

**Future of Higher Education Council**  
*Projecting the Higher Education Needs of Kansans*

**July 16, 2020**  
**10:00 AM - 3:00 PM**

**Kansas Board of Regents**  
**Board Room**  
Curtis State Office Building  
1000 SW Jackson, Suite 520  
Topeka, KS 66612

**Council Members**

Cheryl Harrison-Lee – Chair  
Ed Berger  
Steve Huebert  
Jim Lewis  
Brandon Woodard

Molly Baumgardner  
Blake Flanders  
Nancy Ingram  
Ken Rahjes

Terry Beck  
Tom Hawk  
Cynthia Lane  
Ken Roemer

**COUNCIL CHARGE:**

- A. Analyze existing affiliations and partnerships in the KBOR system to enhance the delivery of higher education to Kansans; and
- B. Ensure alignment of facility and infrastructure capacity with projected enrollments.

# MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, July 16, 2020

- |             |   |  |              |
|-------------|---|--|--------------|
| <b>I.</b>   | <b>Call To Order</b>  | Cheryl Harrison-Lee, Chair   |              |
| <b>II.</b>  | <b>Act on June 16, 2020 Council Minutes</b>                 |  | <i>p. 1</i>  |
| <b>III.</b> | <b>Staff Presentations</b>                                  |  |              |
|             | A. <i>Partnerships in Higher Education</i>                  |  |              |
|             | 1. <b>Other States' Systems of Higher Education</b>         | Julene Miller  | <i>p. 9</i>  |
|             | 2. <b>Transfer and Articulation of Courses and Programs</b> | Daniel Archer  | <i>p. 25</i> |
|             | 3. <b>Postsecondary Technical Education Authority</b>       | Scott Smathers   | <i>p. 28</i> |
|             | B. <i>Follow Up from Last Meeting</i>                       |  |              |
|             | 1. <b>Systemwide Enrollment</b>                             | Elaine Frisbie   | <i>p. 29</i> |
|             |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Predictive Model</li><li>• KSDegreeStats</li></ul> |              |
|             | 2. <b>Discuss Cost Model</b>                                | Elaine Frisbie   | <i>p. 31</i> |
|             | C. <b>Next Steps</b>  | Cheryl Harrison-Lee, Chair   | <i>p. 34</i> |
| <b>IV.</b>  | <b>Closing Remarks</b>                                      | Cheryl Harrison-Lee, Chair   |              |
|             | <i>Set Date for Next Council Meeting</i>                    |  |              |
| <b>V.</b>   | <b>Adjournment</b>  |  |              |

# MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

## FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL MINUTES June 16, 2020

The June 16, 2020, meeting of the Future of Higher Education Council was called to order by Chair Cheryl Harrison-Lee at 10:03 a.m. This was a quasi-virtual meeting, and proper notice was given according to law.

### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Cheryl Harrison-Lee – Chair	Molly Baumgardner	Terry Beck
Ed Berger	Blake Flanders	Tom Hawk
Steve Huebert	Nancy Ingram	Cynthia Lane
Brandon Woodard	Ken Rahjes	Ken Roemer
Jim Lewis		

### **ANNOUNCEMENT**

Chair Harrison-Lee stated that this meeting is being conducted in a quasi-virtual format, with members of the Council, and a few Board staff attending in person. Other Board staff are participating remotely, and the public is accessing the meeting via live broadcast on YouTube. Because of the meeting format, the Council is going to follow the Attorney General’s regulation and best practices for conducting quasi-virtual meetings. Chair Harrison-Lee asked everyone participating remotely to mute their microphones until called upon to speak and asked everyone who is recognized to speak to state their name so that they can be readily identified by both listeners and observers. She also noted that there will be no opportunity for public comment during this meeting.

### **INTRODUCTIONS AND COUNCIL CHARGE**

All the Council members introduced themselves. Chair Harrison-Lee thanked everyone for serving, and then reviewed the following Council charge: the Council is to: 1) analyze existing affiliations and partnerships in the Kansas Board of Regents system to enhance the delivery of higher education to Kansans; and 2) ensure alignment of facility and infrastructure capacity with projected enrollments.

(Biographies filed with Minutes)

### **PRESENTATIONS**

#### **OVERVIEW OF THE BOARD AND THE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS, GOVERNANCE AND COORDINATION**

General Counsel Miller presented information on the Board of Regents’ legal authority and governance and coordination of the institutions that make up the Kansas public higher education system. The Board is created in accordance with Article 6 of the Kansas Constitution and is empowered by the Legislature to “control and supervise” public higher education institutions. However, unlike the constitutional authority bestowed on the Kansas State Board of Education, the Kansas Board of Regents’ authority is not self-executing and is reliant upon the statutes for its scope. The Kansas statutes give the Board different levels of oversight over the different sectors of higher education institutions: 1) governing, 2) supervising, 3) coordinating, and 4) regulating.

The Board governs the state universities, which are state agencies. Under its governing authority, the Board is empowered to control and supervise the operation and management of the state universities. The primary

functions include: 1) appointing and setting compensation for the CEOs of each state university, 2) determining the programs that may be offered and the degrees that may be granted, 3) setting tuition and fees for student attendance, 4) setting admission standards, 5) controlling the physical assets, and 6) setting policy.

The Board supervises the community and technical colleges. Its supervisory authority differs from its governance authority because these institutions, which are local units of government, have their own local governing boards that are responsible for their operation, management, and control. Under its supervisory authority, the Board establishes guidelines for accreditation, approves programs, sets admissions qualification thresholds, and facilitates consolidation activities.

The Board has coordination authority over all public higher education. Its coordination function includes: 1) determining institutional roles, 2) reviewing institutional missions, 3) developing and implementing performance agreements, 4) developing a unified budget for state funding, 5) distributing state and federal funds, and 6) for state funding purposes, reviewing and approving proposed and existing technical education programs and program locations. General Counsel Miller noted the Board has a policy on service areas, which designates where institutions can offer face-to-face courses (for state funding purposes) in the state and sets out processes for institutions that wish to offer programs outside their service area. She reviewed the service area maps and Board policy. It was noted that the community colleges created their map because by statute a community college may not receive state funds for any face-to-face courses taught outside its taxing district unless the location is authorized by the Board. Their map along with the technical college and university service area maps are incorporated into the Board's policy, which allow the institutions the ability to offer courses within their designated areas without going to the Board for additional approval. General Counsel Miller also stated that service areas were established to limit program duplication and to make sure the entire State of Kansas is being served by the public higher education system. General Counsel Miller then reviewed the processes for institutions that wish to offer programs outside their service area and noted that the Board's service area policy does not apply to distance education offerings.

The Board has regulatory authority over the private and out-of-state postsecondary institutions. The Board is responsible for reviewing the institutions and their programs to determine statutory compliance, collecting and analyzing information that will assist with improving the quality of this sector's offerings, and administering the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement for distance education. General Counsel Miller stated the Board's authority over this sector is more limited than its other oversight authority.

The Council members had questions on whether there are conflicts between institutions wanting to offer courses within their own service areas. President Flanders noted that the mission of the community colleges is to serve their taxing district but if a college is not able to offer a specific course that is in demand then another college could seek permission, per the Board process, to offer that course. If it is another college or university that is already in the service area then no permission is needed. He also noted that the market helps determine whether a college or university would be successful in offering a specific course because a college can generally offer a lower-division course at a lower rate. President Flanders acknowledged that the service area maps are dated because of population and demographic changes but stated that the institutions are in favor of keeping the service areas in their current form. Senator Baumgardner stated there have been some conflicts between universities and community colleges where the service areas overlap, which created tension between the institutions. She believes the Board of Regents has done a good job with setting the standard that institutions should work together and noted that as this Council moves forward with its work to strengthen the Kansas public higher education system, it is important to make decisions based on what is in the best interest of the students. Senator Hawk asked if there is conflict with private institutions. President Flanders noted the private institutions (excluding independent institutions) can offer courses anywhere in the state if they are approved to operate in the state by the Board.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> There are a number of private institutions that have been exempted from the Act.

## MISSION AND ROLES

Scott Smathers, Vice President of Workforce Development, reviewed the mission and roles of the institutions. There are 32 institutions in the Kansas public higher education system – six state universities, 19 community colleges, six technical colleges, and one municipal university (Washburn University). Each institution has its own unique mission and role, but there are similarities between specific types of institutions. The three research universities (University of Kansas, Kansas State University, and Wichita State University) offer a full range of undergraduate majors as well as master's and doctoral degrees but what sets them apart from the other institutions is their strong emphasis on research. These three universities receive federal and state funds to support their research endeavors, and their research projects are recognized nationally and internationally. The four regional universities (Emporia State University, Fort Hays State University, Pittsburg State University, and Washburn University) also offer a full range of undergraduate programs and master's level programs. They do offer a few doctoral programs and conduct some research; however, research is not the primary focus of these universities.

The community colleges predominately focus on offering associate degrees and technical certificates. Students who attend these colleges tend to transfer to a university to continue their education or enter the job market after receiving their associate's degree or technical certificate. Many of the community college students (30-40%) are enrolled in technical education programs and a vast majority of those students enter the workforce upon completing their certificate. Often community colleges are cheaper to attend on a per credit hour basis. Community colleges are also unique because they have local taxing authority.

The technical colleges are focused on providing technical education. Most of their students complete their program and enter the workforce. However, some students do transfer to a university to continue their education. Unlike the community colleges, the technical colleges do not have local taxing authority. The one exception is Wichita Area Technical College (WSU Tech), which receives some local taxes from the county. Another difference between technical colleges and community colleges is how their boards of trustees are formed. The community college trustees are elected, and the technical college trustees are appointed.

