FORESIGHT 2020
A Strategic Agenda for the State’s Public Higher Education System

1. Increase higher education attainment among Kansas citizens

2. Improve alignment of the state’s higher education system with the needs of the economy

3. Ensure state university excellence
FORESIGHT 2020
A 10-Year Strategic Agenda for the State’s Public Higher Education System

Foresight 2020 is a 10-year strategic agenda for the state’s public higher education system. Originally adopted by the Kansas Board of Regents in 2010, updated in 2012, and modified in 2015, the plan sets long-range achievement goals that are measurable, reportable, and ensure the state’s higher education system meets Kansans’ expectations. Find each year’s progress report at: kansasregents.org/foresight_2020.

INCREASE HIGHER EDUCATION ATTAINMENT

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

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

IMPROVE ECONOMIC ALIGNMENT

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

Measures
★ Percent of graduates employed and average wages in Kansas, by award level
★ Number of certificates and degrees awarded in selected high-demand fields, and progress made on special state initiatives
★ Summary findings from latest K-TIP Report, providing systemwide analysis of all approved postsecondary CTE programs, by program
★ Percent of certificates/degrees awarded in STEM fields
★ Student performance on assessments tracking industry-requested “Foundational Skills” –
  1. Mathematics/Analytical Reasoning
  2. Written and Oral Communication
  3. Critical Thinking/Problem Solving

ENSURE STATE UNIVERSITY EXCELLENCE

Aspiration
★ Improve regional and national reputations of state universities.

Measures
★ Comparison to peers for each of the six state universities on established metrics
★ Private giving to universities
★ Total research dollars awarded, highlighting federal research dollars (as percent of total) and specific industry support secured
★ University Excellence Profile: select rankings, Composite Financial Index, and assessment of economic impact
1. The Board will develop policy to address concealed carry and open carry laws on state university campuses in Kansas, in advance of the July 1, 2017 expiration of the legal exemption now in place.

2. The Board will study current campus Title IX practices, policies, and procedures and develop a Board policy to add uniformity to current university practices, policies, and procedures.

3. The Board will further the implementation of Credit for Prior Learning in Kansas, with an emphasis on serving active and veteran service members and their families.

4. The Board will explore and identify which are the best strategies to attract Kansans with some college but no degree back to higher education to complete a certificate or degree.

5. The Board will identify strategies for university and college engagement with business and industry with the purpose to increase economic prosperity for Kansans. The strategies will have a national and global reach and focus on innovation and talent development to keep Kansas business competitive.

6. The Board will review current collaborative efforts between institutions and determine if there are other areas where efficiencies can be implemented.

In addition, multi-year Board goals from the previous academic year will be continued.
KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE
2015-2016 AGENDA TOPICS

BAASC 15-01: Developmental education: high school course pilot; differentiated math pathways; assessment scores for placement in remedial/credit-bearing courses; co-requisite remediation

BAASC 15-02: General education transfer policy: Appoint committee to review KBOR’s general education transfer credit policy

BAASC 15-03: Credit for Prior Learning (CPL): Work with campuses to maintain and expand use of CPL, with emphasis on military credit

BAASC 15-04: State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA): Assess the impact of SARA, for which KBOR is the Kansas State Authorization Portal

BAASC 15-05: Qualified Admissions (QA): Monitor the impact of new QA requirements now in effect

KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
2015-2016 AGENDA TOPICS

GOV 15-01 Review Committee Charter and adopt agenda/schedule for the year – Completed

GOV 15-02 Review Board Member COI disclosures and make recommendations to address any actual or perceived conflicts – Completed

GOV 15-03 Consider Board discussion topics for the year – Completed

GOV 15-04 Consider next steps for developing weapons policy – Completed

GOV 15-05 Receive university annual campus security reports

GOV 15-06 Review CEO assessment process

GOV 15-07 Review proposed revisions to policies as they arise

GOV 15-08 Review proposed regulation amendments as they arise

GOV 15-09 Review new board member orientation process

GOV 15-10 Recommend CEO monetary compensation for FY17

GOV 15-11 Discuss next steps toward developing a policy, as needed, for consistency in handling Title IX complaints
KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS FISCAL AFFAIRS AND AUDIT STANDING COMMITTEE
2015-2016 AGENDA TOPICS

FAA 15-01 Review and Adopt Committee Organization, Agenda, and Work Plan – Completed

FAA 15-02 Finalize Revisions to Higher Education Unified Appropriations Request for 2016 Legislative Session – Completed

FAA 15-03 Review FY 2017 KBOR Office Operating Budget – Completed

FAA 15-04 Staff Overview of the Board’s Tuition Setting Process and Discussion of Expectations – Completed

FAA 15-05 Staff Overview of Board’s Capital Budgeting Process – Completed

FAA 15-06 Receive Accountability Report on Major State Investments – Completed

FAA 15-07 Receive Internal Audit Plans and Meet with State University Internal Auditors

FAA 15-08 Review State Universities’ Annual Financial Reports, including Key Financial Statistics and Ratios and Current Year Spending to Budget

FAA 15-09 Receive Ten-Year Debt Capacity Plans for Each of the State Universities and Assessment from KDFA of Debt Affordability

FAA 15-10 Review and Approve Capital Improvement Requests and Five-year Capital Improvement Plans to be Forwarded to the Board (Board Approves in May)

FAA 15-11 Review and approve Johnson County Educational Research Triangle (JCERT) Budgets (KU, KUMC, KSU)

FAA 15-12 Develop Unified State Appropriation Request for 2017 Session (FY 2018 and FY 2019)
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**MEETING INFORMATION AND SCHEDULE**

Unless noted, all meetings take place at the Curtis State Office Building (CSOB) at 1000 SW Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka, Kansas, 66612 in the meeting room indicated. Addresses for offsite meetings can be obtained by contacting the Kansas Board of Regents office at 785-296-3421.

