Discuss financial literacy
6. Other matters

# MINUTES

System Council of Presidents  
December 18, 2013  
10:00 a.m.  
Kansas Board of Regents Office  
1000 SW Jackson  
Kathy Rupp Conference Room

President Michael Shonrock called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

1. Minutes of November 20, 2013 were approved.
2. Report from the System Council of Chief Academic Officers
  - a. Transfer and Articulation Council (TAAC) Update – Marilyn Mahan, Manhattan Area Tech College, reported that work is progressing and of the 19 courses, 5 have been approved thus far.
  - b. Development Education Task Force Update – The subgroups are meeting now. There will be a survey going out to be completed to glean a broader.
  - c. State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) Update - BAASC suggests that the state of Kansas consider becoming a member.
  - d. Statewide Reverse Transfer Agreement - The Task Force has met, they are examining the recognized 45 credit hour degree program. All aspects should be examined and careful consideration should be taken. What is the appropriate number to fulfill the degree programs.
3. Reverse Transfer – Carl Heilman, Barton County Community College and Michael Shonrock, ESU, provided an update and briefly reviewed the draft of the system wide reverse transfer agreement. The draft of a generic agreement was provided which allows each university some flexibility to develop a process to assist students to complete coursework for and attain all certificates and degrees for which they are eligible. Motion made and seconded (Eric Burks/John Bardo) to approve the draft Board Policy with the addition of opt-out language. Motion passed.
4. Review Previous Agreement & Reverse Transfer on General Education Courses – Fred Hammond, FHSU, Significant discussion regarding the proposed amendments to the current concurrent policy. Motion made and seconded (Steve Scott /Kirk Schulz) to request that SCOCAO explore the details of the original agreement that was signed in 1997. Motion passed.
5. Other Business
  - a. Materials disseminated from CBT and a memorandum from the Association of Governing Boards.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:41am

Submitted by,

Sarah McKernan  
Emporia State University

## AGENDA

Council of Presidents  
Kansas Board of Regents Office  
1000 S.W. Jackson  
Topeka, KS  
January 15, 2014  
11:00 a.m.  
Suite 530

1. Approve minutes of December 18, 2013.
2. Report from Council of Chief Academic Officers
3. Report from Council of Chief Business Officers
4. Report from Council of Government Relations Officers
5. Act on Board Policy on Designation of Chief Financial Officer (Attachment)
6. Other matters



**Summary and Staff Recommendation**

*The Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee proposes a revision to the Board Policy Manual to require that each of the Chief Executive Officers of the state universities designate a Chief Financial Officer. This proposed policy is on the January 15 agenda for the Council of Presidents for action. The plan will be to forward the draft policy along with COPS recommendation to the Governance Committee for their review and recommendation in February.*

**Background**

The Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee was charged with reviewing each of the state universities organizational and functional financial reporting structures (FAA 13-02).

As part of its review, the Committee asked each state university business officer to make a presentation to the Committee on its respective financial reporting structures including the following:

- Organizational chart of financial functions and positions
- Description of where the financial functions and control points occur
- Description of all affiliated corporations by composition and membership (controlled and non-controlled) and their respective organizational relationship to the University.

Presentations were made at the Committee’s meetings in September (University of Kansas), October (Emporia State University, Fort Hays State University, and Pittsburg State University), November (Kansas State University), and December (Wichita State University). As a result of this review, the Committee charged staff with developing a specific board policy requiring each state university to chief executive officer to designate a chief financial officer with authority to effectively perform the standard duties and responsibilities of a chief financial officer, including having a broad knowledge and understanding of all of the institution’s financial and business matters.

**Proposed Revision to Board Policy**

CHAPTER II: GOVERNANCE – STATE UNIVERSITIES

...

C. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, FACULTY AND STAFF

...

2. Appointments

a. Chief Executive Officer

i. General Provisions

(1) Subject to the policies, rules and regulations of the Board of Regents, the chief executive officer of each state university shall administer the affairs of the university. The Board of Regents holds the chief executive officer responsible and accountable for all operations of the university, including university controlled affiliated corporations, and expects that each chief executive officer shall devote his or her undivided attention and energies to management of the university.

...

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.

