

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

**CONFERENCE CALL AGENDA
Monday, March 30th, 2020, 11:00 am**

[Join Microsoft Teams Meeting](#)

Phone: +1 785-422-6104

Conference ID: 660 500 973#

The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee will meet by teleconference call. Please see the information above for calling into this meeting through Microsoft Teams. You do not have to download software or have an account to access this call. Please note that you will need to mute your line when at all possible to ensure the least amount of feedback.

- | | | |
|---|------------------------|-------|
| I. Call to Order | Regent Schmidt | |
| 1. Approve minutes from March 18, 2020 conference call | | p. 3 |
| II. Other Matters | | |
| 1. BAASC 20-08 Receive Program Review Report | Sam Christy-Dangermond | p. 7 |
| 2. Policy Revision on Accreditation “nomenclature” | Karla Wiscombe | p. 26 |
| 3. Direct Support Professionals (DSP) Update | Regent Schmidt | |
| 4. Coordinating Council Update | Regent Kiblinger | |
| III. Consent Items | | |
| 1. Request approval to seek accreditation for MS in Health Informatics at the University of Kansas Medical Center | KUMC | p. 37 |
| IV. Suggested Agenda Items for BAASC April 15th Meeting | | |
| • Approve minutes from March 30 th conference call | | |
| • Apply Kansas Update | | |
| • Direct Support Professionals (DSP) Update | | |
| • Coordinating Council Update | | |
| V. Adjournment | | |

Date Reminders: (dates are all tentative)

- April 14: Direct Support Professionals (DSP) Working Group Meeting
- May 19: Coordinating Council 2nd Meeting
- May 20: Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) Update
- May 20: **BAASC 20-04** Receive JCCC & KU Edwards Campus Transfer Agreement Update

Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee

Four Regents serve on the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC), established in 2002. The Regents are appointed annually by the Chair and approved by the Board. BAASC meets by conference call approximately two weeks prior to each Board meeting and prior to the Board Chair's conference call to finalize items for the Board agenda. The Committee also meets in person the morning of the first day of the monthly Board meeting. Membership includes:

Allen Schmidt, Chair

Cheryl Harrison-Lee

Shelly Kiblinger

Helen Van Etten

Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee AY 2020 Meeting Schedule

Meeting Dates	Time	Location	Institution Materials Due
September 18, 2019	10:30 am	Topeka	August 28, 2019
October 7, 2019	11:00 am	Conference Call	
October 16, 2019	9:30 am	Conference Call	
November 4, 2019	11:00 am	Conference Call	October 16, 2019
November 20, 2019	10:15 am	Pittsburg State University	October 30, 2019
December 2, 2019	11:00 am	Conference Call	November 13, 2019
December 18, 2019	10:15 am	Topeka	November 26, 2019
December 30, 2019	11:00 am	Conference Call	December 11, 2019
January 15, 2020	10:15 am	Topeka	December 26, 2019
February 3, 2020	11:00 am	Conference Call	January 15, 2020
February 19, 2020	10:15 am	Topeka	January 29, 2020
March 2, 2020	11:00 am	Conference Call	February 12, 2020
March 18, 2020	10:15 am	Conference Call	February 26, 2020
March 30, 2020	11:00 am	Conference Call	March 11, 2020
April 15, 2020	10:15 am	TBD (Topeka or Conference Call)	March 25, 2020
May 4, 2020	11:00 am	Conference Call	April 15, 2020
May 20, 2020	10:15 am	Topeka	April 29, 2020
June 1, 2020	11:00 am	Conference Call	May 13, 2020

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

**MINUTES
Wednesday, March 18, 2020**

The March 18, 2020 meeting of the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee (BAASC) of the Kansas Board of Regents was called to order by Regent Schmidt at 10:19 a.m. The meeting was held by conference call.

In Attendance:

Members:	Regent Schmidt, Chair Regent Van Etten	Regent Harrison-Lee	Regent Kiblinger
Staff:	Daniel Archer Amy Robinson Travis White Vera Brown	Karla Wiscombe Erin Wolfram Marti Leisinger	Samantha Christy- Dangermond Scott Smathers
Others:	Steve Loewen, FHTC Michael McCloud, JCCC Linnea GlenMaye, WSU Beth Ann Krueger, KCKCC Kaye Monk-Morgan, WSU Shane Bangerter, Board	Jill Arensdorf, FHSU Erin Shaw, Highland CC Howard Smith, PSU Robert Klein, KUMC Michelle Schoon, Cowley CC	Adam Borth, Fort Scott CC Cindy Hoss, Hutchinson CC Joe McCann, Seward Co. CC Sarah Robb, Neosho County CC Brian Inbody, Neosho County CC

Regent Schmidt welcomed everyone.

Approval of Minutes

Regent Van Etten moved to approve the March 2, 2020 meeting minutes, and Regent Kiblinger seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the motion passed.

KSDE Individual Plans of Study (IPS) Presentation

Stacy Smith, Assistant Director, IPS and Career and Technical Education, Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE), provided a presentation on Individual Plans of Study (IPS). Stacy noted his contact and additional information is provided at the end of the PowerPoint if anyone would like to follow up with him as needed. He stated that Kansas is seeking to lead the world in the success of each student, and KSDE is busy identifying how they will support the individual needs of each student. Stacy discussed what it takes to be a successful Kansas high school graduate according to the Kansas State Board of Education (KSBE): academic preparation, cognitive preparation, technical skills, employability skills, and civic engagement. The KSBE believes to be a successful high school graduate to transition into adulthood and post-secondary education or attain an industry recognized credential in the workforce, that these five characteristics must be developed. With these five characteristics in mind, the KSBE has established five outcomes which KSBE uses in the measurement of school success. IPS is one of the five, with the other four outcomes tying into and overlapping in efforts.

IPS is both an actual product the student develops and a process the school implements to guide students. IPS looks at a student's mission, passion, professional interests, and vocational interests. He noted it is important to consider what a student loves to do, what is needed by industry, and job earnings. This information is utilized in counseling departments and school administrators as they plan and develop activities across curricula that will

support IPS implementation. Character, social, and personal developments are social-emotional learning experiences that are an important part of supporting personalized learning for students.

There are four models of IPS implementation that include counselors, advisors, career advocates, or a hybrid of any of the three. Stacy discussed each in more detail. He noted that the hybrid of different models is the most widely used method, and he provided details of what a hybrid model may look like in his presentation material. Stacy also provided a graphic of the IPS process for students.

Stacy discussed the minimum components a school needs to document in order to show they have an IPS in place, discussing these four components as outlined in his presentation. Stacy proceeded to discuss IPS in the broad continuum of experiences from kindergarten to high school. He noted there is a greater emphasis on having formal resources in the high school years and career exploration activities in the middle school years. Stacy believes it is also important for districts to think about the K-5 connection of core content of standards and where these skills eventually become important in the workplace. He stated it was important that a broad range of personnel understand how IPS works and possible intersections of activities and projects in which students participate.

Stacy noted to implement IPS a school does not have to purchase web-based products; however, the majority of schools use Career Cruising (Xello), which is the state's preferred web-based vendor. He also stated training is always available, and each year an implementation survey is conducted. Stacy provided links to resources that are available for additional information on topics he previously discussed.

Stacy provided an update on KSDE's current efforts. His materials included a graphic of career and technical education fields within secondary CTE with 37 pathways of focus that are in 7 broad career fields. At the center of these pathways is applied knowledge, effective relations, and workplace skills; each of these represents employability skills that business and industry partners desire. These employability skills are addressed as competencies during performance tasks that are required to be taught in courses.

Stacy discussed the KSDE pilot project Kansas Work-Based Learning Continuum. This is a partnership project between KSDE, KBOR, Kansas Department of Commerce, and the Kansas Department of Labor, to identify opportunities for engaging community partnerships to develop students' employability skills through meaningful experiences that are best pursued outside of districts. Stacy went over Kansas's work-based learning continuum which includes career awareness, career exploration, and career preparation. He provided a graph of experiences in each of these categories showing the percentage of students in Kansas who have had these experiences. Stacy discussed how each of these categories ties into IPS, and he noted that KSDE will soon have this pilot system included in all IPS's in Kansas. The pilot project was modeled after a comparable project in Wisconsin; Stacy noted he could provide additional information on the Wisconsin project if requested.

Regent Van Etten asked Stacy, in reference to the current climate, if workplace learning would continue. Stacy responded that a virtual delivery of training will be announced closer to April. Stacy noted they do not want to see the momentum of the pilot program slow down, and he believes there are ways to support student learning outside of their institutions if resources are obtained. Regent Schmidt asked for clarification of the timeline for the pilot project. Stacy responded IPS became a KSBE goal in 2010, SB155 included funding in 2012, the KSBE made IPS a major emphasis in 2015, and there is currently a 96% implementation rate for IPS in Kansas schools. The Kansas Work-Based Learning Continuum is a granular level of IPS around career and technical education. Regent Schmidt asked for clarification on where they were with orientation and training for school boards. Stacy responded they have focused around CTE coordinators and school principals over the last year and are relying on building administration. Stacy noted that in the Kansas Work-Based Learning Continuum pilot project they are working with the five school regions where the Kansas Department of Commerce has anchored a representative through a regional workplace development group, so they have a liaison to business and industry to build partnerships. He stated they are also working with community and technical college partnerships in the

five regions. Stacy stated from a state level the superintendents may be suited to inform their local board. With no further questions, the Committee thanked Stacy for his presentation on IPS.