**Wednesday, January 20, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Committee/Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 am</td>
<td>System Council of Chief Academic Officers</td>
<td>Kathy Rupp Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 am or</td>
<td>Council of Chief Academic Officers</td>
<td>Kathy Rupp Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 am</td>
<td>Governance Committee</td>
<td>Conference Room B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>Council of Faculty Senate Presidents</td>
<td>Kan-Ed Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>Students’ Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Conference Room C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 am</td>
<td>Fiscal Affairs &amp; Audit Standing Committee</td>
<td>Board Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Standing Committee</td>
<td>Kathy Rupp Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>System Council of Presidents</td>
<td>Suite 530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon or</td>
<td>Council of Presidents</td>
<td>Suite 530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Noon - 1:15 pm | Lunch  
*Board of Regents & President Flanders* | Conference Room B |
| Noon - 1:15 pm | Lunch  
*Council of Chief Academic Officers* | Kathy Rupp Room |
| 1:30 pm    | Board of Regents Meeting                               | Board Room                             |
| 6:00 pm    | *Board of Regents, President Flanders, State University CEOs, and Legislative Liaisons* | Blue Moose |


MEETING AGENDA

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

Wednesday, January 20, 2016

I. Call To Order
   A. Approve Minutes
      December 16, 2015 Meeting

II. Introductions and Reports
   A. Introductions
   B. Report from the Chair
   C. Report from the President & CEO
   D. Report from System Council of Presidents
   E. Report from Council of Presidents
   F. Report from Council of Faculty Senate Presidents
   G. Report from Students’ Advisory Committee
   H. Report from Unclassified Staff Council
   I. Report from University Support Staff Council

III. Standing Committee Reports
   A. Academic Affairs
   B. Fiscal Affairs & Audit
   C. Governance

IV. Approval of Consent Agenda
   A. Academic Affairs
      1. Act on Request for Approval for a Bachelor of Science
         in Interior Design – PSU

V. Consideration of Discussion Agenda
   A. Presentation
   B. Academic Affairs
      1. Receive Annual Report on Qualified Admissions
      2. Act on Request for New Certificate of Approval with
         Degree Granting Authority for Trinity International
         University

Regent Bangerter, Chair

Regent Bangerter, Chair
Blake Flanders, President & CEO
President Inbody
President Martin
Lorie Cook Benjamin
Jessie Pringle
Brett Morrill
Marcia Tacha
Regent Van Etten
Regent Feuerborn
Regent Bangerter
Gary Alexander, VP, Academic Affairs
Regent Van Etten
Gary Alexander, VP, Academic Affairs
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3. Act on Request for Approval of Courses for Systemwide Transfer

C. Fiscal Affairs & Audit
   1. Receive Information on Lease of State-Owned Property to Wichita State Innovation Alliance (WSIA) – WSU
      Regent Feuerborn
      Greg Hoffman, Director of Facilities
   2. Authorize Lease with Bromley Naismith, LLC – KU
      p. 34
   3. Approve Transfer of Property from KU Hospital Authority and Amendment #7 to Master Ground Lease between the Board of Regents, KU and the KU Hospital Authority – KU
      p. 35
   4. Approve Distribution of State Funds for Technical Education (SB 155 and AO-K Proviso) and Postsecondary Education Performance-Based Incentive Fund (GED Accelerator)
      Elaine Frisbie, VP, Finance & Administration
   5. Act on the Kansas Postsecondary Technical Education Authority Recommendation Regarding the Plan to Fully Implement the Postsecondary Tiered Technical Education State Aid Act
      p. 39

D. Governance
   1. Act on Proposed State University Notice of Litigation Policy
      Regent Bangerter
      Julene Miller, General Counsel
   2. Act on Proposed Amendments to the State University Weapons Possession Policy
      p. 46
      p. 49

E. Other Matters
   1. Receive Budget and Legislative Update
      Elaine Frisbie, VP, Finance & Administration
      Matt Casey, Director, Government Relations
      p. 55

VI. Adjournment
THE DECEMBER 16, 2015 MEETING OF THE KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Shane Bangerter, Chair
Zoe Newton, Vice Chair
Ann Brandau-Murguia
Bill Feuerborn
Dennis Mullin
Dave Murfin
Daniel Thomas
Helen Van Etten

MEMBER ABSENT:
Joe Bain

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Regent Feuerborn stated the minutes for the University of Kansas Lease and Sublease item need to be amended to reflect the “project costs are not to exceed $350 million” rather than the bonds. Regent Feuerborn moved to approve the minutes of the November 18, 2015 meeting as amended. Following the second of Regent Van Etten, the motion carried.

INTRODUCTIONS
Chancellor Gray-Little announced that Kansas State University is now an active partner in the University of Kansas Law School’s 3 plus 3 Program. The program allows KSU undergraduate students to enroll in the University of Kansas Law School after successfully completing three years of undergraduate studies at KSU and meeting other admission requirements. Credit hours earned in the first year of law school will then be transferred back to KSU so the students can complete their undergraduate degree program. President Schulz stated this program will save students from paying one year of tuition and allow them to attain their J.D. degree earlier. Chancellor Gray-Little also reported that Fort Hays State University is exploring the possibility of joining the program.

President Schulz gave the Board the annual progress report on Kansas State University’s strategic plan, K-State 2025. He stated the Board will receive a more in-depth presentation on the report at the April Board meeting.

GENERAL REPORTS

REPORT FROM CHAIR
Chair Bangerter thanked Wichita State University for hosting the Board meeting last month. He reported he and Regent Newton attended former President Bill Clinton’s speech at Pittsburg State University. He noted President Clinton spoke about inclusion and being able to acknowledge and respect different opinions. He stated he appreciated President Clinton’s message. Chair Bangerter also reported he attended Kansas State Polytechnic
graduation earlier in the month. Additionally, he acknowledged and thanked the individuals who donate to each of the state universities.

Chair Bangerter read a Resolution that acknowledged and thanked Dr. Jacqueline Vietti for her service as Interim President at Emporia State University and for her many years of service to the State of Kansas.

(Resolution filed with Official Minutes)

REPORT FROM PRESIDENT AND CEO
President Flanders announced Sherry Farris, Executive Assistant to the Board’s Vice President of Academic Affairs, will be retiring at the end of December. He thanked Ms. Farris for her service to the Board Office and the State of Kansas. President Flanders also reported Emporia State University’s 13th President, Robert Glennen, passed away earlier this month.

REPORT FROM COUNCIL OF PRESIDENTS
President Martin presented the Council of Presidents’ report. The Council received reports from the Council of Chief Academic Officers, the Council of Business Officers, the Council of Government Relations Officers, the Council of Student Affairs Officers, the Regents Information Technology Committee, and the University Support Staff Council. The Council of Presidents approved Pittsburg State University’s Bachelor of Science in Interior Design, the proposed policy on non-academic transcript notations, and the proposed amendments to the Leaves policy regarding the University Support Staff annual leave enhancement.