(2) Provosts, vice presidents or executive vice chancellors, and deans shall serve at the pleasure of the university chief executive officer. Each state university chief executive officer shall designate a chief financial officer for the university, who shall serve at the pleasure of the university chief executive officer. Other university administrative staff positions may be designated as positions that serve at the pleasure of the chief executive officer or at the pleasure of the chief executive officer’s designee: provided, however, that such will and pleasure designation is stated in the administrator’s written annual notice of appointment. The Board shall be notified of the appointment of any provost, vice-president, executive vice-chancellor, chief financial officer, or other position that reports directly to the university chief executive officer. Such notice shall be given after the appointment occurs and prior to its announcement. The Board shall be notified of the departure of any provost, vice-president, executive vice chancellor, chief financial officer, or other position that reports directly to the university chief executive officer at the time the university chief executive officer becomes aware of the departure or planned departure.

CHAPTER II: GOVERNANCE – STATE UNIVERSITIES

...

D. FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

...

6. Designation of Chief Financial Officer

Each state university chief executive officer shall appoint or designate a chief financial officer for the university. Each chief financial officer shall report directly to the university chief executive officer and shall be endowed with authority to effectively perform the standard duties and responsibilities of a chief financial officer, including having a broad knowledge and understanding of all of the institution’s financial and business matters.

# MINUTES

Council of Presidents  
December 18, 2013  
11:00 a.m.  
Kansas Board of Regents Office  
1000 SW Jackson  
Kathy Rupp Conference Room

President Michael Shonrock called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

6. Minutes of November 20, 2013 were approved.
7. Report from the System Council of Chief Academic Officers – Dr. David Cordle, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Emporia State University
  - a. Discussion on the Tilford Conference Data summarized that the conference is addressing their six goals. The keynote speakers have been rated as Excellent and there have been a variation on attendance year after year. There have been transformations on campus's following the conference.
8. Report from Council of Chief Business Officers – Mr. Ray Hauke, Emporia State University
  - a. COBO reported 5 specific areas for potential streamlining of projects (3 immediate, 2 requiring further study). Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee will be discussing those later in the agenda today.
    - Increase the threshold to \$1.0 million for projects requiring formal procurement of architectural or engineering services.
    - Streamline the Notice and Public Hearing Requirements for Alternative Construction Methods.
    - Allow use of Educational Building Fund/Rehabilitation and Repair allocations for short term debt service.
    - Review possibilities for In-House Code Footprint Review.
    - Review possibilities for increased use of Alternative Construction Methods.
  - b. COPS received a summary from COBO on minimum changes necessary to the Student Referendum Statute which is out of date, there may be proposals for amendment in weeks ahead.
9. Report from Council of Government Relations Officers – Mary Jane Stankiewicz, Government Relations, KBOR; and Dr. Kevin Johnson, General Counsel & Government Relations, Emporia State University
  - a. Provided a report regarding performance measures and efficiencies following the meeting with Senators Rhoads and Abrams. This topic has attracted a lot of interest from legislators and the Governor.
  - b. The term “Efficiency” was used related to streamlining and mergers of community colleges.
  - c. Speaker Merrick anticipates two Gun Bills in the future which may be relatively benign but will open the topic up for discussion again.
  - d. Legislative Advocacy Training has been taking place in order to share information on how to contact legislators and share with them what higher education means and how it impacts us.

10. Report from Council of Research Officers - none
11. New Program Request (KSU) for approval of a Bachelor of Science in Personal Financial Planning (CIP 52.0804) was approved. Motion made and seconded (Ed Hammond/Steve Scott).
12. Utilization of tuition dollars for facilities - Motion made and seconded (Steve Scott/Kirk Schulz) to approve the recommendation of the statutory revision and forward to the board. "Student fees" includes student activity fees, special fees and other fees which are charged to students for the purpose of providing revenue for payment of debt service on bonded indebtedness for one or more buildings or facilities, but shall not include any user fee, rent or similar charge that arises from the operation of a building or facility and which is imposed in connection with or for the use of all or part of a building or facility, or any tuition that has been set after consultation with student body leadership representatives.
13. Other Business
  - a. Jim Williams – the Council of Student Affairs Officers are meeting again. Some of the items they are dealing with include the expulsion process, education relative to personal finance, and the support for mental health in rural areas.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:00 a.m.