The Council members discussed the taxing authority of the institutions. It was noted that a community college's local Board can levy taxes. For the technical colleges, the local county commission would need to vote to levy taxes for the college. It was also noted that Washburn University receives local taxes because it is a municipal university and that Wichita State University, because it was a municipal university before becoming a state agency, receives property taxes from Sedgwick County. The budget for the WSU tax levy is approved by the WSU Board of Trustees and the Kansas Board of Regents.

The Council members also discussed systemwide transfer. It was noted that 100 courses are approved for systemwide transfer and those are listed on the Board's website, which allows students and advisors to have easy access to the information. Member Lane asked about the strength of the Board's transfer system. Vice President Smathers stated that in the past the system struggled with systemwide transfer, but the Board made it a priority in recent years, which is why the system currently has 100 approved courses. The next step for the Board is to look at how courses can transfer into programs. Member Lewis asked whether the colleges can place an identifier on the courses that are approved as transfer courses. President Flanders stated that the courses are identified at the system level and that each college could identify the courses at the campus level. He also noted the colleges have their own course management systems that could make it difficult to have a unified approach, but this Council could review this approach to determine if it would be beneficial to the system. Representative Huebert asked to receive additional information on whether there is an appeal process for students regarding the acceptance of transfer courses.

Senator Baumgardner stated there was legislation introduced this year that would have allowed the local school districts to fund concurrent enrollment courses for their students. One component of that legislation required students and parents to be notified if the concurrent course was not an approved transfer course. Member

Baumgardner then stated there are issues that need to be addressed regarding how universities are accepting and incorporating the transfer courses into specific degrees.

#### BREAK

Chair Harrison-Lee called for a break at 11:19 a.m. and resumed the meeting at 11:26 a.m.

#### SERVICE AREA

Vice President Smathers reported that the Board has had policies related to academic extension and off-campus delivery of face-to-face courses and programs since 1959 for the state universities. In 2012, the Board approved the service-area locations where community and technical colleges can deliver Board-approved courses and programs for state funding purposes, and the Board adopted an appeal process so that if a college was denied approval to offer an off-campus, face-to-face academic course or program in the service area of another institution. Vice President Smathers stated that the Board continues to review and update its service area policy and noted the last comprehensive review occurred in 2019. In 2019, the Board altered its policy to align the definition of distance education with that of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), which requires that for a course to be classified as a “distance learning” course, it must be one in which faculty and students are physically separated in place or time and in which at least seventy five percent of the instruction and interaction are provided synchronously or asynchronously via some form of mediated delivery system (i.e., audio or video recording, live interactive video, CD-ROM, or the Internet, etc.). Vice President Smathers stated that overall, the institutions have supported keeping the service area maps in their current form. As mentioned earlier, service areas were established to limit program duplication and to ensure that the entire State of Kansas is being served by the public higher education system. Service areas were also created to protect the physical investments of the colleges and universities. Vice President Smathers also reported that military bases are not included in the policy, which means that any college or university can offer face-to-face instruction on any of the Kansas military bases regardless of where the institution or military base is located in the state. For correctional facilities, the institutions within the service area of the facility are the primary provider.

Senator Hawk asked if the state universities have considered competing on price for students taking general education courses within their service area but not their home county. Vice President Smathers stated the universities can offer programs anywhere in their service area but often they do not compete with the colleges on general education courses outside their home county because the cost-benefit is not favorable to the university. President Flanders stated that because of the pandemic and the financial impact it is having on the universities, he expects that many of the institutions will be more aggressive with their marketing to attract more students. Representative Rahjes cited Barton County Community College as an example of being aggressive with their model of expanding its footprint by reaching out and offering courses on military bases. Senator Hawk noted that one of the main issues that the Council may want to discuss is whether the public higher education system is the correct size for the state. He acknowledged that this will be a difficult conversation but that it needs to be addressed.

#### POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION FINANCE

Elaine Frisbie, Vice President of Finance and Administration, provided a financial overview of the public higher education system and sectors. She provided the members with a copy of the *2020 Kansas Public Institutions of Higher Education Institutional Profiles*, which is a document that contains specific data on each institution. The data includes enrollment numbers, graduation rates, the Student Success Index, and operating expenditures. She noted that this information is also available on the Board’s website.

Vice President Frisbie reported that the Kansas’ public higher education system has four institutional sectors (state universities, Washburn University, community colleges, and technical colleges) and each sector has a different status within the state’s financial report and legislative appropriation process. She reported revenues of the state’s public higher education system in FY 2018 totaled \$3.84 billion, of which \$2.9 billion is attributable to the state universities. The key categories of revenue sources for the public institutions are state appropriations, student

tuition and fees, federal and private grants, auxiliary enterprises, local support, and affiliated component units. Vice President Frisbie noted the percent of revenue collected in each category will vary by sector and institution. She also noted that state funds flow to the sectors in different ways. The state universities typically receive direct appropriations because they are state agencies. For the other institutions, the Board receives the funds and is responsible for distributing them to the institutions. On the expenditure side, the 32 public postsecondary institutions spent nearly \$2.1 billion (57.5 percent) on salaries and benefits. The next major expense for the system is the operation and maintenance of the physical plant, which accounts for 6.8 percent of the total expenditures across the system.

Vice President Frisbie stated the Kansas Higher Education Coordination Act requires the Board of Regents to develop and present to the Governor and Legislature a unified request for state appropriations for postsecondary education each year. The Board's request must be submitted by October 1 every year. Vice President Frisbie then reviewed the State General Fund appropriations to the system over the past years.

### BREAK

Chair Harrison-Lee called for a break at 12:21 p.m. and resumed the meeting at 12:57 p.m.

Vice President Frisbie reviewed the two-year college cost model. In 2011, the Legislature created a new postsecondary education cost model for distribution of technical education state appropriations to the community and technical colleges. The cost model approach for tiered technical education funding was developed to assist in determining what is the state's share of the cost to deliver a tiered technical education course. The model includes four main components: instructor costs, instructional support costs, extraordinary costs, and institutional support costs. When combined, these four elements establish a per-credit-hour composite course rate for each course. However, Vice President Frisbie noted that how a student credit hour is calculated depends on the type of college the student attends and for community colleges, whether the student is in district or out district. These factors are weighted in the funding calculation as follows:

### **Funding Calculation**

Total Course Cost = Course Rate X Eligible Student Credit Hours (SCH)

The "state's share"<sup>2</sup> of the total calculated cost is to be based on student credit hours:

- Community College in district SCH<sup>3</sup> = 1/3 student, 1/3 local taxing district, 1/3 state
- Community College out district SCH = 1/3 student, 2/3 state
- All Technical College SCH = 1/3 student, 2/3 state
- Secondary students in Excel in CTE = 100% state

Vice President Frisbie stated the goal of the model is to determine the state's share of the total calculated cost. Since its development, the model has never been fully funded by the state, which has created funding gaps. This model is currently used to calculate costs for Tiered Technical Education State Aid and Non-tiered Course Credit Hour grants and Excel in CTE funds.

Vice President Frisbie reported that the community and technical colleges generated 1.3 million student credit hours for 113,182 postsecondary students (headcount) in the 2017-2018 academic year. Of those hours, 46 percent of the community college credit hours were in district, and 54 percent were from out district student enrollments

---

<sup>2</sup> The calculated share of the state, local community and the state under the cost model are based on a number of assumptions, including "full funding" by the Legislature.

<sup>3</sup> An in district community college student resides within the college's taxing district (which is the local county, with the exception of Montgomery County which has two community colleges so that county is divided roughly in half).

(without taxing districts, all technical college credit hours are defined as in district). For all two-year colleges, 73 percent of the credit hours were non-tiered, 27 percent tiered.

The Council discussed the cost model and it was noted that the colleges are filling the funding gaps with student tuition and fees and local taxes. President Flanders stated there are assumptions built into model regarding the funding level of tuition and fees and the community college mill levies. Since the colleges are using these funds to backfill the funding gap, the assumptions in the model are not aligned with what is actually occurring. He noted the cost model could be reversed engineered to more accurately depict that information. The Council members would like to see the calculations associated with the cost model when it is reversed. This information will be provided at the next meeting.

### POSTSECONDARY ENROLLMENTS

Vice President Frisbie provided information on the system enrollments. In 2019, the enrollment headcount for public higher education sector was 242,310 and the full-time equivalency (FTE) student count was 135,976. Of those students enrolled, 76.4 percent of were Kansas residents, 54.4 percent were female, and 64.2 percent were enrolled on a part-time basis. Vice President Frisbie noted that enrollment for the public higher education system is down six percent from its peak enrollment in AY 2012. She stated that the institutions are susceptible to economic changes and typically in a strong economy, enrollment tends to decline because individuals are choosing to enter the workforce. This is particularly true for community colleges because they have more part-time, adult students enrolled. Vice President Frisbie reported the Kansas College-Going Rate, which is the percent of Kansas high school graduates entering the public postsecondary institutions within one year of graduation, has been trending downward over the last several years. In 2018, 49 percent of high school graduates entered the public higher education system after graduation, which is six percentage points lower than in 2009-2011. It was noted that this rate could also be tied to the economy. Member Lane asked for the demographic information on the students who are enrolling to better understand their backgrounds. Chair Harrison-Lee stated that the annual system enrollment report that was presented to the Board in May will be provided to the members. Member Lewis expressed his concerns that high school counselors do not have the information they need to help students with the higher education application process, which could be a reason for students choosing not enter college. Vice President Frisbie reported that the Board has an Apply Kansas initiative, which originated out of Wichita State University. Through this initiative, postsecondary educational staff members, high school staff members, and local community volunteers go into the high schools on a designated day to help seniors move through the higher education admission process, which includes filling out financial aid documents. The Board is working to expand this initiative to more school districts.