REPORT FROM COUNCIL OF FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENTS
Lorie Cook Benjamin presented the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents’ report. The Council discussed the proposed amendments to the Board’s Weapons Possession policy and the Transfer and Articulation policy. Dr. Benjamin reported the faculty and staff surveys regarding concealed carry on campus opened on December 3, 2015 and will close on January 4, 2016. So far 10,000 responses have been recorded. Dr. Benjamin anticipates having the final results by the January 2016 Board meeting.

REPORT FROM STUDENTS’ ADVISORY COMMITTEE
The Students’ Advisory Committee report was presented by Jessie Pringle. The Committee discussed creating inclusive campuses. Each student body president has been gathering feedback from their student bodies and this feedback will be used by each of the student senates to form policies on inclusion. The Committee also discussed smoke/tobacco free campus policies.

Ms. Pringle reported the Students’ Advisory Committee decided at its August 2015 meeting that they wanted to conduct a student survey on the concealed carry law. The Docking Institute conducted the survey, which consisted of 30 questions. Ms. Pringle stated the preliminary results were received by the Committee on Tuesday, December 15, 2015. She noted 20,561 students responded to the survey, and she reviewed some of the preliminary data. The Committee plans to share the full report and the Committee’s executive summary with the Board once it is completed.

Chair Bangerter thanked the student body presidents for developing this survey to gather student opinions and thanked Ms. Pringle for her leadership.

(PowerPoint filed with Official Minutes)

STANDING COMMITTEE AND OTHER REPORTS
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Regent Van Etten reported the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee focused on performance funding and qualified admissions at its meeting. Board staff provided an overview of the history of performance funding. The current model provides the Board with two choices for allocating new state funding – 100 percent or 90 percent. The Board then decides what percent to award the institution based on outcomes for the indicators in the institution’s performance agreement. Staff also discussed with the Committee other models for performance funding. The Board could return to the previous model that allocated new state funding at 100 percent, 80 percent, 60 percent, or zero, or the Board could assign funding based on individual indicators. The Committee asked staff to develop a model that combines the current approach with the four-level allocation scale of the older model. Regent Van Etten stated the Committee will review and discuss the combined model at its next meeting.

Additionally, Regent Van Etten reported staff received a proposal asking that the Board accept all high school level work completed in middle school or junior high to fulfill the qualified admissions and the Kansas Scholars curriculum. Staff provided the Committee some history on this topic. The Committee asked staff to develop recommendations for the Committee to review at its next meeting.

FISCAL AFFAIRS AND AUDIT
Regent Feuerborn presented the Board Fiscal Affairs and Audit Standing Committee report. The Committee met by conference call on Friday, December 4, to verify the final negotiated terms of the University of Kansas Central District Project. Regent Feuerborn reported each Committee member asked KU a number of clarifying questions and after that discussion, the Committee agreed that the terms presented to them do conform to what was presented to the Board at the November meeting.

Regent Feuerborn reported the Committee met earlier in the day to review the fiscal items on the Board agenda. The Committee also received an accountability report on the state’s major investments for the KU Medical Center’s Cancer Center, Wichita State University’s Kansas Aviation Research and Technology Growth Initiative, and Kansas State University’s Veterinary Medical Center operating enhancement as well as K-State’s Global Food Solutions. All of these initiatives have received millions in state support to make greater investments in research and commercialization possible by leveraging private and federal dollars. The universities will present the economic impact of these programs to the Legislature in the upcoming session. Additionally, the Committee discussed Wichita State University’s market based tuition initiative and the University’s request that WSU not be required to have a contract already in place with an employer prior to someone seeking a badge, which is a type of credential, from WSU.

GOVERNANCE
Regent Bangerter reported the Governance Committee approved forwarding the proposed amendments to the Board’s Weapons Possession policy to the Board for consideration at the January meeting. He noted Board staff collected and provided the Committee with the feedback received from the campuses on the draft policy. If the policy is approved by the Board, the Governance Committee is hoping to receive the state universities’ institutional level policies and procedures by June 2016.

BREAK
The Chair called for a break at 2:30 p.m. and resumed the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

RECOGNITION
Chancellor Gray-Little stated Provost Jeff Vitter was recently named the University of Mississippi’s new Chancellor. She and the Board thanked him for his years of service to the University of Kansas. Chancellor Gray-Little also introduced KU’s Interim Provost, Sara Rosen.
APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA
Regent Mullin moved, with the second of Regent Murguia, that the Consent Agenda be approved. The motion carried.

Fiscal Affairs and Audit

LEASE AGREEMENT WITH KSU FOUNDATION – KSU
Kansas State University received authorization to enter into a ten-year lease purchase agreement with the KSU Foundation for property referred to as Knox Lane land. The Department of Animal Sciences and Industry will use the land. The total lease cost is $825,000, which will be paid from the Animal Science and Industry restricted fees fund balance. It is the intent of the KSU Foundation to gift the property to the University when the Foundation has been fully reimbursed for all acquisition and holding costs.

Property Legal Description:

Tract 1:

Part of the Northeast Quarter (NE¼) of Section Eight (8), Township Ten (10) South, Range Eight (8) East of the 6th Principal Meridian, described as follows: Beginning at the Northeast corner of Section 8, thence West 25.06 chains, thence South 28.11 chains to the North bank of the old channel of the Big Blue River; thence Southeast along North Bank of said River to East line of said Section 8; thence North along the East line of said Section 8 to the point of beginning, in Riley County, Kansas; LESS that tract conveyed to The Manhattan Chamber of Commerce, a Kansas Corporation, described in Warranty Deed recorded in Book 334, Page 54, in the office of the Register of Deeds of Riley County, Kansas, described as follows: Part of the East Half (E½) of Section Eight (8), Township Ten (10) South, Range Eight (8) East of the 6th P.M., in Riley County, Kansas, more particularly described as follows: Parts of Governments Lots 5 and 6 and the abandoned channel of the Big Blue River adjacent thereto, beginning at a point on the Riley-Pottawatomie County line which is North 23°44’ West (west line of Section 8 is assumed North) from a point which is 660 feet West and 2537 feet South of the Northeast corner of said Section 8; thence in a westerly direction along the Riley-Pottawatomie County line to the West line of the East Half of Government Lots 5 and 8 as extended across the said abandoned channel; thence North along the West line of the East Half of said Government Lot 5 to the center of the abandoned channel of the Blue River (considered midway between contour elevations 1002 as established in 1959); thence in easterly directions along the center of the abandoned channel of the Blue River to a point 1657 feet West of the Northeast corner of said Section 8; thence North to a point 1657 feet West of and 1884 feet South of the Northeast corner of said Section 8; thence East to a point 1264 feet West of and 1853 feet South of the Northeast corner of said Section 8; thence Southeast to a point 1032 feet West of and 1930 feet South of the Northeast corner of said Section 8; thence Southeast to a point 860 feet West of and 2082 feet South of the Northeast corner of said Section 8; thence South 23°44’ East to the Riley-Pottawatomie County line and the point of beginning;