Submitted by,

Sarah McKernan  
Emporia State University

# AGENDA

## System Council of Chief Academic Officers

Wednesday, January 15, 2014  
8:45 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.  
Kathy Rupp Conference Room  
Kansas Board of Regents  
Curtis State Office Building  
1000 SW Jackson  
Topeka, Kansas

1. Approve Minutes of December 18, 2013
  
2. Updates
  - a. Transfer and Articulation Council (TAAC) Update
  - b. Developmental Education Working Group Update
  - c. Student Learning Assessment Update
  - d. Statewide Reverse Transfer Agreement Update
  
3. Other Business

### SCOCAO Schedule – September 2013 – June 2014

AGENDA MATERIALS DUE	MEETING DATES
August 23, 2013	September 18, 2013
September 20, 2013	October 16, 2013
October 25, 2013	November 20, 2013
November 22, 2013	December 18, 2013
December 20, 2013	January 15, 2014
January 22, 2014	February 12, 2014
February 19, 2014	March 12, 2014
March 21, 2014	April 16, 2014
April 18, 2014	May 14, 2014
May 23, 2014	June 18, 2014

# MINUTES

## System Council of Chief Academic Officers Minutes

Wednesday, December 18, 2013  
8:30 a.m.

Kathy Rupp Conference Room  
Kansas Board of Regents

The System Council of Chief Academic Officers met in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room, Kansas Board of Regents, Topeka, Kansas, at 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, December 18, 2013.

### Members Present:

Karla Fisher, Butler Community College  
David Cordle, Emporia State University  
Lynette Olson, Pittsburg State University  
Chris Crawford, Fort Hays State University  
Tony Vizzini, Wichita State University

Robert Klein, University of Kansas Med Center  
Jeffrey Vitter, University of Kansas  
Randy Pembroke, Washburn University  
April Mason, Kansas State University  
Sara Harris, Independence Community College

### Board Staff

Gary Alexander, Karla Wiscombe, Susan Fish, Jean Redeker, Jacqueline Johnson, and Kirk Haskins

### Others Present:

Rick Muma, Wichita State University; Sara Rosen, University of Kansas; Ruth Dyer, Kansas State University; Jon Marshall, Allen County Community College; Marilyn Mahan, Manhattan Area Technical College; Kim Krull, Butler County Community College; Gene George, Butler County Community College; Duane Dunn, Seward Community College; Bill Bactlin, Cloud County Community College; Jim Williams, Emporia State University; and Penny Quinn, Barton County Community College

---

### Approve Minutes of November 20, 2013 Meeting Minutes

Lynette Olson moved, and Sara Harris seconded the motion, to approve the November 20, 2013 minutes as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

### Discussion:

#### Transfer and Articulation Council (TAAC) Update

Karla Wiscombe updated SCOCAO on the progress of TAAC. The Council is reviewing nineteen Kansas Core Outcome Group (KCOG) reports and reviewed nine November 20. TAAC approved five courses and sent three courses back to faculty for clarification. TAAC meets tomorrow and will continue reviewing reports and courses.

#### Developmental Education Working Group Update

Susan Fish gave an update on the progress of the Developmental Education Working Group. The Working Group met Friday, November 22, and discussed Neosho County Community College President Brian Inbody's presentation to the Kansas Board of Regents. Subgroups in Math, Language Arts, and Advising were formed and chairs were appointed. These subgroups will work on reports. A webinar was conducted to discuss what

current data is available and if there is any additional data needed. The Developmental Education Working will meet again in January.

**State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) Update**

Gary Alexander told SCOCAO that BAASC will be making a recommendation concerning SARA to the Board on Thursday, December 19.

**Statewide Reverse Transfer Agreement**

The System Council of Presidents will continue its discussion of statewide reverse transfer today. SCOCAO expressed concern regarding the minimum number of credit hours required to be eligible for reverse transfer. The policy will go through the Governance Committee prior to being placed on the Board agenda.

**Other Business**

There was no other business.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.