Vice President Frisbie then reviewed the different metrics associated with college readiness. One metric that is tracked are those students who need some form of developmental education. It was noted that the community colleges offer the most developmental education courses with the majority of students taking math, English, or reading. Vice President Frisbie stated the way development education is administered has changed over the years. Instead of students taking separate courses, the elements of developmental education are incorporated into student's normal coursework. She also noted that by statute the state universities are prohibited from using their state funds on delivery of developmental education. Another metric that is tracked is the percent of Kansas high school students meeting ACT benchmarks, which has been declining in all four subject areas (English, math, reading, and science) over the last several years. Vice President Frisbie noted that Kansas high school juniors and seniors can take the ACT for free beginning with the 2019 class. ACT also recently changed its policy to allow students to retake a single subject without retaking the entire test, starting in September 2020. Both these changes may impact the percent of students meeting the benchmarks.

Vice President Frisbie also reviewed the system's dual enrollment and distance education data. Kansas has seen increases in the rate of high school students attending postsecondary institutions prior to their graduation. Student co-enrollment in postsecondary education at community and technical colleges while still in high school has increased 86.4% over a ten-year period, and 39.4% over a five-year period primarily due to the Excel in CTE



initiative where the state finances the student's tuition, and formalized concurrent enrollment partnerships. State universities accounted for nearly half of the total distance education credit hour production with more than one-half million credit hours for that sector alone. Nearly one-fourth of their credit hours were online in AY 2019. Community colleges delivered 43% of their student credit hours online.

Vice President Frisbie discussed future enrollments and noted prior to the pandemic, Board staff created a predictive model for Kansas high school graduates. This model, which could be presented to the Council at a future meeting, predicts how many Kansas high school students might graduate, enroll in an institution of higher education, and then graduate with a postsecondary credential in the future. To form the predictions, the model uses data from the higher education system and the Kansas Department of Education (KSDE).

Representative Huebert stated that President Flanders' presentation to the House Education Committee on KSDegreeStats contained a lot of valuable career pathway information and asked that the presentation be shared with the Council at its next meeting.

#### POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION FACILITIES

Vice President Frisbie reported the state university campuses have over 1,000 buildings, which comprise two-thirds of state government's holdings. Facilities are one of the biggest expenses for the universities. As of FY 2019, bonded indebtedness for the state universities and their affiliated corporations totaled nearly \$1.45 billion. Vice President Frisbie stated that the Board presents a biennial report on deferred and annual maintenance to the Legislature, and the most recent report found that the state universities continue to see a backlog of \$966 million in deferred maintenance projects on mission critical buildings, utilities and infrastructure.

This past year, one of the Board's goals was to develop a strategy for addressing deferred maintenance at the state universities. To address this goal, two university building studies have been initiated to gather and analyze data that the Board can then use to support its deferred maintenance initiative. The first study will gather detailed condition assessments of university mission critical buildings. The second is a space utilization study. The Council had a discussion on whether all the buildings located on state property are state-owned buildings. Vice President Frisbie explained that occasionally the universities enter into ground leases for projects and that the Board has very detailed policy on these types of transactions. Board staff will need to review the different lease agreements on specific buildings to determine if they are state-owned buildings and will provide that information to the Council at a future meeting. The specific example that was given was Wichita State University's health and recreation facility that is being built by a private developer. The members also discussed the community and technical college facilities and it was noted that the individual colleges own their buildings.

#### AGENDA AMENDMENT

Chair Harrison-Lee amended the agenda to move the presentations on state postsecondary governance models and the Technical Education Authority to the next Council meeting.

#### RECENT PARTNERSHIPS IN HIGHER EDUCATION – WSU TECH AND WASHBURN UNIVERSITY

President Utash of WSU Tech and President Farley of Washburn University spoke about institutional affiliations. An affiliation is a formalized partnership that allows for more collaborative work between two institutions. Dr. Utash stated that the affiliation between Wichita Area Technical College and Wichita State University (WSU) has had a positive impact on the institutions, students, and business and industry. She described how students from both campuses collaborate on projects together and take advantage of the expanded degree pathways that are available. Additionally, Dr. Utash stated that the institutions continue to look at ways to improve the affiliation. Member Lane asked about WSU Tech's partnerships with the school districts and what the College is learning about influencing the CTE pathways in the schools. Dr. Utash stated that the Excel and CTE initiative changed how colleges interact with schools. Currently, WSU Tech is working with 40 school within the K-12 system at all the different levels (high school, middle school and elementary school). The College has programs at the

middle and elementary school levels that allow students to become familiarized with STEM programs and hands on learning. The College has also increased its dual enrollment.

Dr. Farley stated the affiliation between Washburn University and Washburn Tech has been positive for the institutions, students, and business and industry. He reviewed the history of the affiliation and noted the process was difficult at times. The process began when the technical schools were told by the Higher Learning Commission that to be accredited to grant college degrees, the schools would need to do one of the following: 1) merge with an existing higher education institutions that is accredited, 2) seek accreditation to become a stand-alone colleges, or 3) affiliate with an existing higher education institutions that is accredited. Kaw Area Technical School, which was run by the Topeka school district, decided to work with Washburn University on an affiliation rather than becoming a stand-alone college. The process to affiliate required legislation and a lot of communication with campus and community constituents. President Farley stated the affiliation has allowed Washburn Tech to expand its programming and has expanded degree pathways for all Washburn students. He also noted that business and industry are supportive of the institutions and that there are training sites on the Washburn Tech campus for several nationally recognized companies. President Flanders noted that the Washburn affiliation is recognized as a national model and congratulated Dr. Farley for moving the University forward.

#### AMEND AGENDA

Chair Harrison-Lee amended the agenda to move the Transfer and Articulation of Courses and Programs presentation to the next meeting.

#### MEETING DATE

The Council decided its next meeting will be held on Thursday, July 16.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Chair Harrison-Lee adjourned the meeting at 3:02 p.m.

# DISCUSSION AGENDA

## III. Staff Presentations

### A. *Partnerships in Higher Education*

#### 1. Other States' Systems of Higher Education

Julene Miller

#### State Postsecondary Governance Models

Higher education governance systems across the states and District of Columbia are varied and complex. The structures are a mix of coordinating and governing boards at the state, system and institutional levels; and other agencies and organizations may play important roles in the postsecondary landscape.

While no two states have the same postsecondary governance system, the structures fall within general models — even though the categorization is not a straightforward process. Beyond the basic approaches, numerous boards also govern other postsecondary systems, multi-campus institutions and individual institutions.

**Single, Statewide Coordinating Board/Agency:** Twenty states have a single coordinating board and/or agency that is responsible for key aspects of the state's role with public postsecondary institutions and, in some cases, independent colleges.

*States include:* Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and Washington.

**Single, Statewide Governing Board:** Eight states have a statewide governing board that manages and oversees most functions of the public higher education system and typically has broad authority over institutions.

States include: Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, **Kansas**, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota and Rhode Island.

**One or More Systemwide Coordinating or Governing Board:** Nineteen states have one or more coordinating or governing boards that oversee institutions within a postsecondary system. These states do not have statewide coordinating or governing boards.

*States include:* Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming.

**Administrative/Service Agency:** At least 11 states and the District of Columbia have higher education administrative agencies that may oversee financial aid and specific academic programs, institutional licensure approval and information/data services. The agencies' authority varies across the states and with respect to different types of institutions. These states also have system-level coordinating or governing boards and/or governing boards for individual institutions.

*States include:* Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Iowa, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania.

*Note:* Michigan does not have a state-level board or agency, and the postsecondary systems and institutions are governed by individual boards.

This resource developed by the Education Commission of States and dated March 2019 provides a comprehensive summary of the various entities that make up postsecondary governance ecosystems in each state and the District of Columbia. It also:

- Focuses on and provides in-depth information about statewide coordinating boards/agencies and governing boards. If statewide boards do not exist, then information is provided for major systemwide coordinating and governing boards.
- Includes general information about other state higher education entities, such as administrative/service offices, financial aid offices and advisory boards.
- Lists other postsecondary system-level governing boards, most multi-campus institutional boards and membership organizations.

This resource does not include information related to setting tuition rates, administering funding formulas or allocating funds. The state profile information is based primarily on statutes, codes and state and postsecondary system board/agency policies. To the extent possible, Education Commission of the States reached out to state and system officials to verify its information.