Tract 2:

A tract of land lying in Lot Seven (7), Section Eight (8), Township Ten (10) South, Range Eight (8) East of the 6th P.M., in Pottawatomie County, Kansas, more particularly described as follows: Beginning at a point on the East line of Section 8, which is 3,076 feet South of the Northeast corner of Section 8, thence Northwesterly to a point which is 446 feet West and 2849 feet South of the Northeast corner of Section 8, thence Northwesterly to a point which is 660 feet West and 2537 feet South of the Northeast corner of Section 8, thence North 23 degrees 44 minutes West
(West line of Section 8 is assumed North) to the Pottawatomie-Riley County line, thence Easterly along the Pottawatomie-Riley County line to a point which is on the East line of Section 8 and is 2588.25 feet South of the Northeast corner of Section 8, thence South on the East line of Section 8 a distance of 487.75 feet to the point of beginning; LESS a tract of land conveyed to The City of Manhattan, Kansas, described in Deed recorded in Book 217, Page 118, in the Pottawatomie County Register of Deeds Office, described as follows: A tract of land in Lot Seven (7) and the East Half (E½) of Section Eight (8), Township Ten (10) South, Range Eight (8) East of the 6th P.M., in Pottawatomie County, Kansas, that lies East of a fence accepted as the property line, described as follows: Beginning at a point on the East line of said Section 8, that is S. 0 degrees 03 minutes 41 seconds W. 2904.30 feet from the Northeast corner of said Section 8, being Corner No. 9 and marked by a ½ inch iron bar, thence S. 0 degrees 03 minutes 41 seconds W. 134.97 feet along the East line of said Section 8 to the Manhattan Levee North right of way line and Corner No. 14, marked by a ½ inch iron bar, thence N. 64 degrees 35 minutes 21 seconds W. 23.79 feet along the said Manhattan Levee North right of way line to a property line fence and Corner No. 15, marked by a ½ inch iron bar, thence N. 0 degrees 25 minutes 23 seconds E. 119.41 feet along said property line fence to Corner No. 16, marked by a ½ inch iron bar, thence N. 75 degrees 32 minutes 11 seconds E. 21.43 feet to the point of beginning. LESS a tract of land conveyed to The City of Manhattan, Kansas, described in Deed recorded in Book 217, Page 119, in the office of the Register of Deeds of Pottawatomie County, Kansas, described as follows: A tract of land in Lot Seven (7) and the East Half (E½) of Section Eight (8), Township Ten (10) South, Range Eight (8) East of the 6th P.M., in Pottawatomie County, Kansas, described as follows: Beginning at the intersection of the Manhattan Levee North right of way line and a fence accepted as the property line that is S. 0 degrees 03 minutes 41 seconds W. 3039.27 feet and N. 64 degrees 35 minutes 21 seconds W. 23.79 feet from the Northeast corner of said Section 8, being Corner No. 15 and marked by a ½ inch iron bar, thence N. 64 degrees 35 minutes 30 seconds W. 329.61 feet along the said Manhattan Levee North right of way line to Corner No. 17 marked by a ½ inch iron bar, thence N. 40 degrees 14 minutes 42 seconds E. 43.50 feet to Corner No. 18, marked by a ½ inch iron bar, thence S. 69 degrees 45 minutes 42 seconds E. 287.95 feet to the said property line fence and Corner No. 19, marked by a ½ inch iron bar, thence S. 0 degrees 25 minutes 23 seconds W. 75.02 feet along said property line fence to the point of beginning.

CONSIDERATION OF DISCUSSION AGENDA

Academic Affairs

PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT REPORTS FOR AY 2014

Gary Alexander, Vice President for Academic Affairs, presented the performance agreement reports for AY 2014. He noted the Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee used the Board-approved Funding Guidelines to determine the percentage of new state funds to be awarded to each institution beginning July 2016. Awards are based on the following levels of compliance:

- **100%**: The institution maintained the baseline or improved from the baseline in at least 51% of the indicators (i.e. four or more indicators). The institution qualifies for 100% of any new state funds for which it is eligible.
- **90%** or **100%**: In cases where the institution maintained the baseline or improved from the baseline in exactly 50% of the indicators (i.e. three indicators), the institution qualifies for 90% of new state funds for which it is eligible, though the Board has the discretion to award 100%.
- **90%**: The institution maintained the baseline or improved from the baseline in less than 50% of the indicators. The institution qualifies for 90% of any new state funds for which it is eligible.
• 0%: The institution maintained the baseline or improved from the baseline in one or fewer indicators or failed to submit a report. No new state funds are awarded to the institution.

The Committee determined twenty-nine institutions qualified for 100 percent of any new state funding for which they are eligible and five institutions qualified for 90 percent of any new state funding for which they are eligible. Regent Van Etten moved to approve, and Regent Murguia seconded. The motion carried. The following was approved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University/College</th>
<th>Funding Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emporia State University</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Hays State University</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg State University</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas Medical Center</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washburn University</td>
<td>90% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washburn Institute of Technology</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Community College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Community College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler Community College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud County Community College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffeyville Community College</td>
<td>90% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby Community College</td>
<td>90% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowley Community College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge City Community College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Scott Community College</td>
<td>90% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City Community College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Community College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson Community College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Community College</td>
<td>90% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Community College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City Kansas Community College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labette Community College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neosho County Community College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt Community College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seward County CC/ATS</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Hills Technical College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Area Technical College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Kansas Technical College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Kansas Technical College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salina Area Technical College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita Area Technical College</td>
<td>100% funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Fiscal Affairs and Audit_
FY 2017 HOUSING AND FOOD SERVICE RATE ADJUSTMENT FOR STATE UNIVERSITIES
Elaine Frisbie, Vice President of Finance and Administration, presented the FY 2017 housing and food service rate adjustments for final action. Regent Feuerborn noted that since the November Board meeting, the Board Fiscal Affairs and Audit Standing Committee reviewed the proposals and the reserve funds for each of the university. Regent Feuerborn moved to approve. Following the second of Regent Thomas, the motion carried.