FHTC Academic Advising Presentation

Lisa Kirmer, Vice President of Student Services, Flint Hills Technical College (FHTC), provided a presentation on the college's academic advising model. FHTC consists of several campuses: their main campus in Emporia, the downtown Emporia campus, south Emporia campus, Adult Education Center in Emporia, and their Automotive Training Center in Garnett. FHTC has advisors across their campuses that include 37 in program faculty, and 3 full time advisors for student services. Lisa noted the full-time advisors work with all locations. Lisa discussed each of the three types of advisors in more detail.

Student Services staff work with students in their first year. Program faculty work with students after their first year who are continuing within the college. They perform individual advising for returning students, meet with these students throughout the semester, report on each student's progress, advise students on Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs), and help students find jobs at the end of their study.

The Reeble Student Success Center houses staff who work with admissions, entrance testing, advising, registration, counseling, financial aid, and payment plans. Lisa noted they have student services staff who travel between specific locations. First-year students participate in Wrangler Enrollment Days which consists of individual discussions with academic advisors, development of degree plans, web-based programs and log-in information, financial information, and information on the location of their classrooms. Lisa provided an example of a Degree Plan for a full-time student.

Strategies that FHTC uses include full-year enrollment, a first-year experience course, a texting app, free tutoring, Adult Education Center support, reports with concerns from instructors, annual advising/enrollment week each spring, and a bi-annual assessment week where students are evaluated and provided feedback. Lisa provided more detailed information on the first-year experience course, the role of faculty advisors, and an example of an instructor concern form. Faculty advise students on Institutional Student Learning Outcomes (ISLOs) and Lisa provided an example of the ISLO Dashboard. For ISLOs FHTC identified three areas where they felt all students needed to continue to work on skills to become successful: communication, professionalism, and problem solving. Business and industry have said these three areas are important for incoming employees. ISLOs can be utilized by all staff to evaluate a student throughout the year, and it is used as a tool by faculty advisors to identify areas of improvement for individual students. Lisa stated with all the variety of tools they use to advise, FHTC has a 96% job placement rate and has received national recognition.

Regent Van Etten asked for clarification on how they offer free tutoring. Lisa responded they place fliers up, and faculty can reach out to recommend students for tutoring or that they work with the Adult Education Center staff for assistance. Regent Kiblinger stated she believes an early alert system is vital. Regent Schmidt asked if ISLO observations are anonymous and how many observations are recorded for a student. Lisa responded the observations are anonymous, noting that students understand they can be evaluated by any staff through any interaction. With no further questions, the Committee thanked Lisa for her presentation.

Direct Support Professional (DSP) Update

Regent Schmidt noted the DSP working group has four broad goals they are working on: recruiting statewide, developing training and applied learning opportunities through higher education, connecting workers to industry needs, and improving the quality of skills and pay for support workers.

Coordinating Council Update

Regent Kiblinger stated the council has previously looked at three important items:

1. Concurrent credit, specifically obtaining a list of CTE funded classes online for high school juniors and seniors that is easily accessible. They believe this will help merge the experience for grades 12-14 and make program articulation easier.
2. How to build bridges of advisory connections such as counselors and career advisors at the K-12 and post-secondary levels. She noted KSDE has a listserv that may possibly be utilized to share information.
3. The importance of articulation agreements and new Perkins V requirements and helping move this forward.

Regent Kiblinger discussed the council's new objectives in light of the recent virus outbreak:

1. The need for post-secondary institutions to make sure that instructors located on high school campuses have a plan to help them be able to transition to an online format.
2. When looking at spring break, K-12 and post-secondary should align these dates across the state to improve planning.
3. Better alignment with advisor committees.

Adjournment

The next meeting will be via conference call on March 30, 2020. The next in-person meeting on April 15 was originally planned to be at K-State; however, this location will be changed due to the recent circumstances. Whether the meeting will be held at another location, or by conference call, will be decided at a later date.

Regent Kiblinger moved to adjourn the meeting, and Regent Van Etten seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Receive Academic Program Review Report 2018-2019

Summary and Recommendations

Board policy requires that “in cooperation with the state universities, the Board will maintain a regular program review cycle and a review process that will allow the universities to demonstrate on an ongoing basis that they are delivering quality programs consistent with their mission. Regular program review is institutionally based and follows the departmental or unit structure of the institution.” [Policy and Procedures Manual, II.A.5]. This item is the report on programs reviewed in academic year 2018-2019. Copies of individual campus reports are available at http://www.kansasregents.org/academic_affairs/618-program-review-reports. Staff recommends acceptance of this report.

March 30, 2020

Background

Program review is inextricably bound to academic quality and the allocation of resources within the public universities governed by the Kansas Board of Regents. The primary goal of program review is to ensure program quality by: (1) enabling individual universities to align academic programs with their institutional missions and priorities; (2) fostering improvement in curriculum and instruction; and (3) effectively coordinating the use of faculty time and talent.

Each university’s Program Review report is comprised of four major components: (1) a description of the academic program review process; (2) analysis of the programs reviewed; (3) analysis of data compiled in Kansas Higher Education Database (KHEDS) regarding minimum requirements for majors, graduates, faculty, and average ACT scores; and (4) follow-up summary on concerns raised in previous years.

The Academic Program Review Process

State universities are required to review programs at least once every eight years. It is important to note universities are not required to review programs every year of the eight-year cycle, but the institutions must review all programs within that timeframe. As appropriate, universities establish their review schedules, and those generally align with accreditation reporting requirements and site visits.

A. Criteria

The following criteria are used in reviewing academic programs:

1. centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution;
2. quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty;
3. quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students;
4. demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program;
5. service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond; and
6. cost-effectiveness.

Institutional reviews may include student learning assessment data, evaluations, recommendations from accrediting bodies, and various institutional data (e.g., data on student post-collegiate experiences, data gathered from the core and institution-specific performance indicators, and/or information in national or disciplinary rankings of program quality). The institution may also provide additional information that relates to these criteria and add additional criteria that are meaningful and appropriate.

B. Data and Minima Tables

The Board has established minimum criteria appropriate to each degree level. Data collected on each academic program are critical to the program review process. Academic programs which fail to meet minimum criteria are identified as part of the review process. The nature of system-wide guidelines means that some disciplines may fail to meet a stated criterion, while, at the same time, maintaining exceptional quality and/or serving crucial roles within the university. Below are data minima for programs, which are based on five-year averages.

	Number of Majors	Number of Graduates	Number of Faculty FTE	Average ACT score
Bachelor's	25	10	3	>=20
Master's	20	5	6	-
Doctorate	10	2	8	-

C. Programs Requiring Additional Review or Monitoring for Improvement

Based on review of both qualitative reports and program review data, Board staff and/or institutions identify areas of possible concern and consult with institutions to determine what, if any, steps should be taken to resolve problem areas. Institutions may find that some programs require additional review beyond that provided by the regular review cycle. In addition, some programs may require temporary monitoring to assess progress in rectifying problems as identified in the regular program review.

The minimum data criteria in specific categories serve as the guidelines for intensive review or monitoring. Academic programs which fail to meet any one of these minimum criteria may be targeted for intensive review in addition to the regularly scheduled self-study.

In addition to programs identified by the minima tables, the university may designate any other program for intensive review based on other information in the program review data base or other information sources (such as assessment results and accreditation reports).

Board staff monitors campus activities regarding programs identified for intensive review or until issues are resolved. For programs that are discontinued, each university teaches out students in the program, but does not accept new enrollments.

D. Final Report and Recommendations

Upon the conclusion of the program review process, each state university submits to Board staff an executive summary of its annual review and recommendations for each program. Board staff develops the annual program review report based on information provided by the institutions on each program, analysis of data in the minima tables, and consultation with the institutions. Regarding the minima data, all fractions for this report have been rounded up.

Summary of AY 2019 Reports from ESU, FHSU, KSU, PSU, KU, KUMC, and WSU

For the 2018-2019 program review cycle, Emporia State University, Fort Hays State University, Kansas State University, Pittsburg State University, the University of Kansas, the University of Kansas Medical Center and Wichita State University reviewed a total of 215 degree programs. What follows is a summary of the programs reviewed in AY 2019 by each of these institutions as part of its regular eight-year cycle for program review. In addition, a brief overview of the institution's review process is included.

Emporia State University

At Emporia State University, administrative units have the responsibility to organize program review efforts in a manner that best suits their environment and the nature of the program being reviewed. It is considered essential that all faculty connected to the program participate fully and actively in the program review process. While some departments appoint individual faculty and/or committees to process data associated with the review, reports are provided to the faculty as a whole for discussion, reflection, and decision making.

The program review process at the departmental level requires gathering quantitative and qualitative program information. Both types of data assist units to reflect upon the quality of the program and lend validity to the self-evaluation and resulting recommendations. Budget and financial information is provided by Fiscal Affairs. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness compiles quantitative data related to numbers of majors, credit hour production, productivity per full time/part-time FTE, etc. Surveys of recent graduates, current students, and

employers provide qualitative data. For some programs, qualitative data may also include numbers of students who matriculate into graduate programs of study.