Alabama	Alabama’s Commission on Higher Education is a statewide coordinating board for public postsecondary education and has oversight over other institutions. The affiliated administrative agency is charged with carrying out board policies and administering student financial aid, and state and federal academic programs. The agency also oversees research reports, data collection and analysis, and the State Authority Reciprocity Agreement (SARA). The coordinating board appoints the agency’s executive director. Individual boards govern the University of Alabama System, the Alabama Community College System and other institutions.
Alaska	The University of Alaska Board of Regents is a statewide governing board for the public four- and two-year higher education system and the institutions do not have local boards. The system office provides services, administers academic programs and conducts research, among other duties. The board appoints the president of the University of Alaska system. The Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education is an administrative/service agency that provides centralized planning for postsecondary education and administers several programs, including financial aid. The commission is an agency of the executive branch and is overseen by a board, which appoints the executive director.
Arizona	The University of Arizona Board of Regents is a governing board for the public four-year institutions and appoints the executive director of the system. The board of regents’ system office provides services and programs and conducts research, among other duties. The Arizona Commission for Postsecondary Education is an administrative/service agency that, among other roles, provides a forum for all higher education sectors to discuss issues and administers several programs, including college outreach and financial aid. The agency is overseen by a commission, which appoints the executive director upon approval of the governor. Arizona’s community colleges are locally governed and not part of a system.
Arkansas	The Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board is a statewide coordinating board for public postsecondary education. The Arkansas Department of Higher Education is the administrative agency charged with carrying out the board’s policies and overseeing federal, academic and student financial aid programs, conducting research and analysis, collecting and disseminating data, and publishing higher education reports. The department’s executive director is appointed by the coordinating board with input from the Presidents Council and confirmed by the governor. Individual boards govern Arkansas State University, the University of Arkansas and other institutions.
California	California does not have a single statewide or systemwide coordinating or governing board for public education. The University of California Board of Regents and California State University Board of Trustees govern the public four-year institutions and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges governs the two-year

	<p>institutions. The governing boards appoint the executive directors for the systems. Administrative offices for all three systems implement board policies, oversee academic and operational programs, and provide services to institutions. The California Student Aid Commission administers financial aid programs, provides research and data reports, and provides professional development and training.</p>
Colorado	<p>The Colorado Commission on Higher Education is a statewide coordinating board for public postsecondary education and oversees independent degree-granting institution authorization. Colorado's Department of Higher Education is the administrative agency charged with carrying out the board's policies and overseeing various programs, including student financial aid and credit transfer, and providing data and information services. The department's executive director is appointed by the governor and confirmed by the Senate. Individual boards, with members appointed by the governor, govern the campuses of Colorado State University; while an elected board governs the University of Colorado campuses. The State Board of Community Colleges and Occupational Education governs the two-year colleges, except for two local district colleges.</p>
Connecticut	<p>Connecticut does not have a single statewide or systemwide coordinating or governing board for public higher education. The Connecticut Board of Regents for Higher Education governs state colleges, community colleges and a public online college. The governing board appoints the president of the Connecticut State Colleges and Universities system. The system office implements the board's policies, oversees academic and operational programs, and provides services to the institutions. A separate board governs the University of Connecticut, which also has an administrative arm. The Connecticut Office of Higher Education is an administrative/service agency that, among other responsibilities, provides data and information services and administers student financial aid. The governor appoints the executive director of the agency.</p>
Delaware	<p>The Delaware Office of Higher Education is an administrative and service agency located in the state department of education. An agency committee selects the executive director of the office. The office oversees and administers several programs, including college readiness and student financial aid, provides information and data services for institutions, and licenses and authorizes institutions, among other duties. Delaware has several two- and four-year public institutions with local boards, as well as private colleges, but no systems or multi-campus institutions.</p>
District of Columbia	<p>The District of Columbia's Office of the State Superintendent of Education-- Postsecondary and Career Education Division supports college outreach and access programs, administers career education and student financial aid programs, and provides data and information services. The state superintendent appoints the division's assistant superintendent. The division oversees the Higher Education Licensure Commission, which is a mayoral-appointed authority that licenses public and private institutions, oversees private institutions and advises the mayor and city</p>

	<p>council on postsecondary issues. The Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia appoints the president and governs the university, which offers associate's, bachelor's and master's degrees and workplace development services. The university is comprised of a community college, several schools and colleges offering bachelor's programs, and a law school.</p>
Florida	<p>Florida does not have a single statewide coordinating or governing board for public postsecondary education. The State University System of Florida Board of Governors governs the public four-year institutions, which also have local, institutional governing boards. The system office administers programs and provides services for the institutions. Members of the board of governors appoint the system chancellor. The Florida State Board of Education serves as a governing board for the public community colleges, known as state colleges, as part of the K-20 governance structure. The department of education's Division of Florida Colleges serves an administrative capacity for the Florida College System with responsibilities for academic programs, data and reporting, and financial policy, among others. Florida's College System consists of the state/community colleges, which are governed by local institutional boards and state statute, and the commissioner of education appoints the system chancellor. The department of education's Office of Student Financial Assistance administers financial aid programs.</p>
Georgia	<p>Georgia does not have a single statewide or systemwide coordinating or governing board for public higher education. The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia governs public four-year institutions, which do not have local governing boards. The State Board of the Technical College System of Georgia governs two-year technical institutions, which have advisory but not governing boards. The governing boards appoint the executive directors for the systems. Administrative offices for both systems implement board policies, oversee academic and operational programs, conduct research and data analysis, and provide services to their institutions. The Georgia Student Finance Commission administers financial aid programs and oversees student outreach and access programs related to postsecondary financial assistance.</p>
Hawaii	<p>The Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii is a statewide governing board for the public four- and two-year higher education institutions, which do not have local boards. The system office administers academic programs, offers support services, provides information and data analysis, and conducts research, among other duties. The board appoints the president of the University of Hawaii system. Individual campuses are responsible for administering student financial aid.</p>
Idaho	<p>Idaho's State Board of Education governs the K-12 and public postsecondary education system, which consists of three universities and a state college. Community colleges operate in accordance with policies established by their</p>

	<p>local board of trustees, except for state appropriations requests, academic and career and technical program offerings and other matters governed by the state board. The superintendent of public instruction is elected and serves on the state board as a voting ex-officio member. The executive director is appointed by the state board of education and serves as a member of the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association. The Office of the State Board of Education implements board policies and oversees the public higher education institutions. Idaho's Division of Career and Technical Education is responsible for the secondary, postsecondary, and adult career and technical programs for public school districts and technical colleges.</p>
Illinois	<p>The Illinois Board of Higher Education is a statewide coordinating board for public postsecondary education and oversees independent degree-granting institution authorization. The affiliated administrative agency is charged with carrying out the board's policies, overseeing various programs, and providing data and information services, among other responsibilities. The coordinating board appoints the agency's executive director. The Illinois Student Assistance Commission administers student financial aid, administers federal programs, conducts policy research, and supports student outreach programs related to financial assistance. Individual governing boards oversee the University of Illinois and the Southern Illinois University systems. The Illinois Community College Board serves as a coordinating board for public two-year institutions, which also have individual governing boards. Governing boards oversee other public institutions.</p>
Indiana	<p>The Indiana Commission on Higher Education is a statewide coordinating board for public postsecondary education and works with independent institutions. The affiliated administrative agency is charged with carrying out the board's policies and overseeing various programs, including credit transfer and student financial aid, conducts research analysis and produces reports on postsecondary topics. The coordinating board appoints the commission's executive director. Indiana has at least three multi-campus institutions with governing boards, including the University of Indiana, Purdue University and Ivy Tech Community College.</p>
Iowa	<p>Iowa does not have a single statewide or systemwide coordinating or governing board for public higher education. The Iowa Board of Regents governs public four-year institutions, which do not have local boards, and appoints the system's executive director. The system office implements board policies, administers academic programs, produces reports on higher education topics, and provides services to the institutions. The Iowa State Board of Education exercises certain governing authority over the community colleges, which also are governed by local boards. The state board of education accredits community colleges based on criteria established in state statute and adopts policies through administrative rules for community colleges, among other responsibilities. Divisions within the state department of education administer academic and workforce programs, approve new academic programs and provide data services for community colleges. The Iowa College Student Aid Commission is overseen by a</p>



	board and administers financial aid programs, conducts research and analysis, and oversees student outreach and access programs for financial assistance.
Kansas	The Kansas Board of Regents serves as the governing board for the state’s six universities and the coordinating board for the state’s other 32 public higher education institutions, including state universities, a municipal university, community colleges and technical colleges. In addition, the board authorizes private proprietary schools to operate in Kansas. The board appoints the executive director. The board’s system office provides various services and administers programs, including student financial aid and career and technical education. While some of the state universities governed by the Board of Regents have multiple campuses, the institutions do not have local governing boards. However, the institutions coordinated by the Regents are also governed by local boards.
Kentucky	Kentucky’s Council on Postsecondary Education is the statewide coordinating board for public higher education and oversees licensing and authorization of non-public institutions. The affiliated administrative agency is charged with carrying out the board’s policies and overseeing the statewide virtual library and various programs, including credit transfer and adult education. The agency also conducts research and analysis and provides data services. The coordinating board appoints the council’s president. A separate state agency, the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority, administers student financial aid programs. Kentucky’s universities are governed by individual boards. A governing board oversees the Kentucky Community and Technical College system and local advisory boards are affiliated with the individual campuses.
Louisiana	The Louisiana Board of Regents is the statewide coordinating board for public higher education. The affiliated administrative agency is charged with carrying out the board’s policies, overseeing state and federal programs, conducting research and providing data and information services. The coordinating board appoints the agency’s executive director. The Louisiana Office of Student Financial Assistance operates as part of the Regents and administers financial aid programs. Governing boards oversee the University of Louisiana system and the Louisiana Community and Technical College system and the Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College’s multiple campuses.
Maine	Maine does not have a single statewide or systemwide coordinating or governing board for public postsecondary education. The University of Maine System Board of Trustees governs public four-year institutions and the Maine Community College System Board of Trustees governs two-year institutions. The governing boards appoint the system’s chancellor and president, respectively. Administrative offices for both systems implement board policies, oversee academic and operational programs, and provide services to their institutions, which do not have local governing boards. The Finance Authority of Maine administers financial aid programs and supports professional