(Complete Listing of Adjustments filed with Official Minutes)

ALLOCATION OF FY 2017 REHABILITATION AND REPAIR APPROPRIATION
The FY 2017 proposed allocation of the Rehabilitation and Repair appropriation was presented by Greg Hoffman, Director of Facilities. He explained $32,000,000 was appropriated from the Educational Building Fund for this purpose. Regent Feuerborn moved that the project list for the FY 2017 rehabilitation and repair appropriation be approved. Regent Thomas seconded, and the motion carried. The following summary reflects the authorized totals:

SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Kansas Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Hays State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET FOR STUDENT UNION – KSU
Director Hoffman presented Kansas State University’s request to amend its FY 2016 project budget from $25 million to $31 million for the K-State Student Union expansion and renovation project. The $6 million will be funded with Housing and Dining Services funds, privilege fee balances and university resources. Regent Mullin moved to approve, and Regent Newton seconded. The motion carried.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SUMMARY OF APPROVAL REQUIREMENTS POLICY AND THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS POLICY
Director Hoffman presented proposed amendments to the Board’s Summary of Approval Requirements policy and the Capital Improvement Project policy. During the last Legislative session HB 2395 was signed into law, which increased the threshold of capital improvement costs for architectural and engineering services to $1 million before the Secretary of Administration must convene a meeting of the State Building Advisory Committee. The proposed policy amendments reflect the change in the statute. The amendments also increase the Director’s approval limit from $500,000 to $750,000. Regent Murguia moved to approve. Regent Feuerborn seconded, and the motion carried. The following amendments were adopted:
# SUMMARY OF APPROVAL REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board of Regents</th>
<th>Building Committee</th>
<th>Full Legislature</th>
<th>Program Statement required?</th>
<th>Execution process (architect/contractor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Improvements and Financing &gt; $750,000 - $1,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated Corporations</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>advise</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State General Fund</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>advise</td>
<td></td>
<td>approve (DA 418)</td>
<td>State selection/bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Non-State Funds</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>advise</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>K.S.A. 76-7,125 et seq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>advise</td>
<td></td>
<td>approve (DA 418)</td>
<td>State selection/bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>advise</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>K.S.A. 76-7,125 et seq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Building Fund</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>advise</td>
<td>***(^1)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>State selection/bid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rehabilitation and Repair Projects**\(^2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board of Regents</th>
<th>Building Committee</th>
<th>Full Legislature</th>
<th>Program Statement required?</th>
<th>Execution process (architect/contractor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated Corporations</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>advise</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State General Fund/EBF</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>advise</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>State selection/bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Non-State Funds</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>advise</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>K.S.A. 76-7,125 et seq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>advise</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>K.S.A. 76-7,125 et seq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deferred Maintenance Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board of Regents</th>
<th>Building Committee</th>
<th>Full Legislature</th>
<th>Program Statement required?</th>
<th>Execution process (architect/contractor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Maintenance Funds</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>advise</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>State selection/bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Interest</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>advise</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>K.S.A. 76-7,125 et seq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Credits</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>advise</td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>State selection/bid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Energy Performance Contracting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Board of Regents</th>
<th>Building Committee</th>
<th>Full Legislature</th>
<th>Program Statement required?</th>
<th>Execution process (architect/contractor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>approve</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>advise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K.S.A. 75-37,111 through 37,114 and 75-37,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Building Razing                                                 | approve         | advise\(^3\)       |                   |                             |                                          |

---

\(^1\) If new project or major renovation.

\(^2\) Projects < $500,000 - $750,000 require only Director’s approval.

\(^3\) Not required by law.
3 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

a Definitions

i Capital improvement projects are those the costs for which exceed $750,000 or $1,000,000, regardless of funding source, including new buildings, remodeling or alterations, annual maintenance, and utility projects. Deferred maintenance projects are governed by subsection 5., below.

ii Educational Building Fund, or EBF, means the fund created pursuant to K.S.A. 76-6b01 et seq. and funded by the annual mill levy authorized by Article 6, Section 6 of the Kansas Constitution. Moneys in the EBF may only be expended as authorized by K.S.A. 76-6b02.

b Process

i Initial Request: Each state university shall include initial concept requests for authorization of capital improvement projects with the university’s five year plan submitted to the Board for consideration on April 1 of each year. Each project that will require the services of an architect and/or engineer shall have a written program statement included with the request. The request shall identify each anticipated source of funding for the project. For improvements that include new space for which private moneys are to finance at least 51% of the cost, the request shall include a plan for paying the annual maintenance and operation costs for the project from either private funds or existing university resources. (K.S.A. 76-790) For improvements that include new space for which private moneys are to finance less than 51% of the cost, the request shall include a plan for paying annual maintenance and operation costs that identifies the resources to be used for such costs. Such annual maintenance and operation costs plans shall be included in the program statement and shall adhere to standards prescribed by the Board’s Director of Facilities. Each request approved by the Board shall be filed with the appropriate state offices on or before July 1 in the format determined by the State Budget Director. Each state university is prohibited from pursuing gubernatorial or legislative approval of any project not previously approved by the Board.

ii Amendments: Amendments to the current year capital improvements project list may be submitted to the Board at times other than those specified above. Once approved, each university shall be responsible for ensuring that appropriate legislative approvals are obtained, including advising the Joint Committee on Building Construction.

iii Licensed Professional Consultants: The design and construction administration for all new buildings and major renovations on state property shall be performed by licensed professional consultants retained in accordance with Kansas statutes. A written program for each building project shall be submitted and approved by the Board and by the Legislature or legislative building committee as set forth in section E.2. before such services are obtained.

iv Program Statements: Minimum requirements for program statements include introductions, project budgets, and project schedules. For new construction or major renovations the program statement must also include space projections, space summaries, space descriptions, a discussion of the impact the additional space will have on overall campus space, and new buildings operating costs and the proposed source of funding for such operating costs (or a statement that such will not be requested). Additional information that the institutions deem necessary may be included.

v Design Development Plans: Following Legislative and Board approval of a specific capital improvement project, design development plans for a building or project and the location of the new building shall be submitted to the President and Chief Executive Officer for review and approval before final plans are prepared. The President and Chief Executive Officer, upon the recommendation of the Director of Facilities, may approve said design development plans for the Board.

c Funding
Funding Sources: Capital improvement projects may be paid for from state general funds, tuition, educational building funds, revenue bond proceeds (in accordance with chapter II.D. of this Policy Manual), restricted fees, research overhead funds and other resources as approved by the Board.