Once data are collected, faculty, staff, and administrators engage in serious and on-going dialogue both formally and informally about the implications of the data. Department chairs provide written summaries, including recommendations for each program of study, to the respective school/college dean and to the provost.

ESU reviewed a total of ten degree programs at the undergraduate level and five at the graduate level. The BA, BSE, and MA in English; the BS, BSE, and MS in Mathematics; the BA and BS in Sociology; the BSE in Social Science; and the BA and BS in Crime and Delinquency Studies all met program minima and are recommended to continue.

The BA and BS in History fell one student short of meeting the minimum number of majors but there are several courses in the department students use to fulfill general education requirements. The MA in History was one student shy of meeting the minimum number of graduates, but the online master's program has been an especially attractive option for high school instructors to obtain the necessary credentials to teach dual-credit courses at their high schools. Therefore the programs in History are also recommended to continue.

Though the Bachelor of Music (Education), the Bachelor of Music (Performance), and the BA in Music do not meet the minima individually, all the undergraduate-level music programs function (and are funded) as a single unit, and collectively exceed the minima for majors and graduates. The Master of Music did not meet the minimum number of majors, and has been recommended for additional review.

The BS in Economics did not meet the minimum number of majors, and the BA and BS in Political Science did not meet minima for majors or graduates. These programs are also recommended for additional review.

Finally, the Master of Arts in Teaching, Social Sciences, has been discontinued.

Emporia State University
Program Review Summary Table AY 2019

Program	CIP	Degree Level	Recommendation
Crime and Delinquency Studies	43.0199	B	Continue
Economics	45.0603	B	Additional Review
English	23.0101	B, M	Continue
History	54.0101	B, M	Continue
Mathematics	27.0101	B, M	Continue
Music	50.0901	B, M	Additional Review (master's)
Music Education	13.1312	B	Continue
Political Science	45.1001	B	Additional Review
Social Sciences	45.0101	B	Continue
Social Sciences	13.1317	M	Discontinue
Sociology	45.1101	B	Continue

M= Master's; B=Bachelors; D= Doctorate
*Recommendation options are: Continue, Additional Review, Enhance, Discontinue

One program was identified last year for enhancement: the MS in School Psychology. It was one student short of meeting the minimum number of majors. (The department also offers an EdS in School Psychology, which meets program minima for majors and graduates.) Last year, the institution planned to reassign some resources from another area to the master’s program. This year, they indicate that the allocation of the additional resources and the establishment of a program cohort at ESU/KC have led to dramatic growth over prior years. As such, the program currently meets minima for majors and graduates.

**Emporia State University
Status of Programs Needing Additional Review AY 2015-2018**

Program	Year of Review	CIP	Degree Level	Previous Recommendation
School Psychology	2018	42.2805	M	Enhance

Fort Hays State University

Fort Hays State University procedures for Program Review are contained within the Memorandum of Agreement between the FHSU Chapter of the American Association of University Professors and Fort Hays State University/Kansas Board of Regents, under Program Discontinuance, which can be found at <https://www.fhsu.edu/fhsu-aaup/moa-2018>. To summarize, the Provost, in consultation with the Faculty Senate President, appoints a Program Review Committee consisting of faculty members. Each department with programs to be reviewed conducts a self study and submits a report to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs (APAA) and the Program Review Committee. The Program Review Committee reviews the report and makes program recommendations, determining if programs are subject to Intensive Program Review or Discontinuance. For those programs subject to Intensive Program Review, the APAA notifies the department, who meets with the Program Review Committee to discuss findings. For programs recommended for Discontinuance, the Provost and the APAA work with the department to make a recommendation to the President, who ultimately makes a final recommendation to the Board of Regents.

FHSU reviewed a total of 23 degree programs, many of which met program minima and are being recommended to continue. The Bachelor of Fine Arts, Master of Fine Arts, BA in Communication, the BA and BS in Criminal Justice, the BA in English, the BA in Global Business English, the Associate of General Studies, the Bachelor of General Studies, the BA and BS in Organizational Leadership, the BA and BS in Political Science, and the BA and BS in Sociology all meet program minima and are recommended to continue.

There are several programs not meeting all program minima. The MA in English is one student below the minimum number of majors, but exceeds the minimum number of graduates for the master’s level. It is being recommended to continue. The MA in History is slightly below minima for majors and graduates, but due to the recent promising online growth in this program, FHSU recommends continuing the program. The BA in Art Education and the BA in Art are not meeting minima for majors or graduates, and FHSU is recommending the two programs merge and undergo additional review. This merger will create efficiencies in course scheduling and staffing for courses involved in those programs.

Programs recommended for Additional Review include the MS in Communication, which is slightly below the minimum number of majors. The BS in Health Studies, the BA in History, and the Bachelor of Music do not meet the minimum number of graduates, and are being recommended for Additional Review. The BA in Foreign Language, the BA in Performing Arts, and the BA in Philosophy do not meet minima for majors or graduates, and are being recommended for additional review.

Fort Hays State University
Program Review Summary Table AY 2019

Program	CIP	Degree Level	Recommendation
Art	50.0702	B, M	Continue
Art	50.0701	B	Additional Review
Art Education	13.1302	B	Additional Review
Communication	09.0101	B	Continue
Communication	09.0101	M	Additional Review
Criminal Justice	43.0104	B	Continue
English	23.0101	B, M	Continue
Foreign Language	16.0101	B	Additional Review
General Studies	24.0101	A, B	Continue
Global Business English	23.9999	B	Continue
Health Studies	51.9999	B	Additional Review
History	54.0101	B	Additional Review
History	54.0101	M	Continue
Liberal Studies	24.0101	M	Continue
Music	13.1312	B	Continue
Organizational Leadership	52.0213	B	Continue
Performing Arts	50.0901	B	Additional Review
Philosophy	38.0101	B	Additional Review
Political Science	45.1001	B	Continue
Sociology	45.1101	B	Continue

Additionally, FHSU previously identified four programs for additional review, listed in the table below. The BBA in International Business and Economics previously did not meet the minimum number of graduates. At this point, the number of graduates far exceeds the minimum of ten, so the institution recommends continuation of this program. Three other programs were identified last year for additional review: the AAS in Technology and Leadership, the BS in Technology and Leadership, and the BS in Information Systems Engineering. These programs were also identified by FHSU for strategic program alignment. FHSU has made the initial recommendation to discontinue the BS in Information Systems Engineering, and plans to continue review of the other two programs through strategic program alignment.

Fort Hays State University
Status of Programs Needing Additional Review AY 2015-2018

Program	Year of Review	CIP	Degree Level	Recommendation
International Business and Economics	2016	45.0605	B	Continue
Technology and Leadership	2018	52.0210	A	Additional Review
Technology Leadership	2018	14.3501	B	Additional Review
Information Systems Engineering	2018	15.1299	B	Discontinue

Kansas State University

The program review process at K-State began with each program examining its assessment of student learning. The Office of Assessment reviewed all reports with the Graduate School Assessment and Review committee additionally reviewing graduate programs' reports on the assessment of student learning. Reviewers provided feedback and recommendations for improvement. Each program examined the statistical data and drafted a summary report resulting from their program's self-review including information on: (1) Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and the role of the institution; (2) The quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty; (3) The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students; (4) Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program; (5) The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond; and (6) The program's cost-effectiveness. In consultation with the College Dean's Office and/or the respective College or Program Committee on Planning, each department finalized the Program Review Report for its academic programs (by CIP code) as required by KBOR. The college dean then forwarded the reports to the Office of Assessment for review and comment. If necessary, the Office of Assessment returned the reports with suggested revisions to the college dean, which were returned with revisions for final approval.

K-State submitted for review 29 degree programs representing the Colleges of Agriculture and the College of Arts and Science. Of the 29 degrees reviewed, 15 are bachelor's, 9 are master's, and 5 are doctorate.

Baccalaureate programs that met or exceeded major and graduate minima and that are recommended to continue include the following: Art; Biochemistry; Biology; Communication Studies; English; Fisheries, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology; Horticulture and Natural Resources; Microbiology; Modern Languages; Music; Music Education; Park Management and Conservation; Theatre; and Wildlife and Outdoor Enterprise Management.

The bachelor's program in Philosophy did not meet the minimum number of graduates, but the number has been trending up in the last few years. This program is recommended for additional review.

Master's programs that met or exceeded minima and that are recommended to continue include Biology; Communication Studies; English; Modern Languages; and Music; and doctorate programs in Biochemistry; Biology; and Horticulture and Natural Resources.

There were several master's programs that did not meet one or both minima. The master's in Biochemistry met neither minima but it is a feeder program for the doctorate, so it is recommended to continue. The master's in Fine Arts did not meet the minimum number of majors; the program is recommended to be enhanced. The master's in Horticulture and Natural Resources, and the master's in Theatre do not quite meet the minimum number of majors, and are recommended for additional review.

The doctorate in Leadership Communication did not meet the minimum number of graduates, but this was a new program in 2018, so has not yet existed long enough to graduate students. Thus, the recommendation is to continue the program. The doctorate in Microbiology was one student short for the minimum number of graduates, but is recommended to continue, as well.