	<p>development and student outreach programs for postsecondary financial assistance. A higher education office in the Maine State Department of Education works with the state board of education and education commissioner to review requests for degree-granting authority, oversee the licensing of proprietary and correspondence schools, and administer the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA).</p>
Maryland	<p>Maryland’s Higher Education Commission serves as the statewide coordinating board and is responsible for establishing policies for public and private institutions and for-profit career schools. The affiliated administrative agency is charged with carrying out the board’s policies, overseeing state and federal programs, administering student financial aid, and providing data and information services, among other responsibilities. The governor appoints the secretary of higher education – the agency’s executive director – from a list of three names submitted by the coordinating board and who serves at pleasure of the commission. Governing boards oversee the University of Maryland system and other institutions. Maryland’s community colleges are not part of a system and are governed by local boards.</p>
Massachusetts	<p>The Massachusetts Board of Higher Education is the statewide coordinating board for public postsecondary education. The affiliated administrative agency is charged with implementing the board’s policies and overseeing various programs, including student financial aid, program approval for both public and private higher education institutions, and college completion initiatives. The board appoints the commissioner of higher education, subject to the approval of Massachusetts’ Secretary of Education. The Massachusetts public higher education system consists of three segments, which includes community colleges, state universities, and the campuses of the University of Massachusetts (UMass). Community colleges and state universities have their own board of trustees, while the UMass campuses are overseen by the UMass Board of Trustees. The Massachusetts Board of Higher Education has coordinating and some governing authority over all three segments.</p>
Michigan	<p>Michigan does not have a single statewide or systemwide coordinating or governing board. An elected board governs the University of Michigan system’s three campuses. Statewide elected governing boards also oversee Michigan State University and Wayne State University, and the governor appoints the governing boards of the other state universities. The state’s community colleges are governed by locally elected boards. The Michigan State Budget Office serves as an administrative entity for data collection and various oversight functions of public universities and community colleges. Michigan’s Student Financial Aid Services Bureau is located within the department of treasury and administers financial aid programs. Several membership organizations play key roles in advocating, intra-sector coordinating, data reporting and analysis, and providing services for various types of institutions. The Michigan Association of State Universities (MASU) operates a peer review system for all new academic programs and is a member agency of the SHEEO association. MASU and the Michigan Community</p>

	<p>College Association and the Michigan Independent Colleges and Universities work jointly on various academic policy issues, including credit transfer, student success initiatives and increasing state attainment.</p>
Minnesota	<p>Minnesota does not have a single statewide or systemwide coordinating or governing board for public postsecondary education. Minnesota’s Office of Higher Education is an administrative and service agency that oversees academic programs, provides data and information services, and administers student financial aid programs. The governor appoints the office’s executive director with the Senate’s advice and consent. The Board of Trustees of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities governs a system of state colleges and universities and appoints the chancellor. The University of Minnesota Board of Regents governs the system’s campuses and appoints the president. Both system offices implement board policies, administer programs and provide services to the campuses, which do not have local governing boards.</p>
Mississippi	<p>Mississippi does not have a single statewide or systemwide coordinating or governing board for public postsecondary education. The Mississippi Board of Trustees of State Higher Education Institutions governs the system of public four-year institutions and appoints the commissioner. The system office implements board policies, administers various programs and provides services to the institutions, which do not have local governing boards. The Mississippi Community College Board is a coordinating board for two-year institutions and appoints the executive director. The affiliated administrative office carries out board policies, administers programs, and provides data and research services to the institutions, which are governed by local boards. The Mississippi Postsecondary Education Financial Assistance Board administers financial aid programs and provides outreach and access programs related to financial support for students.</p>
Missouri	<p>Missouri’s Coordinating Board for Higher Education is the statewide coordinating board for public education and oversees some aspects of independent institutions. The Missouri Department of Higher Education is the administrative agency for the board and carries out policies, oversees state and federal programs, administers financial aid, collects and analyzes data, and provides other services. The coordinating board appoints the executive director. The Board of Curators of the University of Missouri is the governing board for the multiple campuses, and local boards govern other institutions. Missouri’s two-year colleges are not part of a system and are governed by local boards.</p>
Montana	<p>The Montana Board of Regents for Higher Education serves as the governing board for four- and two-year institutions within the system and as a coordinating board for community colleges. The board appoints the commissioner of higher education. The board’s system office administers state and federal programs, conducts policy research, collects and analyzes data, administers student financial aid programs and provides other services</p>

	to the institutions. While Montana’s universities do not have local governing boards, the community colleges are governed by boards.
Nebraska	Nebraska’s Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education is the statewide coordinating board for public higher education and appoints the executive director. The commission’s administrative agency oversees academic and student financial aid programs, conducts research and analysis, and provides data and information services, among other responsibilities. Boards govern the campuses of the University of Nebraska and the Nebraska State Colleges. Nebraska’s community colleges are not part of a system and are governed by local boards.
Nevada	The Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education governs the state’s public four- and two-year postsecondary institutions and oversees the Desert Research Institute. The board appoints the system’s chancellor. The system office implements board policies, oversees academic programs, administers student financial aid, and provides data and information services, among other responsibilities. Institutions within the system are not governed by local boards.
New Hampshire	New Hampshire does not have a single statewide or systemwide coordinating or governing board for public postsecondary education. The Division of Higher Education within the New Hampshire Department of Education is an administrative agency that oversees federal programs, provides data and information services, and administers student financial aid programs. The Higher Education Commission oversees certain responsibilities of the division and the governor appoints the members while others serve as ex-officio members. The governor appoints the division’s executive director after consultation with the K-12 education commissioner, higher education commission and state board of education. Governing boards oversee the University System of New Hampshire and the Community College System of New Hampshire and appoint the chancellors. The four-year and two-year system offices implement board policies and programs and provide services to the institutions, which do not have local governing boards.
New Jersey	New Jersey does not have a single statewide or systemwide coordinating or governing board for public postsecondary education. The State of New Jersey Office of the Secretary of Higher Education is an administrative/service agency that leads statewide planning and policy development, advocates for institutions postsecondary issues, administers state and federal programs, produces data analysis and research reports, licenses institutions and oversees accountability programs. The secretary of higher education, who is appointed by the governor with consent of the Senate, advances statewide goals and submits recommendations on the higher education budget and student aid levels to the governor and legislature. New Jersey Presidents' Council serves an advisory role on postsecondary issues. The New Jersey Higher Education Student Assistance Authority, which is a

	<p>separate agency, administers financial aid programs. The state’s postsecondary institutions are governed by local boards and not part of systems.</p>
New Mexico	<p>New Mexico’s Department of Higher Education is a coordinating agency for public postsecondary education and oversees independent institutions. New Mexico no longer has a statewide coordinating board associated with the agency. The governor, with consent of the Senate, appoints the department’s executive director. The department develops higher education strategic plans, administers federal and state academic programs, conducts studies, administers student financial aid programs, provides data services to institutions and ensures academic program quality. Boards govern the University of New Mexico, Mexico State University and Eastern New Mexico University, which also include community college branch campuses, and other individual institutions. The public independent community colleges are governed by local boards.</p>
New York	<p>The University of the State of New York (USNY) consists of all elementary, secondary and postsecondary education institutions, and other libraries, museums, institutions, schools, organizations and agencies for education. University is a broad term encompassing all the institutions offering education in the state. The Board of Regents of The University of the State of New York is responsible for the general supervision of and setting policy for all education activities within the state and presides over USNY and the state education department. The education department’s Office of Higher Education administers federal programs, oversees college outreach, authorizes institutions and registers academic degree programs. New York State has two public higher education sectors/systems: The City University of New York (CUNY) and The State University of New York (SUNY). Governing boards have primary authority over the policies, procedures and operations of their systems and appoint the chancellors. The Higher Education Services Corporation, which is not part of the education department, administers student financial aid programs.</p>
North Carolina	<p>North Carolina does not a single statewide or systemwide coordinating or governing board for public postsecondary education. The University of North Carolina Board of Governors governs a system of public four-year institutions and appoints the president. The system office implements board policies, administers various programs and provides services to the campuses. The universities have local advisory boards, although the Board of Governors may delegate additional authorities to these boards. The North Carolina State Board of Community Colleges is a governing board for two-year institutions and appoints the system president. The system office carries out board policies, administers programs, licenses for-profit colleges, and provides data and services to the institutions, which are governed by local boards. The North Carolina State Education Assistance Authority administers student financial aid programs, oversees outreach and access programs related to financial assistance, and administers the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA).</p>