Capital improvement projects that are also approved deferred maintenance projects may be paid for in whole or in part by tuition interest earnings, contributions received pursuant to the postsecondary educational institution tax credit program (K.S.A. 79-32,261), and other funds earmarked by the Board or Legislature for the purpose of addressing deferred maintenance.

Federal Grant Requests: All institutional requests for federal grants for capital improvements shall be submitted to the Board President and Chief Executive Officer before the request is submitted to the appropriate federal agency.

Private Funds: No capital improvement project that is funded in part or totally from private funds may proceed to signature of contract unless and until all private funds have been deposited in an account for the use of the project or a letter of credit has been received by the Board President and Chief Executive Officer that guarantees the availability of the funds necessary to complete the project.

Fund Raising: In addition to the project approval required in subsection 3.b.i. of this section, notification of all capital improvement projects to be funded in part or in whole from private resources must be submitted to the Board’s President and Chief Executive Officer before fund raising efforts are publicly announced.

d  Annual Maintenance

Beginning with projects initiated after January, 2007, and except as otherwise specifically provided for by law or approved by the Board, state universities shall not seek new state general funds to finance annual maintenance and operation costs for any new capital improvement project.

4 REHABILITATION AND REPAIR PROJECTS

a  Definition

Rehabilitation and repair projects are those projects that cost \$750,000 \$1,000,000 or less, including new buildings, remodeling or alterations, annual maintenance, or utility projects. Deferred maintenance projects are governed by subsection 5. below.

b  Process

The state universities are authorized by the Board and the Legislature to proceed with rehabilitation and repair projects on a fiscal year basis. Upon request of the university with concurrence of the Board’s Director of Facilities, the Board President and Chief Executive Officer has the authority to revise such authorizations during the fiscal year; provided, however, that any project requiring expenditures of \$500,000 \$750,000 or more must be considered by the Board.

c  Funding

The Board receives an annual line item appropriation from the Educational Building Fund for rehabilitation and repair projects. This appropriation is allocated by the Board to the state universities pursuant to an “adjusted square footage” formula, which factors in gross square footage, building age and complexity of the physical plant.

Additionally, the universities may provide funds for rehabilitation and repair projects from state general fund revenues, tuition, restricted fees, research overhead funds and other resources as approved by the Board.
Rehabilitation and repair projects that are also approved deferred maintenance projects may be paid for in whole or in part by tuition interest earnings, contributions received pursuant to the postsecondary educational institution tax credit program (K.S.A. 79-32,261), and other funds earmarked by the Board or Legislature for the purpose of addressing deferred maintenance.

AMENDMENTS TO THE FINANCIAL REPORTING POLICY
Vice President Frisbie presented proposed amendments to the Board’s Financial Reporting policy. Currently Board policy requires an external management review to be conducted every five years, or when there is a change in the chief executive officer, on expenditure of non-public unrestricted funds held by the university or an affiliated corporation and potential conflicts of interest. Additionally, the non-controlled affiliated corporations have external auditors review annually for conflicts of interest regarding the unrestricted funds. After having gone through the policy cycle, the Council of Business Officers believe these two procedures are duplicative. The proposed changes would allow the Board the flexibility to rely on the external affiliated corporation and internal institutional audit findings and limit the external management review to the immediately preceding fiscal year. However, if the Board wants the review to be more than one year, the language allows for augmented review. Regent Van Etten moved to approve, and Regent Murfin seconded. The motion carried. The following policy amendments were adopted:

5 FINANCIAL REPORTING

a Annual Financial Report

Each state university shall submit to the President and Chief Executive Officer a comprehensive financial report for the prior fiscal year in accordance with the schedule maintained on the Board of Regents’ website. The President and Chief Executive Officer shall be responsible for recommending to the Board any specific financial report findings that should be further reviewed by the Board. The financial report shall conform to a format determined by the Council of Business Officers. The financial report shall reflect conformity with financial reporting methods and formats promulgated by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, and the Governmental Accounting Standards Board and the National Association of College and University Business Officers’ Financial Accounting and Reporting Manual for Higher Education (formerly CUBA) unless otherwise provided by state law, practices or procedures.

b Internal Audit Function

i Each state university shall have an internal audit function. The responsibility of the internal audit function is to serve the university in a manner that is consistent with the International Professional Practices Framework (IPPF) promulgated by the Institute of Internal Auditors. Additional resources, tools and guidance should be obtained through the Association of College and University Auditors and the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations.

ii The purpose, authority, and responsibility of each university’s internal audit function shall be defined in a formal written document (internal audit charter) that is approved by each state university’s chief executive officer. The charter shall make clear the purposes of the internal audit function, specify the unrestricted scope of its work, and declare that auditors are to have no responsibility for the activities they audit. The scope of work of the internal auditors shall include review of university controlled affiliated corporations, including a review of the IRS form 990 for each such corporation, with a focus on for potential conflicts of interest and transactions between the university and university controlled affiliated corporations. The charter shall endow internal auditors with the authority to fully and freely access all the university’s records, properties, and personnel relevant to an audit. The charter shall provide that the auditor report directly to the university chief executive officer on all audit matters. The charter shall clearly state that internal auditors shall report directly to the Board Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee any situation wherein the auditor perceives a conflict of interest with or on the part of the university chief executive officer’s involvement with the subject of an audit. In addition, each
state university shall include the charter in university manuals, policies, and procedures as appropriate. Each state university internal audit department shall report annually to the Board’s Committee on Fiscal Affairs and Audit, summarizing the prior year’s activities and audit plans for the coming year. Each state university shall notify the Board’s Committee on Fiscal Affairs and Audit in writing of any personnel change in the position of university internal auditor.

iii Each state university shall develop and maintain an internal audit plan. At a minimum, internal controls for the university’s highest risk units, based on public funds exposure, should be assessed on a regular basis.

iv Each completed internal audit reporting material financial weaknesses or fraud shall be submitted to the Board President and Chief Executive Officer who shall be responsible for recommending to the Committee on Fiscal Affairs and Audit any specific audit findings that should be further reviewed by the Committee.