# AGENDA

## Council of Chief Academic Officers

Wednesday, January 15, 2013  
 9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.  
 or upon adjournment of SCOCAO  
 Kathy Rupp Conference Room  
 1000 SW Jackson Street, Suite 520  
 and reconvene at noon

1. Approve Minutes of December 18, 2013
2. New Program Requests
  - a. ESU - Request Approval for a Master of Science in Forensic Science (CIP 43.0106) FIRST READING
  - b. KU - Request Approval for a Master of Art in Contemporary East Asian Studies (CIP 05.0104) FIRST READING
  - c. KU - Request Approval for a Bachelor of Art and Bachelor of General Studies in Human Sexuality (CIP 05.0207) FIRST READING
  - d. PSU - Request Approval for a Doctor of Nursing Practice (CIP 51.3818) FIRST READING
3. Program Requests
  - a. WSU - Request Approval to Change the Name of a B.S. in Engineering for Manufacture (CIP 14.3601) to a B.S. in Manufacturing Engineering
4. Informational Items
  - a. KU - New Foreign Area Studies (FAST) track within existing MA in Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies
  - b. PSU - A New Minor in Women’s Health
5. Discuss Social Media Policy
6. Other Business

AGENDA MATERIALS DUE	MEETING DATES	LUNCH ROTATION
August 23, 2013	September 18, 2013	Washburn U
September 20, 2013	October 16, 2013	FHSU
October 25, 2013	November 20, 2013	KSU
November 22, 2013	December 18, 2013	PSU
December 20, 2013	January 15, 2014	ESU
January 22, 2014	February 12, 2014	WSU
February 19, 2014	March 12, 2014	KU
March 21, 2014	April 16, 2014	KUMC
April 18, 2014	May 14, 2014	Washburn U
May 23, 2014	June 18, 2014	FHSU

\*Please Note: New Program Proposals are to be submitted 4 weeks prior to the next COCAO meeting for review and processing purposes.



# MINUTES

## Council of Chief Academic Officers

**Wednesday, December 18, 2013**  
**9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.**  
**Or upon adjournment of SCOCAO**  
**Kathy Rupp Conference Room**  
**Kansas Board of Regents**  
**Reconvene at noon**  
**Kathy Rupp Conference Room**  
**Topeka, Kansas**

## MINUTES

The Council of Chief Academic Officers met in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room, Kansas Board of Regents, Topeka, Kansas at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, December 18, 2013, and reconvened at noon in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room.

### Members Present:

Chris Crawford Interim Provost, FHSU  
Jeffrey S. Vitter, Provost and EVC, KU  
Robert Klein, VCAA, KU Med Ctr  
Lynette Olson, Provost, PSU

David Cordle, Provost, ESU  
Tony Vizzini, VPAA, WSU  
April Mason, Provost, KSU  
Randy Pembroke, Provost, Washburn U

### Staff Present:

Gary Alexander, Jean Redeker, Jacqueline Johnson, Karla Wiscombe, Susan Fish and Kirk Haskins

### Others Present:

Rick Muma, Wichita State University; Sara Rosen, University of Kansas; Ruth Dyer, Kansas State University; Jim Williams, Emporia State University; Sheryl Lidzy, Emporia State University; Manjula Shinge, Emporia State University; and Ananda Jayawardana, Pittsburg State University

### Approve Minutes of November 20, 2013

April Mason moved, and Tony Vizzini seconded the motion, to approve the November 20, 2013 minutes as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

### Informational Items

- a. **KUMC - Two new graduate certificates in the Department of Biostatistics:**
  - (1) **Statistics Graduate Certificate**
  - (2) **Statistical Applications Graduate Certificate**
- b. **KUMC - Discontinuation of the Nurse Educator Certificate**
- c. **PSU - Discontinuation of the Bachelor of Arts in Mathematics (CIP 27.0101)**
- d. **KU - New Graduate Certificate in Russian East European, and Eurasian Studies**

The above listed items are informational and no action is required.

### Tilford Conference – Sheryl Lidzy (ESU)

Sheryl Lidzy, Emporia State University, Ananda Jayawardana, Pittsburg State University and Manjula Shinge, Emporia State University were present representing the Tilford Conference Planning Committee.

COCAO had requested a report from the Planning Committee.