North Dakota	<p>The North Dakota State Board of Higher Education is a single statewide governing board for public postsecondary education and appoints the system chancellor. The board of higher education also oversees extension service centers and research institutes. The system office implements board policies, administers academic and financial aid programs, and publishes various data reports on higher education, among other responsibilities. The system's four- and two-year institutions do not have local governing boards.</p>
Ohio	<p>Ohio's Department of Higher Education is a statewide coordinating agency for postsecondary education and oversees authorization of and program approval for independent institutions. The department is responsible for duties common to administrative agencies and coordinating boards since the Ohio Board of Regents serves in an advisory capacity to the chancellor (executive officer). These responsibilities include developing strategic plans, advising state policy leaders, approving new academic programs, administering academic and student financial aid programs, and providing data and reporting services. The governor, with confirmation by the Senate, appoints the department's chancellor. Ohio's four- and two-year institutions are governed by local boards and are not part of postsecondary systems.</p>
Oklahoma	<p>The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education serves as a statewide coordinating board for postsecondary education, authorizes independent institutions and appoints the chancellor for the affiliated agency. The agency carries out board policies, administers financial aid programs, analyzes and disseminates higher education data, and produces research reports, among other services. Governing boards oversee postsecondary systems, multi-campus institutions and individual institutions in Oklahoma.</p>
Oregon	<p>Oregon's Higher Education Coordinating Commission is a statewide coordinating board for public postsecondary education and authorizes independent institutions. The coordinating board appoints the executive director of the commission. The administrative agency associated with the board implements policies; administers academic, financial aid and workforce programs; conducts research and analysis; and provides data reports and other services. The universities and community colleges are governed by local boards and are not part of postsecondary systems, although several institutions have multiple locations.</p>
Pennsylvania	<p>Pennsylvania does not have a statewide coordinating or governing board for postsecondary education. The Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education Board of Governors is the governing board for the state's four-year institutions and appoints the chancellor. The system office implements board policies, administers various programs and provides services to the campuses, which have local governing boards. Pennsylvania State University Board of trustees governs its multi-campus and governing boards oversee other four-year institutions. The state's community colleges are governed by local boards and are not part of a system. The Pennsylvania Department of</p>

	<p>Education has limited jurisdiction over postsecondary institutions. The Higher and Career Education division in the department oversees postsecondary education with respect to degree granting authority, new program and degree approvals, and data and information services. The Pennsylvania State Board of Education governs various components of K-12 and higher education, although the board exercises limited authority over postsecondary institutions. Pennsylvania’s Higher Education Assistance Authority administers student financial aid programs and oversees other programs related to financial assistance.</p>
Rhode Island	<p>Rhode Island’s Board of Education serves as a coordinating board with certain governing responsibilities for all public education, preschool through graduate school (P-20) and its authority pertains primarily to broader P-20 issues. Within the P-20 governance system, the board is comprised of members of the Rhode Island Council on Postsecondary Education, which serves as the governing board for public higher education, and the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education, which governs the K-12 sector. The councils and the board have limited authority over independent institutions. The Council on Postsecondary Education appoints the commissioner of postsecondary education, with approval of the state board, and the governor serves as an additional voting member for purpose of appointing, retaining or dismissing the commissioner. Rhode Island’s Office of the Postsecondary Commissioner is the affiliated administrative agency and charged with carrying out board policies, providing data analysis, assisting with P-20 policy coordination and offering support services to the institutions, which do not have local governing boards. The office also administers financial aid programs.</p>
South Carolina	<p>South Carolina’s Commission on Higher Education is the statewide coordinating board for public postsecondary education and authorizes independent institutions. The board appoints the executive officer for the affiliated agency. The administrative agency is charged with implementing board policies, provides data analysis and reports, conducts research, and administers academic and student financial aid programs, among other duties. A governing board oversee the South Carolina Technical College System and its institutions are governed by local boards (commissions). Local boards govern several other four- and two-year institutions.</p>
South Dakota	<p>South Dakota does not have a single, statewide coordinating or governing board for postsecondary education. The South Dakota Board of Regents is a governing board for the public four-year institutions and two special schools, which do not have local governing boards, and appoints the system’s executive director. The system office is responsible for administering academic and financial aid programs, and providing data and accountability reports, among other duties. South Dakota’s Board of Technical Education, established in 2017, coordinates the locally-governed technical colleges and appoints the executive director. The board of technical education is housed within the department of education which, along with the board of education, previously governed the colleges.</p>

Tennessee	<p>Tennessee’s Higher Education Commission is the statewide coordinating board for postsecondary education and exercises limited authority over independent institutions. The coordinating board appoints the commission’s executive director. The affiliated agency implements board policies, administers federal and state programs, provides data analysis and reports, and conducts research, among other duties. The Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation administers financial aid programs and is housed within but operates separately from the higher education commission. The Board of Trustees of the University of Tennessee governs the four-year institutions within its system, which have advisory boards, and Tennessee’s Board of Regents governs community and technical colleges, which do not have local governing or advisory boards. Local governing boards oversee the state universities and have authorities aligned with those of the two postsecondary systems.</p>
Texas	<p>The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board serves as a single statewide coordinating board for public postsecondary education and authorizes and monitors accredited degree-granting private postsecondary institutions. The board appoints the commissioner of higher education. The affiliated agency administers federal and states academic programs, provides data analysis and reports on higher education-related issues, administers student financial aid programs, conducts research and analysis, and determines programs of study, among other responsibilities. Governing boards oversee several four-year postsecondary systems and multi-campus institutions and the Texas State University System, which includes four- and two-year institutions. The community colleges in Texas are not part of a system and are governed by local district boards, and several have multiple campuses. A board of regents oversees the Texas State Technical College System, which operates as a single statewide institution with multiple campuses.</p>
Utah	<p>Utah does not have a single, statewide coordinating or governing board for postsecondary education. The Utah Board of Regents is a governing board for public four- and two-year institutions, which have local governing boards, and a research institute. The board of regents appoints the system’s commissioner with approval of the governor and Senate. The system office is responsible for administering academic and financial aid programs, publishing data and accountability reports, and providing services to institutions, among other duties. The Higher Education Assistance Authority, which is under the direction of the Board of Regents, provides student loan services and is governed by a board of directors. Utah’s System of Technical Colleges Board of Trustees governs the technical colleges, which have local governing boards, and appoints the commissioner with approval of the governor and Senate. The technical college system office carries out board policies, provides data and reporting services, and administers academic and workforce programs, among other responsibilities.</p>
Vermont	<p>Vermont’s higher education system is not overseen by a statewide governing or coordinating board. The Vermont State Colleges Board of Trustees governs four- and two-year institutions, which do not have local governing boards,</p>



	<p>and appoints the system’s chancellor. The system office carries out board policies, administers academic programs and provides support services to its campuses, among other duties. The University of Vermont’s Board of Trustees governs the institution and appoints the president. Vermont’s Student Assistance Corporation administers financial aid programs and oversees outreach and training programs related to financial assistance.</p>
Virginia	<p>The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia is the statewide coordinating board for public postsecondary education and has certain oversight responsibilities for independent institutions. The coordinating board appoints the director. The associated agency is responsible for implementing board policies, administering academic and financial aid programs, developing and maintaining a comprehensive data system, analyzing and reporting data, and conducting research, among other duties. Virginia’s State Board for Community Colleges governs the system’s two-year institutions, which do not have local governing boards. The state’s four-year institutions are overseen by local governing boards.</p>
Washington	<p>Washington’s Student Achievement Council serves as the state’s coordinating board for public education. The governor appoints the executive director based on the recommendation of the coordinating board. The affiliated agency implements board policies, conducts research and analysis, and administers academic and student financial aid programs. The Washington State Board for Community and Technical Colleges coordinates a system of two-year institutions, which have individual governing boards. The universities, some of which have multiple campuses, are governed by local boards.</p>
West Virginia	<p>West Virginia does not have a single, statewide coordinating or governing board for postsecondary education. The West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission is the coordinating board for the state’s four-year institutions, which have local boards, and appoints the agency’s chancellor. The agency is responsible for administering academic and financial aid programs, conducting research and analysis, providing data services and reports, and managing capital projects, among other duties. Legislation enacted in 2017 shifted certain authorities from the commission to the institutional governing boards for selected universities. West Virginia’s Council for Community and Technical College Education serves as a coordinating board for two-year institutions, which are governed by local boards, and appoints the chancellor. The affiliated agency office produces data and special reports, administers academic and workforce programs, and provides various support services to campuses.</p>
Wisconsin	<p>Wisconsin does not have a single, statewide coordinating or governing board for postsecondary education. The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System governs the institutions, which do not have local boards, and appoints the system’s president. As of July 2018, the 13 two-year campuses formerly known as UW Colleges became branch campuses of seven of the system’s four-year comprehensive or research institutions. The system</p>

	<p>office carries out board policies, administers academic and student success programs, and conducts research and policy analysis, among other responsibilities. Wisconsin's Technical College System Board coordinates the technical institutions, which are governed by local boards, and appoints the president. The system office carries out board policies, provides data and reporting services, and administers academic and workforce programs, among other responsibilities. The Wisconsin Higher Educational Aids Board administers student financial aid programs, provides training related to financial assistance and oversees the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA). The Educational Approval Program, located within the Wisconsin Department of Safety and Professional Services, is charged with authorizing private trade, technical and other degree-granting schools.</p>
<p>Wyoming</p>	<p>Wyoming does not have a single, statewide coordinating or governing board for postsecondary education. The Board of Trustees governs the University of Wyoming, which is the state's four-year institution, and appoints the president. Wyoming's Community College Commission coordinates the two-year institutions, which have local governing boards, and appoints the executive director. The commission office provides data and reporting services, administers academic programs and administers the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA). Wyoming's Department of Education administers the state's student financial aid program.</p>

Source: Education Commission of the States, <https://www.ecs.org/>

## 2. Transfer and Articulation of Courses and Programs Daniel Archer

### Summary

*This paper summarizes the current practices and plans regarding student transfer in the Kansas public postsecondary education system. The paper 1) addresses systemwide transfer, an existing framework that ensures that individual courses transfer seamlessly throughout the state, 2) outlines the advantages and plans to expand systemwide transfer to the programmatic level, and 3) provides background information on a common course numbering system and current Board policy.*

### Course Transfer

In 2012, Kansas established systemwide transfer (SWT) as a framework to improve course transfer. Under this framework, a SWT course completed at a Kansas public university, community college, or technical college transfers to any Kansas public postsecondary institution offering the equivalent course.