c Non-Public Funds Management Review

i Each state university chief executive officer shall maintain on file at the university a current list and description of the non-public, unrestricted funds under his or her direction or that of direct subordinates.

ii Each state university chief executive officer shall maintain and provide to the Board annually a list of all affiliated corporations (controlled and non-controlled) and a description of their respective governing boards and management structure.

iii Each state university shall annually review the roles of direct subordinates in or with such affiliated corporations for the purpose of identifying potential conflicts of interest. If appropriate and to the extent it is within the chief executive officer’s control, the university chief executive officer shall initiate a plan to either eliminate or manage any identified actual or potential conflicts of interest and shall file the plan with the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Board of Regents.

iv The President and Chief Executive Officer of the Board shall annually review the roles of the state university chief executive officers in or with all affiliated corporations for the purpose of identifying potential conflicts of interest. If appropriate, the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Board shall initiate a plan to either eliminate or manage any actual or potential conflicts of interest and shall submit such plans to the Board Chair and Vice-chair for approval.

v The Board may initiate external management reviews of the use and expenditure of non-public, unrestricted funds held by the university or an affiliated corporation of the university and under the direction of each state university chief executive officer and each state university chief executive officer’s direct subordinates at any time, but such reviews shall be conducted no less than once every 5 years beginning fiscal year 2013. For the once every five year audits, the period under review may be limited to the immediately preceding fiscal year. Additionally, such reviews shall be conducted when there is a change in the chief executive officer. All such reviews shall be contracted by the Board and financed by a transfer of funds to the Board from the state university under review. The university shall request its university non-controlled affiliated corporations having non-public, unrestricted funds that are under the direction of the university chief executive officer or the chief executive officer’s direct subordinates to cooperate in the conduct of such reviews.

vi Each state university chief executive officer shall request the board of directors of each university non-controlled affiliated corporation to include in the scope of conduct an agreed-upon procedure engagement at the time of annual independent audit identification of potential conflicts of interest involving unrestricted, non-public funds under the authority or direction of the university chief executive officer or the chief executive officer’s direct subordinates. The state university chief executive officer shall request that such review Agreed upon procedures shall be established by the Board’s Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee. The agreed-upon procedures shall
include an examination of fund transfers and other transactions between and among the university, its affiliated corporations, and external entities reported on statements of substantial interest forms, and
that the University non-controlled affiliated corporation shall be asked to share a report of each such review engagement with the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Board.

vii For purposes of paragraph c.,

(1) “non-public funds” means any funds expended for the benefit of the state university but not processed through the state financial system, and

(2) “affiliated corporation” shall not include the Wichita State University Board of Trustees.

BOND RESOLUTION FOR THE RENOVATION AND EXPANSION OF SEATON HALL – KSU
General Counsel Julene Miller introduced a bond resolution for Kansas State University to finance the cost of the renovation and expansion of Seaton Hall. The resolution would authorize the issuance of revenue bonds in one or more series in a total aggregate amount not to exceed $60,000,000, plus costs and reserves. The bonds will be secured with a pledge of generally available unencumbered funds of the University. General Counsel Miller noted for FY 2017, the state directly appropriated $3.7 million of the Educational Building Fund to the University to pay debt service for the Seaton Hall project, and KSU is anticipating using a portion of its share of the Educational Building Fund to pay debt service for this project in the future. She also mentioned KSU is considering issuance of refunding bonds, which does not require Board approval if Board policy conditions are met. Regent Mullin moved to approve and authorize the Chair and the President and CEO to execute the resolution and various other documents relating to the security and payment of such bonds. Regent Newton seconded, and the motion carried.

(Resolution filed with Official Minutes)

BOND RESOLUTION FOR THE RENOVATION, EXPANSION AND EQUIPPING OF THE STUDENT UNION – KSU
General Counsel Miller introduced a bond resolution for Kansas State University to finance the cost of the renovating, expanding, and equipping the Student Union. The resolution would authorize the issuance of revenues bonds in one or more series in a total aggregate amount not to exceed $25,000,000, plus costs and reserves. The bonds will be secured with a pledge of generally available unencumbered funds of the University. General Counsel Miller noted KSU expects to use a dedicated campus privilege fee to pay debt service on the bonds. Regent Mullin moved to approve and authorize the Chair and the President and CEO to execute the resolution and various other documents relating to the security and payment of such bonds. Regent Thomas seconded, and the motion carried.

(Resolution filed with Official Minutes)

Other Matters

KANSAS POSTSECONDARY TECHNICAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE PLAN TO FULLY IMPLEMENT THE POSTSECONDARY TIERED TECHNICAL EDUCATION STATE AID ACT
Rita Johnson, Vice President for Workforce Development, presented the Kansas Postsecondary Technical Education Authority’s (TEA) recommendation regarding the plan to fully implement the Postsecondary Tiered Technical Education State Aid Act. Vice President Johnson stated this past legislative session an additional proviso was passed to require the Board to create a preliminary plan prior to November 1, 2015 to fully implement the postsecondary tiered technical education state aid and submit a final plan to the House Appropriations and Senate Ways and Means Committees no later than February 1, 2016. At the October Board meeting, she presented the TEA’s preliminary plan. The Board expressed concerns that this option alone did not fulfill the language of the legislative proviso and asked the TEA to bring forward additional options that fully implement the plan without
new state funding. Vice President Johnson reported the TEA adopted the following options at the December 10, 2015 TEA meeting:

Preferred Option:

- Recommend the Board include a request for additional funding for Postsecondary Tiered Technical Education State Aid to fully fund the gap between what is considered the state share of the calculated costs and the current appropriated amount.
- Recommend any new funding appropriated for Postsecondary Tiered Technical Education State Aid be distributed only to those institutions with a funding shortfall and that institutions with no funding shortfall maintain their current base.
- Recommend a plan to begin resolving the remaining funding distribution disparity for institutions still receiving less than their institution’s calculated state share be addressed the following year.
- Agree that the non-tiered funding distribution would be addressed since there has been no additional state funding for non-tiered courses, since the Non-Tiered Course Credit Hour Grants were established and a number of courses have been moved from tiered status to non-tiered status during this time.