Kansas State University
Program Review Summary Table AY 2019

Program	CIP	Degree Level	Recommendation
Art	50.0702	B	Continue
Biochemistry	26.0202	B, M, D	Continue
Biology	26.0101	B, M, D	Continue
Communication Studies	09.0101	B, M	Continue

English	23.0101	B, M	Continue
Fine Arts	50.0702	M	Enhance
Fisheries, Wildlife and Conservation Biology	26.0709	B	Continue
Horticulture and Natural Resources	01.1103	B, M, D	B & D – Continue M - Additional Review
Leadership Communication	44.0201	D	Continue
Microbiology	26.0502	B, D	Continue
Modern Languages	16.0101	B, M	Continue
Music	50.0901	B, M	Continue
Music Education	13.1312	B	Continue
Park Management and Conservation	31.0301	B	Continue
Philosophy	38.0101	B	Additional Review
Theatre	50.0501	B, M	B – Continue M - Additional Review
Wildlife and Outdoor Enterprise Management	03.0201	B	Continue

K-State had previously identified three master’s programs and one doctoral program for additional review. The MS in Software Engineering and the Professional Master of Technology are both recommended for discontinuance. (The MS in Software Engineering was identified earlier this year for Strategic Program Alignment. K-State has done additional review and is recommending to discontinue the program.) The MS in Genetics and the Doctorate in Genetics did not meet program minima in 2018 when these programs were last reviewed. The MS still does not meet KBOR minima, though the PhD program now exceeds the minima. Because of the success of the PhD program and because the MS is a feeder for the PhD program, both programs are recommended to continue.

Kansas State University
Status of Programs Needing Additional Review AY 2015-2018

Program	Year of Review	CIP	Degree Level	Recommendation
Software Engineering	2018	11.0201	M	Discontinue
Professional Master of Technology	2015	15.9999	M	Discontinue
Genetics	2017	26.0801	M, D	Continue

Pittsburg State University

The PSU program review process is designed to enhance overall institutional quality and accountability. The focus is on providing campus-wide input to help departments align programs with the institutional assessment process, institutional strategic plan, and resource allocation. Program Review is a major opportunity for departments to complete a comprehensive self-study in order to demonstrate that programs are current, of sufficient size and quality, and help the institution serve its mission. This process provides two pathways to review; through an external accrediting agency recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) or by an external reviewer. Programs accredited by an external agency are scheduled for the PSU Program Review during the academic year following the visit, using the response from the accrediting body in lieu of an additional external review.

In AY 2019, all 24 degree programs reviewed were accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE). For these accredited programs, the

Program Review Committee reviewed the accreditation self-study documents and site visit team reports, the programs' minima data, the programs' assessment of student learning, and the past Program Review Committee feedback. In addition, the committee met with faculty from each program and the supervising department chairs.

The Program Review Committee provided individual feedback to all programs in the form of the Committee Response, included herein. The Committee Response includes an overview, concerns, and recommendations for each individual program.

Overall, the programs reviewed were clearly in alignment with the mission and role of the institution. Accreditation visit reports identified no major challenges. Bachelor degree level programs offered within content area departments of the College of Arts and Sciences were asked to examine the effectiveness of the current organizational structure. Several of the programs reviewed did not meet minima for number of majors or number of graduates, and were required to submit a plan of action to the institution: BA Modern Languages (Teaching emphasis only); BSEd in Biology; BSEd in Chemistry (currently in phase out); BSEd in Communication; BSEd in Family and Consumer Sciences Education; BSEd in Mathematics; BSEd in Physics; and the BSEd in Technology and Engineering Education.

The BFA did not quite meet the minimum number of graduates, but is recommended for continuation. Examining the data shows a dip in the number of majors for 2016 and 2017, but a rise in 2018 and 2019, so the number of graduates is expected to go back up.

Some degree programs did not meet the minimum for number of graduates, and were required to submit a plan of action: BME in Music; BSEd in English; BSEd in History/Government.

The Ed.S. in School Psychology did not meet the minimum number of majors, but was required to submit a plan of action, as well.

The committee recommended continuation for all but one of the reviewed programs. The departments of Teaching and Leadership and Family and Consumer Sciences requested that the BSEd in Early Childhood, Unified (birth through Grade 3) be recommended for discontinuance, indicating the paperwork to formalize the request was ready for the legislative process. A new degree in Early Childhood, Unified (Birth through Kindergarten) was developed to meet the interest of potential students and the need for educators focusing on early childhood.

The committee discussed the organizational structure of all of the BSEd programs housed in the College of Arts and Sciences as a group and when meeting with program faculty. Each of these degrees credentials graduates to teach in a specific content area. The majority of these programs struggle to maintain the number of students enrolled and degrees awarded to meet minima. Some cited the challenge of educator preparation students not having an identified advocate or specific support protocols. The programs were asked to contemplate whether the organizational structure, where these programs report within content area specific departments under the auspices of Arts and Sciences, is the most effective format for supporting and maintaining the degrees. Examples of structures for comparable programs at peer institutions were included in the conversations. Each of these programs was asked to submit a plan of action which demonstrates that the organizational structure, among any individualized concerns, was considered.

Among the programs reviewed, several stood out as having healthy enrollment numbers as well as consistency in the number of degrees awarded, the majority of these programs being graduate degrees. The department where they are housed cited the distinctive nature of some of the programs, the continued growth in industry need for educators trained in these areas, and the strength of a highly qualified group of faculty as factors influencing the success of the programs. Moving forward, under the new budget model, colleges will be

monitoring all programs not only for KBOR minima, but also whether the programs can be feasibly supported going into the future.

**Pittsburg State University
Program Review Summary Table AY 2018**

Program	CIP	Degree Level	Recommendation
Biology	13.1322	B	Continue
Chemistry	13.1323	B	Continue
Communication	13.1399	B	Continue
Early Childhood Unified	13.1202	B	Discontinue
Educational Leadership	13.0401	M	Continue
Educational Technology	13.0501	M	Continue
Elementary Education (K-6)	13.1202	B	Continue
English	13.1305	B	Continue
Family and Consumer Sciences Education	13.1308	B	Continue
History/Government	13.1328	B	Continue
Mathematics	13.1311	B	Continue
Modern Languages (Teaching Certification emphasis only)	16.0101	B	Continue
Music	13.1312	B	Continue
Physical Education	13.1314	B	Continue
Physics	13.1329	B	Continue
Reading	13.1202	M	Continue
Special Education Teaching	13.1001	M	Continue
Teaching	13.1202	M, M	Continue
Technology and Engineering Education	13.1309	B	Continue
Art (Teaching Certification emphasis only)	50.0701	B	Continue
Advanced Studies in Leadership	13.0411	Post-M	Continue
School Psychology	42.2805	Post-M	Continue
School Counseling	13.1101	M	Continue

Three degree programs were previously submitted for additional review. The MBA program meets KBOR minima and is recommended to continue. Two baccalaureate programs in Geography and Workforce Development failed to meet KBOR minima. The programs are recommended for continuance of additional review.

**Pittsburg State University
Status of Programs Needing Additional Review AY 2015-2018**

Program	Year of Review	CIP	Degree Level	Recommendation	Update on Status of Program
Business Administration	2015	52.0210	M	Continue	After completing additional review, the Program Review Committee

					recommends continuation of the MBA program.
Geography	2017	45.0701	B	Continue Additional Review	Additional review is still needed to show improvement meeting KBOR minima.
Workforce Development	2017	15.1501	B	Continue Additional Review	Additional review is still needed to show improvement meeting KBOR minima.

University of Kansas

The university reviewed programs in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; the Law School; the School of Engineering; School of Music; School of Pharmacy; and the School of Education. All degrees submitted were recommended for continuation.

This review consisted of a total of 108 degree programs. Disaggregated, 12 program areas included all three levels – bachelor’s, master’s, and doctorate; eight programs were bachelor’s and master’s level; 14 were master’s and doctorate; one was bachelor’s and doctorate, and the rest represented one level only (bachelor’s - 11; master’s - 10; and doctorate - 5).

The University of Kansas program review process employs a standard self-study template, managed through an online system, with questions addressing each of the six KBOR criterion, on topics such as:

1. Departmental mission and how it aligns with the mission and role of the institution
2. Faculty productivity, impact of department scholarship, grant awards and expenditures, honors and awards, community-engaged scholarship
3. Assessment of student learning, pedagogical innovations, curricular changes, student satisfaction
4. Effectiveness of degree and program demand
5. Faculty service to the discipline and contributions to university committees
6. Teaching loads, recruitment and retention of students, ideal size for programs, faculty/student mentoring

For those programs within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, an external review was conducted following the completion of the self-study. Professional schools each completed self-studies for KBOR program review in addition to their standard accreditation reporting and reviews. For each program, review materials were then reviewed by the dean and by the Office of the Provost. The completed program review report was reviewed by the appropriate deans/department chairs and the provost prior to submission to KBOR.

Due to the volume of programs reviewed, only the programs that did not meet minima for number of majors and/or number of graduates *at a specific level* are summarized in the table below. The university categorized the programs not meeting minima using an explanatory code. The codes are explained below the table.