The SWT process operates on an annual cycle. Each Fall, faculty from universities and two-year colleges convene at the Kansas Core Outcomes Group (KCOG) Conference to develop common course learning outcomes in specific courses. After KCOG, the Kansas Transfer and Articulation Council (TAAC), a group of faculty and administrators from universities, community colleges, and technical colleges that oversees transfer processes and procedures, reviews and recommends that the Board approve such courses for SWT.

To date, the Board has approved 100 SWT courses.

### Program Transfer

The SWT inventory exists in conjunction with a long-standing tradition of Kansas community colleges playing a vital role in supporting baccalaureate degree completion. In 2019, Kansas ranked second in the nation in the percentage of baccalaureate degree earners who started at two-year public colleges.<sup>4</sup>

While Kansas has built an effective model for individual course transfer and has a documented history of students progressing from two-year colleges to universities, the state does not currently have a systemwide policy or strategy that advances associate-to-baccalaureate degree program transfer. Seeing an opportunity for growth, the Board recently directed Board staff to collaborate with colleges and universities to develop a systemwide program transfer plan.

A systemwide program transfer approach is intended to preserve credits and establish a clear transfer pathway between two-year colleges and universities.<sup>5</sup> As a result, this approach creates a concrete trajectory in which all courses completed within an earned associate degree transfer and apply toward the completion of specific baccalaureate degree requirements. Implementing a systemwide associate-to-baccalaureate transfer model is advantageous to students, states, universities, and community colleges for a multitude of reasons.

---

<sup>4</sup> National Student Clearinghouse. (2019). *Completing college-state-2019*. Retrieved from <https://nscresearchcenter.org/signature-report-16-state-supplement-completing-college-a-state-level-view-of-student-completion-rates/>

<sup>5</sup> Gross, B., & Goldhaber, D. D. (2009). *Community college transfer and articulation policies: Looking beneath the surface*. Bothell, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education, University of Washington.

Among others, the benefits include:

#### *Benefits to the Student*

- Provides a shorter path to completion, thereby reducing time-to-degree<sup>6</sup>
- Decreases the cost of the degree<sup>6</sup>
- Creates more flexibility and increases options for students<sup>7</sup>

#### *Benefits to the State*

- Increases efficiencies and reduces course redundancy<sup>7</sup>
- Saves state costs associated with excessive credits<sup>6</sup>
- Aligns with the KBOR Strategic Plan – Promotes affordability, retention, and completion

#### *Benefits to the University*

- Provides an opportunity to attract more non-traditional students as universities adapt to recruiting from smaller high school graduating classes<sup>8</sup>
- Establishes an opportunity to have a larger population of junior transfer students, which could increase the demand for upper-division coursework<sup>8</sup>
- Simplifies transfer student advising and streamlines degree audits because the transferability has previously been determined<sup>9</sup>
- Creates opportunities to increase baccalaureate degree completion (transfer students who have an associate degree are more likely to earn a baccalaureate degree)<sup>10</sup>

#### *Benefits to the Community College*

- Creates an opportunity to increase associate degree completion<sup>11</sup>
- Simplifies transfer student advising<sup>9</sup>

A review of practitioner and scholarly literature revealed that three components are commonly cited when establishing a systemwide associate-to-baccalaureate program transfer model.

- Developing a common general education (GE) package<sup>6,7</sup>
- Creating a framework in which program courses transfer as a block without the loss of credit<sup>5,6</sup>
- Examining associate and/or baccalaureate degree credit limits<sup>7</sup>

A working group, which is comprised of fourteen representatives (seven from universities and seven from two-year colleges), will begin convening prior to the September Board meeting to address these issues and develop a systemwide program transfer system.

---

<sup>6</sup> Root, M. (2013). *Essential elements of state policy for college completion*. Retrieved from [http://publications.sreb.org/2013/013\\_ess\\_elem\\_tran\\_courses.pdf](http://publications.sreb.org/2013/013_ess_elem_tran_courses.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> Kisker, C. B., Wagoner, R. L., & Cohen, A. M. (2012). Elements of effective transfer associate degrees. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2012(160), 5-11.

<sup>8</sup> Jenkins, D., Kadlec, A., & Votruba, J. (2014). *Maximizing resources for student success: The business case for regional public universities to strengthen community college transfer pathways*. Retrieved from [http://hemstrategists.com/maximizingresources/images/Transfer\\_Pathways\\_Paper.pdf](http://hemstrategists.com/maximizingresources/images/Transfer_Pathways_Paper.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> Manz, N. (2015). *The transfer handbook: promoting student success*. Washington, DC: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

<sup>10</sup> Shapiro, D., Dundar, A., Ziskin, M., Chiang, Y.-C., Chen, J., Harrell, A., & Torres, V. (2013). *Baccalaureate attainment: A national view of the postsecondary outcomes of students who transfer from two-year to four-year institutions* (Signature Report No. 5). Herndon, VA: National Student Clearinghouse Research Center.

<sup>11</sup> Spencer, G. (2017). *Improving transfer pathways: the impact of statewide articulation policies* (Doctoral dissertation)

## Other Transfer Issues

### *Common Numbering*

In addition to statewide program transfer, some states have established a common numbering system to ensure that prevalent courses are easily identified on a collegiate transcript by the same course prefix and number. As an example, under a common numbering system, all English Composition classes in a state are codified on the transcript as ENGL 101. This establishes continuity throughout the system, simplifies the transfer process for students, and streamlines transcript review and data entry at the receiving institution. A review of a national inventory revealed that 18 states currently employ a common numbering system.<sup>12</sup>

If a common numbering system was implemented in Kansas, it would require registrars and information technology staff to reclassify course numbers and reprogram student information systems. One of the significant challenges would likely be based on the fact that the 32 colleges and universities in the state use different student information systems. These systems have heterogenous features and varying levels of flexibility, so more input would be needed to gauge the feasibility of implementing this potential initiative.

### *Appeal Process*

At the June 16, 2020 Future of Higher Education Council meeting, there was a question about the options that a student has when he/she disagrees with an institution's course transfer evaluation. Board policy requires institutions to have an appeal process to ensure that a student has an option to petition such cases. This policy is detailed in section d.iii below.

*d. Institutional Transfer and Articulation. To promote seamlessness, each public postsecondary educational institution shall develop and publicize its own transfer policy.*

- i. Each public university shall appoint a point person for transfer and articulation issues and shall clearly identify that individual's contact information on the university web site.*
- ii. An institutional transfer policy shall not conflict with the Board's systemwide transfer policy.*
- iii. An institutional transfer policy shall include an appeal process.*
- iv. An institutional transfer policy shall treat transfer students the same way academically as non-transfer students.*
- v. An institutional transfer policy shall ensure transfer of substantially equivalent courses from any Kansas public postsecondary institution.*
- vi. An institutional transfer policy shall ensure transfer of general education courses from any Kansas public postsecondary institution accredited by a nationally recognized agency, subject to conditions in paragraphs f.(iii) and b.*
- vii. Courses not substantially equivalent to a course offered by the receiving institution may be transferred at the discretion of the receiving institution.*

---

<sup>12</sup> Education Commission of the States. (2020). *Transfer and articulation: Statewide common course numbering*. Retrieved from <http://ecs.force.com/mbdata/MBquest3RTA?Rep=TR2002>

### 3. Postsecondary Technical Education Authority

Scott Smathers

#### **Purpose**

*To accommodate an increased interest and focus on postsecondary technical education in the state, the 2007 Kansas Legislature created the Kansas Postsecondary Technical Education Authority (TEA) to work under the auspices of the Kansas Board of Regents (Board) and to make recommendations to the Regents regarding the coordination, statewide planning and improvements/enhancements to the postsecondary technical education system.*

#### **Responsibilities and Activities**

The legislation (K.S.A. 72-4482) provides that the TEA shall have delegated authority from the Kansas Board of Regents to:

- 1) Coordinate statewide planning for postsecondary technical education, new postsecondary technical education programs and contract training;
- 2) Recommend rules and regulations for the supervision of postsecondary technical education for adoption by the Board;
- 3) Review existing and proposed postsecondary technical education programs and program locations and make recommendations to the Board for approval or disapproval of such programs for state funding purposes;
- 4) Make recommendations to the Board for state funding of postsecondary technical education;
- 5) Develop benchmarks and accountability indicators for postsecondary technical education programs and make recommendations to the Board related thereto, for purposes of state funding;
- 6) Study, develop and advocate a policy agenda for postsecondary technical education;
- 7) Continuously study ways to maximize the utilization of resources available for postsecondary technical education and make recommendations for improvement in the use of such resources to the Board;
- 8) Conduct studies to develop strategies and programs for meeting the needs of business and industry;
- 9) Report on the performance of its functions and duties to the Board and the Legislature;
- 10) Coordinate development of a seamless system for the delivery of technical education between secondary and postsecondary program levels; and
- 11) Develop and recommend to the Board a credit hour funding distribution formula for postsecondary technical training programs that (i) is tiered to recognize and support cost differentials in providing high-demand high-tech training, (ii) takes into consideration target industries critical to the Kansas economy, (iii) is responsive to program growth and (iv) includes other factors and considerations as deemed necessary or advisable; and establish and recommend to the state board of regents the rates to be used in such funding distribution formula.