Ananda provided several handouts covering the following:

- Tilford Conference Statement/Goals
  - Identifying methods for diversity curriculum transformation
  - Identifying the changing demographics of college campuses
  - Examining the role of faculty, staff, and administration dealing with the changing academic climate
  - Sharing what works in both academic and student affairs areas
  - Understanding the implications of these changes in terms of policy, curriculum, teaching methods, recruitment, and retention
  - Promoting inclusion for marginalized populations
- Presentations
  - Number of Presentations
  - Keynote Evaluations Summary
  - Workshops Evaluations Summary
  - Classification of the Conference Presentations According to the Goals
- Attendees of the Tilford Conference
  - Summary of the Tilford Attendance Rosters (2008-2012)
  - Types of faculty, staff and administrators
  - Attendees likes and dislikes of the conference
- How has the Tilford Conference been a precursor to the development of campus groups focused on multicultural curriculum transformation
- Tilford Survey to Planning Committee
- How the cost of the conference has changed over time
- Community College participation

COCAO thanked the group for the report.

Discussion followed:

- What should the goals be
- Should the Conference time be lengthened
- Keynote speaker needs to be adequate for the mission of the Tilford Conference
- Maybe each conference should focus on one goal with the workshops focused around that goal

The Planning Committee will meet in January and plan to bring recommendations to the Council in February or March.

Tony Vizzini moved, and Lynette Olson seconded the motion, to recess until noon. Motion carried.

COCAO reconvened at noon in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room.

### **Breakfast Meeting with the Regents**

The Council of Chief Academic Officers is having breakfast with the Regents Thursday morning. The Council decided on the following topics for discussion:

- Transfer and Articulation
- Social Media
- Faculty recruitment and retention

### **Other Business**

**Program Review**

Jean Redeker informed the Council this is the last year that program review reports use disciplines. Next year it will use Classification of Instructional Programs (CIPs).

**Undergraduate and Graduate Research Days**

Randy Pembroke brought the concern that the Undergraduate Research Day is not well attended. Robert Klein encouraged COCAO members to inform people of the research days at the Capitol.

The Undergraduate Research Day is February 12<sup>th</sup> and the Graduate Research Day is February 13<sup>th</sup>.

The Council is considering going to the Undergraduate Research Day during its noon meeting time.

Lynette Olson moved, and April Mason seconded the motion, to adjourn. Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Sincerely,  
David Cordle  
Provost  
Emporia State University

# CURRENT FISCAL YEAR MEETING DATES

## Fiscal Year 2014

<u>Meeting Dates</u>	<u>Agenda Material Due to Board Office</u>
August 13-15, 2013 Retreat	
September 18-19, 2013	August 28, 2013 at noon
October 16-17, 2013	September 25, 2013 at noon
November 20-21, 2013	October 30, 2013 at noon
December 18-19, 2013	November 27, 2013 at noon
January 15-16, 2014	December 26, 2013 at noon
February 12-13, 2014	January 22, 2014 at noon
March 12-13, 2014	February 19, 2014 at noon
April 16-17, 2014	March 26, 2014 at noon
May 14-15, 2014	April 23, 2014 at noon
June 18-19, 2014	May 28, 2014 at noon

# TENTATIVE MEETING DATES

## Fiscal Year 2015

### Meeting Dates

- August 19-21, 2014 – Retreat
- September 17-18, 2014
- October 15-16, 2014
- November 19-20, 2014
- December 17-18, 2014
- January 14-15, 2015
- February 18-19, 2015
- March 18-19, 2015
- April 15-16, 2015
- May 20-21, 2015
- June 17-18, 2015

## COMMITTEES (2013-2014)

**Fred Logan, Chair**  
**Kenny Wilk, Vice Chair**

### Standing Committees

Academic Affairs

Robba Moran, Chair  
 Mildred Edwards  
 Tim Emert  
 Helen Van Etten

Fiscal Affairs and Audit

Ed McKechnie, Chair  
 Shane Bangerter  
 Ann Brandau-Murguia  
 Kenny Wilk

Governance

Fred Logan, Chair  
 Tim Emert  
 Kenny Wilk

Regents Retirement Plan

Mildred Edwards, Chair  
 Fred Logan

### Board Representatives and Liaisons

Education Commission of the States	Robba Moran
Postsecondary Technical Education Authority	Tom Burke Connie Hubble
Kansas Bioscience Authority	Kenny Wilk Jerry Boettcher
Kansas Campus Compact	Kenny Wilk
Midwest Higher Education Compact (MHEC)	Mildred Edwards
Washburn University Board of Regents	Robba Moran
Transfer and Articulation Advisory Council	Shane Bangerter Fred Logan
P-20 Workgroup	Robba Moran Helen Van Etten Christine Downey-Schmidt