University of Kansas Programs Not Meeting Minima AY 2019

Program	Degree Level	Explanation
American Legal Studies	M	SSP
Architectural Engineering	M	ICP
Atmospheric Science	B, M, D	NP, ASP
Bioengineering	M	ICP, GFP
Chemical Engineering	M	RSP

Classical Antiquity	B	ASP
Classics and Classical Languages	B, M	ASP
Computer Engineering	M	RSP
Construction Management	M	ICP
Educational Psychology and Research	M	GFP
Environmental Engineering	M, D	RSP
Environmental Science	M, D	RSP
French and Francophone Studies	M, D	ASP
German Studies	B, M	ASP
Gerontology	M, D	RSP
Homeland Security: Law & Policy	M	NP
Information Technology	M	RSP
Medicinal Chemistry	M	GFP, RSP
Music Education	M	SSP
Neurosciences	M	GFP, RSP
Petroleum Engineering	M	RSP
Pharmaceutical Chemistry	M	GFP, RSP
Pharmacology and Toxicology	M	GFP, RSP
Pharmacy Practice	M	ICP
Physical Education Plus	B	SSP
Slavic Languages and Literatures	B, M, D	ASP
Social and Cultural Studies In Education	M	GFP
Spanish and Portuguese	M	GFP
Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies	M, D	GFP, NP

ASP - Academic Support Program: Academic support programs provide coursework and other academic support for other majors within the University. Many of these programs may fail to meet criteria for majors or degrees conferred.

RSP - Research Support Program: Many programs, especially at the graduate level, are closely tied to the research enterprise and to the mission of the institution. These programs are necessary for institutional success.

ICP - Interdisciplinary and Coordinated Programs: Interdisciplinary programs are generally characterized by a significant contribution in donated faculty time from affiliated departments. As such, interdisciplinary programs may have few students or faculty, but nonetheless reflect an institutional attempt to maximize the efficient use of resources. Similarly, some programs are cooperative ventures between two or more units.

SSP - Service Support Program: Many programs are closely tied to the service mission of the institution and are necessary to support that mission.

GFP - Graduate Feeder Program: These programs may have low counts because students completing both the master's and Ph.D. (or the Ph.D. directly from the bachelors) are not counted as master's students. They are counted in the highest degree level rather than double counted.

NP – New Program: New programs include those that have been initiated within the past five years. Many of these programs are still building enrollment.

All remaining programs reviewed met the minimum number of majors and graduates, and are summarized in the table below.

University of Kansas
Program Review Summary Table AY 2019

Program	CIP	Degree Level	Recommendation
Aerospace Engineering	14.0201	B, M, D	Continue
American Legal Studies	22.0203	M	Continue
Architectural Engineering	14.0401	B, M	Continue
Athletic Training	51.0913	B	Continue
Atmospheric Science	40.0401	B, M, D	Continue
Bioengineering	14.0501	M, D	Continue
Chemical and Petroleum Engineering	14.9999	D	Continue
Chemical Engineering	14.0701	B, M	Continue
Civil Engineering	14.0801	B, M, D	Continue
Classical Antiquity	30.2201	B	Continue
Classics and Classical Languages	16.1200	B, M	Continue
Computer Engineering	14.0901	B, M	Continue
Computer Science	11.0101	B, M, D	Continue
Construction Management	52.2001	M	Continue
Counseling Psychology	42.2803	M, D	Continue
Curriculum and Instruction	13.0301	M, D	Continue
Digital Content Strategy	09.0702	M	Continue
Education Administration	13.0499	M	Continue
Educational Leadership and Policy	13.0401	D	Continue
Educational Psychology and Research	42.2806	M, D	Continue
Educational Technology	13.0501	M	Continue
Electrical Engineering	14.1001	B, M, D	Continue
Elementary Teacher Education	13.1202	B	Continue
Engineering Management	15.1501	M	Continue
Environmental Engineering	14.1401	M, D	Continue
Environmental Science	14.1301	M, D	Continue
Exercise Science	31.0505	B	Continue
French and Francophone Studies	16.0901	M, D	Continue

French, Francophone, and Italian Studies	16.0901	B	Continue
Geology	40.0601	B, M, D	Continue
German Studies	05.0125	B, M	Continue
Gerontology	30.1101	M, D	Continue
Health, Sport Management, and Exercise Science	13.1314	M, D	Continue
Higher Education Administration	13.0406	M	Continue
Homeland Security: Law & Policy	43.0301	M	Continue
Human Sexuality	05.0207	B	Continue
Information Technology	11.0103	B, M	Continue
Interdisciplinary Computing	11.0101	B	Continue
Juridical Science	22.0201	D	Continue
Law	22.0101	D	Continue
Mechanical Engineering	14.1901	B, M, D	Continue
Medicinal Chemistry	51.2004	M, D	Continue
Music	50.0901	B, M, D	Continue
Music Education	13.1312	B, M, D	Continue
Music Therapy	51.2305	B, M	Continue
Neurosciences	26.1501	M, D	Continue
Petroleum Engineering	14.2501	B, M	Continue
Pharmaceutical Chemistry	51.2003	M, D	Continue
Pharmacology and Toxicology	26.1007	M, D	Continue
Pharmacy Practice	51.2001	B, D	Continue
Pharmacy Practice	51.2008	M	Continue
Physical Education Plus	13.1314	B	Continue
Project Management	52.0211	M	Continue
School Psychology	42.2805	D	Continue
Secondary Teacher Education	13.1205	B	Continue
Slavic Languages and Literatures	16.0400	B, M, D	Continue
Social and Cultural Studies In Education	13.0901	M	Continue
Spanish and Portuguese	16.0905	B, M, D	Continue
Special Education	13.1001	M, D	Continue
Sport Management	31.0504	B	Continue
Unified Early Childhood	13.1210	B	Continue

Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies	05.0207	B, M, D	Continue
-------------------------------------	---------	---------	----------

University of Kansas Medical Center

Due to the inherent professional nature of many of the programs at the KU Medical Center, such programs are reviewed and evaluated by an appropriate discipline-specific accrediting agency with site visits occurring on a schedule determined by the accreditation body. These reviews are rigorous and measure progress toward the program’s stated mission, identify its strengths and weaknesses, and, if appropriate, state improvements necessary to meet national standards. Many accrediting bodies now require annual updates on benchmark data related to outcome minima.

All degree programs at the University of Kansas Medical Center are accredited under the umbrella of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), with the most recent Reaffirmation of Accreditation effective in 2015 for a full ten-year period. Additionally, most of our professional programs are accredited by a discipline-specific agency, viewed as a critical component for having a valid program in the eyes of students and employers. To take advantage of the activities associated with this type of accreditation, the Medical Center makes efforts to coordinate the Program Review year with site visits from the accrediting body.

Leading up to the Program Review year, programs are provided minima tables from KHEDS data, and they may use information compiled during internal self-review, annual updates required by the accrediting body, and/or a self-study report produced for an accreditation site visit team. Data comes from centralized sources involving student, HR, research, and financial systems, as well as internal department record keeping. Departments may use course evaluation and program evaluation data from students and other stakeholders to make necessary modifications, or to further enrich their programs. Many departments run exit surveys on student satisfaction as well as surveys on recent graduates regarding employment.

For programs that do not have additional accreditation outside of the HLC, the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs and Graduate Studies institutes a process of internal self-review based upon a set of standard criteria, with the end result being a recommendation to Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs regarding the program (e.g. enhancement, continuation, deletion) from the Dean of Graduate Studies. One example of this process used in the past is illustrated below. For professional programs with specific accreditation, the University understands the rigors undertaken to maintain accreditation and to prepare for site visits or annual updates. In these cases, Academic Affairs does not mandate additional internal review in preparation for Program Review. The final recommendation by Academic Affairs is made based on these inputs in conjunction with strategic planning and external forces (e.g. financial support, research landscape, state health-professional needs).

For this program review year, KUMC assessed three degrees from three programs, including the baccalaureate degree program in Health Information Management, and the doctorate programs in Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Sciences. All programs met minima requirements and were recommended for continuation.

University of Kansas Medical Center
Program Review Summary Table AY 2019

Program	CIP	Degree Level	Recommendation
Health Information Management	51.0706	B	Continue
Physical Therapy	51.2308	D	Continue
Rehabilitation Sciences	51.2314	D	Continue

In an update of previous reporting, it is recommended that the graduate program in health informatics undergo one more year of additional review. The program is seeking accreditation and they wish to give it due process. At this time, the program is not meeting minima for majors or graduates.

The Therapeutic Science program was reviewed last year and was recommended for additional review at that time. Currently, it surpasses the minima for majors and graduates, though it does not meet Faculty FTE minima for a doctoral program. However, this is an interdisciplinary program. KUMC will continue to monitor the program.

**University of Kansas Medical Center
Status of Programs Needing Additional Review AY 2015-2018**

Program	Year of Review	CIP	Degree Level	Recommendation	Update on Status of Program
Health Informatics	2015	51.2706	M	Additional Review (5 th year requested)	The program is seeking accreditation with the Commission on Accreditation for Health Informatics and Information Management Education (CAHIIM)
Therapeutic Science	2018	51.2399	D	Additional Review	We continue to monitor the program due to leadership changes in the department.