The Board has also authorized the TEA to perform the following tasks:

- 1) Administer the Kansas Technology Innovation and Internship program with results reported back to the Board (Sept. 2017)
- 2) Approve program requests for two-year colleges (including Washburn Tech and WSU Tech) which are then submitted on the Board's consent agenda (Dec. 2017)
- 3) Provide to the Board Adult Education/AO-K updates (Aug. 2017)
- 4) Provide to the Board Carl D. Perkins updates (Aug. 2017)

B. *Follow Up from Last Meeting*

1. **Systemwide Enrollment**

- **Predictive Model**
- **KSDegreeStats**

**Elaine Frisbie**

**Summary**

*An enrollment report was presented to the Kansas Board of Regents in the spring, examining historical trends as well as projections for Kansas public higher education enrollment. The full report is available for viewing on the Board website at [https://www.kansasregents.org/data/system\\_data/enrollment\\_reports](https://www.kansasregents.org/data/system_data/enrollment_reports).*

*While the state's overall population is projected to continue to increase, there are marked differences in projections for the rural and urban counties of the state. Also, the racial demographics of the state are projected to vary from historical trends. Enrollments in Kansas public postsecondary education institutions will be impacted by these demographic changes in the state. As Kansas demographics change, postsecondary institutions must close equity gaps and find ways to serve a more racially diverse population, as well as more first generation and low-income students in order to meet the state's postsecondary attainment needs.*

*The Kansas DegreeStats web portal was developed by the Kansas Board of Regents in response to interest expressed by the Kansas Legislature that a degree prospectus be published for each postsecondary degree program in Kansas. The first iteration launched in March 2016, with state university data. 2016 House Bill 2622 was enacted the next year and additional data were incorporated from all public institutions of higher education.*

*K.S.A. 74-32,303 states in part, "The state board of regents shall publish degree prospectus information for each undergraduate degree program offered by each postsecondary educational institution that summarizes information and statistics on such degree program." The website is updated annually and maintained by the Kansas Board of Regents with data submitted by each of the state's public universities and colleges.*

**Background**

Many data points presented in the enrollment report are also available in the agency's self-serve data portal, Kansas Higher Education Statistics ("KHEStats"). For interactive views of enrollments, credential production, the student success index, institutions' finances, and wage earnings of graduates, navigate from the main webpage at [www.kansasregents.org](http://www.kansasregents.org) to "Data" and then to "KHEStats." Data are available for all institutions of higher education within all four public sectors: state universities, community colleges, technical colleges, and Washburn University. Data can also be filtered by institution, academic year, and semester.

The Board office also publishes comprehensive data books for the four public sectors each year in January. The data books are an important source for financial information and faculty/staff data in addition to typical enrollment data. Enrollment data in the data books has been aligned with the data in KHEStats. Data books are available at: [http://www.kansasregents.org/data/system\\_data/higher\\_education\\_data\\_books](http://www.kansasregents.org/data/system_data/higher_education_data_books).

**Kansas Board of Regents Uniform Data System**

In 1999, the Kansas Higher Education Coordination Act charged the Board with collecting and analyzing data and maintaining a uniform postsecondary education database. Today the data system houses comprehensive data for 32 public institutions and limited data for the private independent institutions and Haskell Indian Nations University. Collectively, the data is called the Kansas Higher Education Data System (KHEDS). The Board Office also maintains data on students enrolled in adult education programs.

KHEDS data are frequently used to support the Board's strategic agenda, calculate state and federal performance indicators, respond to legislative requests, report enrollment and outcome data, and perform strategic evaluation and research relevant to the improvement of educational instruction and the effective administration of educational and financial aid programs. Major system enhancements have been made in support of the state's postsecondary funding formula for career and technical education and to provide data for research purposes.



## 2. Discuss Cost Model

Elaine Frisbie

### Summary

*Council members requested at the prior meeting to see greater detail on the calculations associated with the cost model. A presentation will be made at the meeting to show college-level information comparing the cost model data to actual institutional finance data.*

### Background

2011 Senate Bill 143 (K.S.A. 2019 Supp. 71-1801, *et seq.*) created a new postsecondary education cost model for distribution of technical education state appropriations to the community and technical colleges. The formula was later determined to be applicable to distribute state aid for general education credit hours.

The following year, Senate Bill 155 was enacted to provide state support for college tuition on behalf of high school students enrolled in postsecondary technical education courses and authorized incentive payments to local school districts for high school graduates who have also earned industry-recognized credentials in high demand occupations. This program is referred to as “Excel in CTE.”

The approach for determining funding under these two pieces of legislation is the cost model, which calculates a course-level cost rate and recognizes the cost differential in delivering technical courses. Each course is designated “tiered” or “non-tiered.” In order to be “tiered,” a course must be a technical course and part of an approved technical program. Courses are bucketed to group similar courses together for consistency across the system and to reflect cost differentials of the courses. All other courses are designated non-tiered.

### Cost Calculation

#### Tiered (Technical Courses)

Total Course Rate = Instructor Costs + Extraordinary Costs +  
Instructional Support Costs + Institutional Support Costs

#### Non-Tiered (General Education Courses)

Total Course Rate = Instructor Costs +  
Instructional Support Costs + Institutional Support Costs

Instructor Costs are those faculty salary costs as reported to the National Community College Cost and Productivity Project conducted by Johnson County Community College (JCCC) annually. Instructor costs are categorized by CIP<sup>13</sup> and placed into tiers dependent upon the program and overall cost level. To the extent that data are not available for all CIPs, the Project rolls up information to the next available tier of available information.

Extraordinary Costs are those costs associated with purchase of supplies, materials and specialized equipment needed to provide intensive, hands-on learning opportunities within technical education (e.g., welders, patient simulators, cattle feeders, lab supplies). The “extraordinary” amount is an additional per-credit value assigned to each program, based on the needs of the courses within the program. Kansas institutions submit actual expenditure data to the Board of Regents. The Board Office has initiated a multi-year process to re-evaluate and update each technical program’s extraordinary costs in the Fall of 2019.

---

<sup>13</sup> The Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) provides a taxonomic coding scheme of instructional programs. Its purpose is to facilitate the organization, collection, and reporting of fields of study and program completions.

Instructional Support Costs are those costs associated with academic support and student services (e.g. computer labs, instructional materials, library). The model uses data submitted by two-year colleges in Kansas and surrounding states to the federal Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) to establish a cost for instructional support.

Institutional Support Costs are those institutional costs associated with administration, facilities, and maintenance (e.g., operation/maintenance of physical plant and facility upgrades). The model uses data submitted by Kansas colleges and two-year colleges in surrounding states to the federal Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) to establish a cost for institutional support.

The cost model data sources and model components are identified in further detail below.

Components	Elements	Description
Instructor Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct instructor costs</li> <li>• Tiered rates from CIP codes and cost study</li> </ul>	Program instructor tier rates are based on an annual analysis of direct instructor costs – specifically salaries and benefits - as reported in the Cost and Productivity Study (previously known as the Kansas Study), a national instructor cost study conducted by Johnson County Community College.
Instructional Support Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student and academic support services</li> <li>• Flat Rate</li> </ul>	<p>This category captures costs associated with academic support and student services. This value is then used to establish a flat instructional support cost for each credit hour delivered by multiplying the percentage by the Tier 3 Instructor cost per credit hour to establish the rate each year.</p> $\text{Instructional Support Percent} = \frac{(\text{Public Service} + \text{Academic Service} + \text{Student Service})}{(\text{Total Operating Expenses} - \text{Auxiliary Enterprises} - \text{Scholarship and Financial Aid})}$
Institutional Support Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operation and maintenance of physical plant, Administration</li> <li>• Flat Rate</li> </ul>	<p>This category includes costs associated with administration, and operation and maintenance of the physical plant. This value is then used to establish a flat institutional support cost for each credit hour delivered by multiplying the percentage by the Tier 3 Instructor cost per credit hour to establish the rate each year.</p> $\text{Institutional Support Percent} = \frac{(\text{Institutional Support} + \text{Operation and Maintenance of Plant})}{(\text{Total Operating Expenses} - \text{Auxiliary Enterprises} - \text{Scholarship and Financial Aid})}$
Extraordinary Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs for specialized equipment &amp; materials</li> <li>• Level rates from cost study</li> </ul>	Technical education typically provides intensive, hands-on learning opportunities, often requiring additional supplies, materials and specialized equipment. The “extraordinary” amount is an additional per-credit value assigned to each program, based on the needs of the courses within the program. Absent a national data source, institutions identified courses with intensive “extraordinary” costs and submitted five years of actual expenditure data reflecting these types of expenses. Costs based on these data were grouped into four tiers and are adjusted annually using the Consumer Price Index.

There are 24 cost model composite rates, which for 2019 ranged from \$207/credit hour to \$497/credit hour. The following course example is provided to illustrate the components:

## Funding Calculation

Total Course Cost = Course Rate X Eligible Student Credit Hours (SCH)

The “state’s share”<sup>14</sup> of the total calculated cost is to be based on student credit hours:

- Community College in district SCH<sup>15</sup> = 1/3 student, 1/3 local taxing district, 1/3 state
- Community College out district SCH = 1/3 student, 2/3 state
- All Technical College SCH = 1/3 student, 2/3 state
- Secondary students in Excel in CTE = 100% state

---

<sup>14</sup> The calculated share of the state, local community and the state under the cost model are based on a number of assumptions, including “full funding” by the Legislature.

<sup>15</sup> An in district community college student resides within the college’s taxing district (which is the local county, with the exception of Montgomery County which has two community colleges so that county is divided roughly in half).

C. Next Steps

Cheryl Harrison-Lee, Chair

**IV. Closing Remarks**

Cheryl Harrison-Lee, Chair

*Set Date for Next Council Meeting*

**V. Adjournment**