Wichita State University

WSU’s program review is organized around a year-long preparation and review of a self-study that is intended to create a thoughtful assessment of the quality of academic programs and to establish goals for improvements. The process of reviewing these studies (which includes faculty, the deans, the University Program Review committee, the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Provost) is expected to strengthen the academic programs, identify program needs and campus priorities, and identify areas for reorganization and provide opportunities for both short and long-term goal setting.

On a four-year cycle each academic unit prepares a self-study using a standard reporting template. These four-year reports then feed into the required review by the Kansas Board of Regents (i.e., each program is required to be reviewed twice during an 8 year period). Programs that demonstrate the need for additional support are asked to complete interim reports. Hence, there is a continuous review process of each academic unit.

The quadrennial reporting cycle, begins one year in advance of being due each November, (on a staggered schedule so that college programs are reviewed together) when the Office of Academic Affairs offers a workshop for chairs and assessment coordinators, and continues until April 1st when the studies are submitted to the respective Deans. Thereafter the studies are reviewed by the Deans, Graduate School (as appropriate) and the University Program Review committee (consisting of the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs; Assistant Director of the Office of Planning Analysis; the President, President-Elect, and Past-President of the Faculty Senate; and a Dean). Each unit is provided with an opportunity to discuss and clarify those reviews. The University committee submits its final report to the Provost by December 1st.

For this review cycle, WSU reviewed 14 programs representing ten bachelor’s level and four master’s level, all from the Barton School of Business. Reviewed programs include the following baccalaureate programs: Accountancy, Economics, Entrepreneurship, Finance, General Business, Human Resource Management, Information Technology and Management, International Business, Management, and Marketing. The following master’s programs were reviewed: Accountancy, Business Administration, Economics, and the Executive MBA program.

All programs met KBOR minima criteria, including number of majors, number of graduates, and number of faculty. All programs were recommended to continue.

Wichita State University
Program Review Summary Table AY 2019

Program	CIP	Degree Level	Recommendation
Accountancy	52.0301	B, M	Continue
Business Administration	52.0201	M	Continue
Economics	45.0601	M	Continue
Economics	52.0601	B	Continue
Entrepreneurship	52.0701	B	Continue
Executive M B A	52.0201	M	Continue
Finance	52.0801	B	Continue
General Business	52.0201	B	Continue
Human Resource Management	52.1001	B	Continue
Information Technology & Management Information Systems	52.1201	B	Continue
International Business	52.1101	B	Continue
Management	52.0299	B	Continue
Marketing	52.1401	B	Continue

Additional Programs Monitored

In addition to the programs that underwent intensive review this year, the remaining low major/degree triggered programs were also reviewed for updates on plans to increase majors and degrees (using AY 2019 data, see below).

School or College	Program	Trigger from Minima Report	Status
Barton School of Business	Management Sciences and Quantitative Methods	Majors (GR)	Continue – NEW.
College of Applied Studies	Athletic Training	Majors (UG) Degrees (UG)	Continue – intensive review in 2020
College of Health Professions	Health Care Administration	Majors (GR)	Continue - Intensive review in 2020
	Communication Science/Disorders	Degrees (PhD)	Continue - Intensive review in 2020
College of Fine Arts	Arts/Studio Arts	Majors (GR) Degrees (GR)	Continue – 2019 Forward Facing goals address trigger.
	Game and Interactive Media Design	Degrees (UG)	Continue - NEW

	Music Teacher Education	Majors (GR)	Continue – 2019 Forward Facing goals address trigger.
College of Engineering	Biomedical Engineering	Majors (GR) Degrees (GR)	Continue - NEW
	Manufacturing Engineering	Majors (UG) Degrees (UG)	Continue – New program emphasis to help with recruitment
Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	Chemistry	Majors (GR) Degrees (GR)	Continue - Intensive review in 2021 MS only awarded to students who are ABD
	Homeland Security	Majors (UG)	Continue - NEW
	Interdisciplinary (Liberal Studies)	Majors (UG) Degrees (UG) Majors (GR) Degrees (GR)	Discontinue - Recommendation for Elimination in AY 2021
	Physics	Degrees (UG) Majors (GR) Degrees (GR)	Continue – Intensive review in 2021 Academic support program
	Philosophy	Majors (UG) Degrees (UG)	Continue - Intensive review in 2021 Academic support program
	Psychology	Majors (GR)	Continue – Intensive review in 2021 MA only awarded to students who are ABD
	Forensic Science	Majors (UG) Degrees (UG)	Continue - Intensive review in 2021
	Sociology	Majors (GR) Degrees (GR)	Continue - Intensive review in 2021
	Spanish	Majors (GR) Degrees (GR)	Continue - Intensive review in 2021
	Women’s Studies	Majors (UG) Degrees (GR)	Renaming major to Women, Gender and Diversity Studies
Bill & Dorothy Cohen Honors College	Honors	Majors (UG) Degrees (GR)	Continue - NEW
Institute for Interdisciplinary Innovation	Industrial and Product Design	Majors (GR)	Continue – NEW

Strategic Program Alignment

Two programs were selected for strategic program alignment this year.

- Liberal Studies (B/M) The bachelor option is not needed as most students are now electing the BGS. The master option ‘bleeds’ other master programs, i.e., sociology, history, social work. More generally, the master is duplicative.
- Women’s Studies (B) - As WSU’s underserved population (defined as first-generation, underrepresented minority, and low income) has increased, students have requested topics that have a broader appeal to these groups. Plans include (1) realignment of program and its host department, (2) remove religion from the scope of the department and degree program, (3) move ethnic studies to department from the School of Criminal Justice, (3) rename department Women, Gender, and Diversity Studies, along with the degree program, (4) realign mission to provide expertise in advancing equity, justice and diversity through allyship and interdisciplinary studies (5) major and minor will offer courses in dimensions of diversity such as gender, race, ethnicities, sexualities, disabilities and class privilege.

Program Review Summary

As a result of the 215 degree programs reviewed in AY 2019 for the first time during the eight-year cycle, two programs were slated for discontinuation, including one baccalaureate level and one master’s level program. These programs are: PSU’s BS in Education – Early Childhood Unified, and ESU’s Master of Arts in Social Sciences – Teaching. Kansas State University’s Master of Fine Arts was recommended for enhancement.

Fourteen programs were recommended to undergo additional review, and are summarized in the table below. ESU and PSU had three programs each, while FHSU identified eight.

***Programs Identified for Additional Review
AY 2019***

Institution	Program	Degree Level	CIP
ESU	Economics	B	45.0603
ESU	Music	M	50.0901
ESU	Political Science	B	45.1001
FHSU	Art	B	50.0701
FHSU	Art Education	B	13.1302
FHSU	Communication	M	09.0101
FHSU	Foreign Language	B	16.0101
FHSU	Health Studies	B	51.9999
FHSU	History	B	54.0101
FHSU	Performing Arts	B	50.0901
FHSU	Philosophy	B	38.0101
KSU	Horticulture and Natural Resources	M	01.1103
KSU	Philosophy	B	38.0101
KSU	Theatre	M	50.0501

The remaining 198 programs were recommended to be continued. While Board policy requires state universities to review programs at least once every eight years, universities have an internal review process that monitors program quality on an on-going basis that allows institutions to identify issues early to have time to work to correct those issues before the eight-year review cycle is complete.

For the 13 programs each institution had identified for additional review in previous review years, one is recommended for enhancement, three are recommended to be continued, three are recommended to be discontinued, and the remaining six will continue under the “additional review” category for another year.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends acceptance of this report.

Act on Request for Approval of Policy Change to Align with Recent U.S. Department of Education Regulations and Update other Language

Summary and Staff Recommendation

On November 1, 2019, the U.S. Department of Education (U.S.D.E.) issued final regulations governing the recognition of accrediting agencies and other areas of the Higher Education Act to take effect July 1, 2020. One key change was the labeling of accrediting agencies. The Department will no longer categorize accrediting agencies as regional or national. The terms “regionally accredited” and “nationally accredited” will no longer be used or recognized by the department. According to the U.S. Department of Education these regulations seek to “provide increased transparency and introduce greater competition and innovation that could allow an institution or program to select an accrediting agency that best aligns with the institution’s mission, program offerings, and student population” (<https://federalregister.gov/d/2019-23129>). This regulation requires changing Board policy to align with the U.S.D.E. recognized term of “nationally recognized” accrediting agencies. Changes to the policy were reviewed by SCOCAO and SCOPS.

March 30, 2020

Background

The Higher Learning Commission is the accrediting body currently assigned to the geographic region of 19 states, which includes Kansas. Board policy requires all public post-secondary institutions conferring degrees to achieve and maintain accredited status with the Higher Learning Commission. Recent action of the U.S. Department of Education no longer categorizes accrediting agencies as regional or national and requires the removal of “regional” in policy when referencing accreditation. Three areas of Board policy contain “regional” language and require revisions. These revisions occur in Chapter III under Academic Affairs: Section 2- Transfer and Articulation, Section 12- Accreditation of Degree Granting Institutions, and Section 13- Concurrent Enrollment of High School Students in Eligible Public Postsecondary Institutions Through Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships.

In addition to the updated language for accreditation, the recent launch of the Transfer Kansas portal provided an opportunity to remove outdated language in the Systemwide Transfer and Articulation section of Board policy. These minor changes do not affect the intent or purpose of the policies.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the proposed policy changes below to update language of current practice and align with the final regulations of the *Student Assistance General Provisions, The Secretary’s Recognition of Accrediting Agencies, The Secretary’s Recognition Procedures for State Agencies* from the Office of Postsecondary Education of the U.S. Department of Education.

CHAPTER III: COORDINATION¹ - STATE UNIVERSITIES, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, TECHNICAL COLLEGES, WASHBURN UNIVERSITY AND/OR THE WASHBURN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

A ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (See Chapter II., Section A. for additional academic affairs policies applicable to state universities)

...

2 TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION

a Purpose

¹ See Chapter I., Section A.3 for definition of Coordination.

Transfer is recognized as a crucial element within a seamless educational system. The purpose of this policy is to promote seamlessness in the public postsecondary education system in Kansas. A seamless educational system offers the best resources to provide a high quality education for every student, and empowers and encourages each student to reach maximum potential by engaging in life-long learning. This includes:

- i Aligning high school and college expectations and standards to improve access and success;
 - ii Providing access to postsecondary education;
 - iii Providing high quality advising and information at every point of the journey to ensure that students understand the preparation required to succeed at the next level;
 - iv Building connections and strengthening communications within and between the parts of the system; and
 - v Providing a smooth transition from one level of learning to the next level, including graduate and professional education.
- b Systemwide Transfer and Articulation

To facilitate transfer and articulation across the Kansas public postsecondary education system, the Board shall provide for a Transfer and Articulation Council with oversight responsibility for implementing the Board's systemwide transfer and articulation policy. The Council's mission is to create structures and processes that facilitate student transfer and degree completion within Kansas higher education. The Council provides status reports, as appropriate, to the System Council of Chief Academic Officers.

- i The Transfer and Articulation Council shall:
 - (1) Charge the Kansas Core Outcomes Groups with developing specific course articulations;
 - (2) Adjudicate disagreement from the Kansas Core Outcomes Groups;
 - (3) Provide final recommendation on systemwide transfer of specific courses;

(The Board of Regents approves specific courses to be accepted for systemwide transfer from any public postsecondary educational institution in Kansas. Each course approved and accepted for systemwide transfer by the Board is identified by a shared course number that supports a student-first philosophy, and is designed to enhance educational planning and effortless course transfer. A Kansas Regents Shared Number (KRSN) uses a 3-letter prefix and a 4-digit course number to differentiate the KRSN number from individual institution course prefixes and numbers. Each institution retains its own unique course prefix and course number.)

 - (4) Assure quality and adherence to the agreed-upon learning outcomes of courses articulated across the institutions; and
 - (5) Review proposed revisions to Board policies and bring forward issues and trends that affect transfer and articulation.
- ii In addition, the Transfer and Articulation Council shall:
 - (1) Identify courses acceptable for systemwide articulation and transfer with a focus on lower division general education courses and introductory courses to majors;
 - (2) Create an effective, faculty-led structure for discipline level course articulations based on learning outcomes;

- (3) Ensure that appeals processes exist: (a) for individual students at the institutional level; and (b) at the system level to ensure equitable resolution of transfer concerns between institutions;
 - (4) Address barriers to inter-institutional cooperation as they arise;
 - (5) Use learning outcomes to determine course equivalency; and
 - (6) Implement a clear and ongoing transfer structure.
- iii The Transfer and Articulation Council shall have a core outcomes subcommittee and a quality assurance subcommittee.
 - iv Kansas Core Outcomes Groups – These groups composed of faculty representing specific disciplines, shall carry out the work of course transfer articulation in accordance with the *Kansas Transfer and Articulation Procedures*. Each Kansas core outcomes group shall:
 - (1) Receive its charge from the Transfer and Articulation Council;
 - (2) Review specific courses within the discipline to articulate learning outcomes associated with courses and agree upon system-wide transfer of course credit as direct equivalents for transfer; and
 - (3) Report to the Transfer and Articulation Council.

One Transfer and Articulation Council member shall be appointed by the Council to serve as a non-voting ex officio member liaison to each discipline-specific core outcomes group. The Council liaison's role is to ensure that the mission of the Transfer and Articulation Council is communicated to, and carried out by, each core outcomes group and to ensure excellent communication between the Council and each core outcomes group.

- c System Support. Board staff shall support the Board's systemwide transfer initiative by:
 - i Maintaining a website for dissemination of transfer information;
 - ii Maintaining ~~a Common Course Equivalency Guide including a Common Course Matrix~~ a list of equivalent courses offered by institutions for all courses that transfer systemwide; and
 - iii Collecting and reporting common data on transfer student success and completion as one measure of system effectiveness.
- 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 ~~HLC accredited~~ 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.
- e Articulation Agreements
- i Between Community Colleges, Technical Colleges and the Institute of Technology

In accordance with K.S.A. 74-32,420, the board of trustees of each Kansas community college, the governing board of each Kansas technical college and the board of control of the Institute of Technology shall establish transfer and articulation agreements providing for the transferability of substantially equivalent courses of study and programs in order to facilitate the articulation of students to and among those institutions.

 - (1) The Board of Regents shall be notified of each agreement at the time the agreement is executed.
 - (2) Each agreement shall be effective only after submission to and approval by the Board of Regents. (K.S.A. 74-32,420). Preliminary approval shall be given by the Board President and Chief Executive Officer, or designee, upon verification that the agreement is consistent with this policy. Final approval shall require ratification by the Board.
 - ii Between Community Colleges, Technical Colleges, the Institute of Technology, State Universities, and Washburn University

In accordance with K.S.A. 72-4454, Kansas technical colleges, community colleges, the Institute of Technology, state universities and Washburn University shall establish articulation agreements providing for the transferability of substantially equivalent courses of study and programs that are offered at those institutions in order to facilitate articulation of students in technical programs to and among the Kansas technical colleges, community colleges, Institute of Technology, state universities and Washburn University.
 - iii Institutions are strongly encouraged to develop program-to-program articulation agreements. Such agreements may provide additional transfer opportunities over and above the opportunities named in this policy, but may not conflict with this policy.
- f General Transfer Provisions
- i Each Kansas public postsecondary educational institution shall establish its residency requirements, graduation requirements, and any admission requirements to professional or specific programs.
 - (1) Admission to an institution shall not equate with admission to a professional school or a specific program.
 - (2) Except as provided in paragraph f.iii., students must complete all graduation requirements of the receiving institution.
 - (3) Students with a completed associate degree who transfer into a professional school or specialty program may need more than two academic years of course work to complete the baccalaureate degree, depending on requirements of the program.
 - ii Requirements for transfer of credits between and among Kansas public postsecondary educational institutions include the following:

- (1) Transfer coursework must be transcribed in credit hours.
- (2) Students transferring to Kansas public universities with a completed AA or AS degree shall be given junior standing.
- iii Transfer of general education credit to and among Kansas public universities, including state universities and Washburn University, shall follow the requirements below.

Although the following distribution of courses does not necessarily correspond to the general education requirements for the bachelor degree at any Kansas public university, it shall be accepted as having satisfied the general education requirements for the bachelor degree of all Kansas public universities.

A minimum of 45 credit hours of general education with distribution in the following fields shall be required. General education hours totaling less than 45 shall be accepted, but transfer students must complete the remainder of this requirement before graduation from the receiving institution, which may require an additional semester(s).

- (1) 12 hours of Basic Skills courses, including:

- 6 hours of English Composition
- 3 hours of Public Speaking or Speech Communication
- 3 hours of college level Mathematics; college Algebra and/or Statistics will be required of transfer students where the curriculum of the receiving institution requires it

- (2) 12 hours of Humanities courses from at least three of the following disciplines:

- Art*
- Theater*
- Philosophy
- Music*
- History**
- Literature
- Modern Languages

- (3) 12 hours of Social and Behavioral Science courses from at least three of the following disciplines:

- Sociology
- Psychology
- Political Science
- Economics
- Geography
- Anthropology
- History**

- (4) 9 hours of Natural and Physical Science courses from at least two disciplines (lecture with lab)

- *Performance courses are excluded.
- **The receiving institution will determine whether history courses are accepted as humanities or as social sciences.

- iv Many of the Board approved systemwide transfer courses meet general education requirements at the public postsecondary educational institutions in Kansas.
- v Although a transfer general education curriculum has not been established for associate degrees, the transfer curriculum is assumed to be a subset of the curriculum in paragraph j. above.

- vi Public universities may develop program-to-program articulation agreements for the AAS degree.
- vii Courses completed as part of technical programs (non-degree) and completed AAS degrees shall transfer according to option (1) or (2) below:
 - (1) As a block to articulated programs at community colleges, technical colleges, and to those universities that have program to program articulation agreements.
 - (2) On a course-by-course basis
 - (a) General education courses may be transferred according to paragraphs d.vi., f.iii., and f.v. above.
 - (b) Substantially equivalent courses may be transferred on a course-by-course basis according to paragraph d.v. above.
 - (c) Other courses may be transferred as electives according to paragraph d.vii. above.
- g Students who intend to transfer are responsible for becoming acquainted with the program and degree requirements of the institution to which they expect to transfer.

...

12 ACCREDITATION OF DEGREE GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

It is the policy of the Board of Regents that all public post-secondary institutions conferring college degrees achieve and maintain accredited status with ~~the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association,~~ an nationally recognized accrediting commission agency for higher education in the United States.

Any public post-secondary institution that has not achieved or does not maintain accredited status with ~~the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association~~ a nationally recognized accreditor may be subject to loss of degree granting authority.

Each public post-secondary institution pursuing ~~HLC~~ institutional accreditation shall continue to comply with all standards established by the institution's current accrediting agency; and shall submit an end of fiscal year report to the Board of Regents confirming adequate progress toward accredited status ~~with the HLC,~~ including as applicable any supporting documentation.

13 CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN ELIGIBLE PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS THROUGH CONCURRENT ENROLLMENTS PARTNERSHIPS

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

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

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

a Purposes of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships

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

i To Reduce Time-to Degree and Lower Costs

Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships enable students to get an early start on their college education, thus potentially reducing the time required to complete a degree and lowering the costs borne by parents, students and taxpayers.

ii To Challenge High School Students and Promote College-Level Success

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

iii To Foster Improved Relationships Between Kansas Public Postsecondary Education Institutions and Kansas Secondary Schools

Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships are intended to foster improved relationships among stakeholders by clarifying expectations, roles, and responsibilities

b Procedures and Standards for Implementing Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships

i Definitions

For purposes of this policy:

(1) "Concurrent Enrollment Partnership student" means a person who is in grades 10, 11, or 12, or who is gifted and is in grade 9 (see paragraph b.v.(2)); has been admitted to an eligible postsecondary education institution as a degree-seeking or non-degree seeking student; and is enrolled in courses at a high school at which approved high school faculty teach college credit courses during the normal school day.

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

(3) "Eligible postsecondary institution" means any state university, community college, technical college, municipal university or affiliated institute of technology.

ii Agreement between Eligible Postsecondary Institutions and School Districts

A Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreement shall be established between the eligible postsecondary institution and the school district. Such agreement shall satisfy the requirements of

K.S.A. 72-11a04 and contain the essential elements provided in this policy. The agreement shall contain, at a minimum:

- (1) the names and contact information of the liaisons for both parties, term of the agreement and any provisions for early termination, the individual and joint responsibilities of both parties, information, guidelines and necessary directions for curriculum, faculty, students, assessment, and a listing of principles for assuring quality in programming;
- (2) an implementation plan for ensuring high school faculty teaching concurrently enrolled partnership students are integrated into the postsecondary partner institution through orientation, professional development, seminars, site visits, annual evaluations and ongoing communication with the postsecondary partner institution's faculty;
- (3) a clause addressing issues of compensation, awarding of credit and course listings for each party;
- (4) acknowledgement that the academic credit shall be granted for course work successfully completed by the student at the postsecondary partner institution, which shall qualify as college credit and may qualify as both high school and college credit;
- (5) acknowledgement that such course work shall qualify as credit applicable toward the award of a degree or certificate at the postsecondary partner institution;
- (6) acknowledgement that the student shall pay to the postsecondary partner institution the negotiated amount of tuition, fees and related costs charged by the institution for enrollment of the student except in the case of tiered technical courses. Secondary students admitted to postsecondary tiered technical courses conducted by a community college, technical college or institute of technology may be charged fees, but shall not be charged tuition; (K.S.A. 72-4417, as amended)
- (7) a plan for ensuring that courses offered through a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership are annually reviewed by college faculty in the discipline at the postsecondary partner institution according to the criteria described in iii.(5); and
- (8) a statement indicating the Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreement shall be reviewed at least every five years by the postsecondary partner institution to assure compliance and quality considerations as outlined in this policy.

iii Curriculum Standards, Course Content/Materials, and Assessment of Students

- (1) Courses administered through a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership shall be university/college catalogued courses with the same departmental id, course descriptions, numbers, titles and credits. Courses must have been approved through the curriculum approval process of the postsecondary partner institution.
- (2) The high school and college-level prerequisites, the content of courses, course goals and objectives, must be the same as those for the same courses offered to students at any location or by any delivery method.
- (3) Materials such as textbooks must be comparable to those used in the same course throughout the postsecondary partner institution. Procedures for selection of textbooks and related material by high school faculty who teach concurrently enrolled students must follow the postsecondary partner's institutional policies.
- (4) If a course has been approved by Board staff as competency-based, the competencies for the courses must be the same as those for courses not taught to concurrently enrolled students.

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

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

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

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

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

(6) Remedial/developmental course work shall not be offered as a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership course.

iv High School Faculty

(1) Qualifications

(a) High school faculty teaching college-level, non-tiered Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses shall ~~attain instructional eligibility by meeting the~~ faculty qualifications and standards established by the ~~Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association, as stated that the body's~~ Criteria for Accreditation and Assumed Practices nationally recognized agency that accredits the sponsoring higher education institution regarding faculty roles and qualifications.

(b) Faculty teaching college-level tiered technical courses through a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership shall attain instructional eligibility by meeting the academic standards addressed above or possess a valid/current industry-recognized credential and a minimum of 4,000 hours of work experience in the specific technical field.

(c) Postsecondary partner institutions may set higher standards.

(2) Orientation, Professional Development and Evaluation

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

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

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

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

v Student Eligibility for Enrollment, Advising and Student Guides

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

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

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

(4) Advising of students who desire to enroll in Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses must be carried out by both the high school and postsecondary institution.

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

vi Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Courses that Include Students Enrolled for Secondary and/or Postsecondary Credit

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

c Reporting of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships

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

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

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

- (1) Copy of the Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreement that includes the criteria described in b.ii.;
- (2) Student Guide for Concurrent Enrollment Partnership students as described in b.v.(5); and

- (3) Report resulting from the annual review of Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses by postsecondary partner institution, aggregated by discipline (as described in section b.iii.(5)).
- iii By January 31 of odd-numbered years, each institution shall forward to the Board office a copy of all reports resulting from the five-year institutional review of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (as described in b.ii.(8)).
- iv All reports shall be reviewed for compliance and the results will be reported to the Board President and Chief Executive Officer.

Request to Seek Accreditation for Master of Science in Health Informatics –University of Kansas Medical Center

Summary and Recommendation

The University of Kansas Medical Center is seeking approval to pursue programmatic accreditation for its Master of Science in Health Informatics from the Commission on Accreditation for Health Informatics and Health Information Management Education (CAHIIM). The total cost of initial accreditation is \$16,000. Staff recommends approval.

March 30, 2020

Background

Board policy (II.7.1.i.) on accreditation requires state universities to seek approval prior to pursuing initial accreditation for an academic program.

Request: Master of Science in Health Informatics

The University of Kansas Medical Center seeks approval for the Master of Science in Health Informatics from the Commission on Accreditation for Health Informatics and Health Information Management Education (CAHIIM).

CAHIIM is the only accreditor for informatics master’s programs of study in the United States. It is recognized by the Council for Higher Education and Accreditation (CHEA), a national advocate and institutional voice for self-regulation of academic quality through accreditation. As the field of health informatics is relatively new, this accreditation just opened for applications in mid-2019. Accreditation is being sponsored by the American Medical Informatics Association (AMIA).

The following costs are associated with CAHIIM accreditation:

Costs for Health Informatics Accreditation		
Fee	Amount	Due
Pre-Application Fee	\$500	One-time fee due when submit pre-application for candidacy
Candidacy Status Fee	\$7,500	One-time fee, due 3 months after pre-application, when candidacy is granted, and self-study starts
Site Visit Processing Fee	\$8,000	One-time fee, due 12-18 months after candidacy s granted and before site visit
Total for Initial Accreditation	\$16,000	
Continuing Accreditation	\$2,750	Annually

Advantages of Public Health Accreditation

Increasingly, higher levels of education and professionalism are required in health informatics, as it is considered to be indirect patient care. Accreditation offers both students and potential employers some assurance that a degree program provides its graduates with the necessary training. Potential students in applied health informatics inquire about program accreditation with increasing frequency.

In addition to sponsoring the development of the accreditation standards, AMIA is also in the process of developing a professional board certification exam for new graduates. The current plan is to require graduation from an accredited educational program. The tentative date for the first exam is March 2021.

There are currently only 11 CAHIIM accredited master’s informatics programs in the United States. There are currently no programs accredited in the KUMC region. However, the University of Missouri – Columbia has

begun the accreditation process through CAHIIM. Part of the KUMC MS in Health Informatics marketing strategy is to be the first in the area to be an accredited program in applied health informatics.

Some of the benefits of accreditation in health informatics programs include²

- Encouraging confidence that the educational activities of a program have been found to meet accreditation standards supported by the profession.
- Assisting with student mobility by indicating to institutions that transfer students or graduate school applicants have met the expected thresholds of education quality.
- Signaling to prospective employers that a student's educational program has met widely accepted professional standards; graduation from an accredited program is often a prerequisite for entering the profession.
- Assuring that programs reflect changes in knowledge and practice.

Recommendation: Total cost of initial accreditation is \$16,000, with an annual renewal fee of \$2,750 thereafter. Staff recommends approval of this request.

² CAHIIM (2020). *Value of Accreditation*. Retrieved from: <https://www.cahiim.org/about-us/value-awareness/benefits-of-accreditation> .