Alternative Option:

- Begin addressing the funding distribution disparity over a four-year period
  - The base for institutions receiving more than their calculated state share would be reduced by one-fourth of the amount they receive over their calculated state share each year over the four-year period with those funds going into a designated funding redistribution pool
  - The base amount for institutions receiving less than their calculated state share would be increased using funds from the redistribution pool and based on each institution’s percentage of the overall funding shortfall
- Begin addressing the calculated state share funding shortfall over a four-year period
  - Request the Legislature appropriate new funding to the tiered technical education state aid appropriation that is equal to or more than one-fourth of the overall calculated funding shortfall each year over the four-year period
- Full implementation of tiered technical education funding would be revisited in the fifth year and depend on full funding of the calculated state share cost amount.

President Brian Inbody, representing the nineteen community colleges, presented the community colleges’ position that includes the following: 1) any new state funds should be distributed according to the formula, 2) any cuts should be taken across the board for each college, and 3) if there is no new state funding and no cuts, the current funding should remain as it is now. He stated the community colleges are in favor of presenting only the preferred option to the Legislature. Regent Bangerter noted that failure to fully implement the tiered funding model has resulted in some colleges receiving less than their calculated state share. He asked if the presidents and the boards of trustees for those community colleges are okay with maintaining the status quo. President Inbody stated the trustees understand the impact of not re-centering and noted the community colleges do not want to redistribute funds.

President Burks, representing the technical colleges, reported the technical college presidents are not in unanimous agreement. The institutions receiving less than their calculated state share would like to begin moving toward implementation of the funding model as presented in the options presented.

The Chair of the Kansas Postsecondary Technical Education Authority, Ray Frederick, stated the TEA stands by the recommendations as presented. He noted TEA members, who represent business and industry, feel strongly that colleges that deliver good quality technical education and have grown should be rewarded. They also believe that more than half of the colleges should not have to continue receiving less than their calculated state share while
others are receiving more than their calculated share of the available funding. The majority of the TEA believe it is time to move toward full implementation of the funding model.

Regent Bangerter reiterated that the Board believes their charge from the Legislature is to present a plan that fully implements the postsecondary tiered technical education state aid. The Board wants to include with the options feedback from the community college sector, technical college sector, and TEA regarding their concerns or any additional comments they want to share regarding the two options. The Board asked the Board Fiscal Affairs and Audit Standing Committee to work with the leadership of the community colleges, technical colleges, and TEA on these comments. The final plan will be presented to the Board for consideration at the January meeting.

NON-BUDGETARY LEGISLATIVE ITEMS
Matt Casey, Director of Government Relations, presented the proposed non-budgetary legislative items. Last month the Board received a first reading on the Kansas Innovation Act proposal and the University of Kansas Medical Center’s university police jurisdiction technical edit. Regent Murguia moved to approve the two proposals. Following the second of Regent Thomas, the motion carried.

EXECUTIVE SESSION
At 4:30 p.m., Regent Newton moved, followed by the second of Regent Feuerborn, to recess into executive session for 30 minutes starting at 4:35 p.m. to discuss personnel matters of non-elected personnel. Participating in the executive session were members of the Board, President Flanders, and Chancellor Gray-Little. The motion carried. At 5:05 p.m., the meeting returned to open session. Regent Feuerborn moved to extend 15 minutes, and Regent Bangerter seconded. The motion carried. At 5:20 p.m., the meeting returned to open session. Regent Feuerborn moved to extend 10 minutes, and Regent Bangerter seconded. The motion carried. At 5:30 p.m., the meeting returned to open session.

ADJOURNMENT
The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.
REPORTS AND CONSENT AGENDA

II. Introductions and Reports
   A. Introductions
   B. Report from the Chair Regent Bangerter, Chair
   C. Report from the President & CEO Blake Flanders, President & CEO
   D. Report from System Council of Presidents President Inbody
   E. Report from Council of Presidents President Martin
   F. Report from Council of Faculty Senate Presidents Lorie Cook Benjamin
   G. Report from Students’ Advisory Committee Jessie Pringle
   H. Report from Unclassified Staff Council Brett Morrill
   I. Report from University Support Staff Council Marcia Tacha

III. Standing Committee Reports
   A. Academic Affairs Regent Van Etten
   B. Fiscal Affairs & Audit Regent Feuerborn
   C. Governance Regent Bangerter

IV. Approval of Consent Agenda
   A. Academic Affairs
      1. Act on Request for Approval for a Bachelor of Science in Interior Design – PSU Gary Alexander, VP, Academic Affairs

Summary
Universities may apply for approval of new academic programs following the guidelines in the Kansas Board of Regents Policy Manual. Pittsburg State University has submitted an application for approval of a Bachelor of Science in Interior Design. The proposing academic unit has responded to all of the requirements of the program approval process. Only Kansas State University has programs designated by this Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) code. Board staff concurs with the Council of Presidents and the Council of Chief Academic Officers in recommending approval.

Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Program Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Program Identification</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science with a major in Interior Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIP: 50.0408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program start date: Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Academic Unit</td>
<td>School of Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Program Description**

The Bachelor of Science with a major in Interior Design degree prepares students for professional practice as an interior designer in the fields of commercial and residential design, with opportunities in the construction and graphic design fields. The curriculum emphasizes design as an integrative, multidisciplinary education that includes interior design, construction, and graphic design courses for a holistic approach to the interior design profession. The interior design curriculum is designed as a creative, problem solving approach including the application of materials and processes for creating environments that improve the quality of life and protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

4. **Demand/Need for the Program**

PSU has had a BS in Family and Consumer Sciences with an interior design emphasis for over 20 years. In 2000, with the hiring of a certified NCIDQ (National Council for Interior Design Qualifications) faculty member, the emphasis changed significantly with the goal to develop an interior design program that would meet and ultimately obtain accreditation through the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA).

When the School of Construction was established, the designers included an option to add an Interior Design program based on changing the current emphasis to a baccalaureate program. The School of Construction is a logical fit for the interior design program since construction and design are integrated on many projects. CIDA requires accredited programs to address technical content relative to environmental systems, building systems, interior construction, building regulations and guidelines. NCIDQ includes building systems, building codes, construction standards and contract administration as four of the seven content areas that characterize interior design work.

The faculty have currently identified 20 existing PSU students committed to declaring the proposed major in Interior Design if approved. Steady growth in enrollment over the next 3-5 years is anticipated with expectations of 60 majors. Recent interest and feedback from students visiting campus suggest that adding 10 or more students per year is feasible.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012 data shows that interior design professionals would: 1) expect an average salary of $47,600 per year; 2) require a Bachelor’s degree as an entry level education; and 3) have a job outlook growth around 13%. Per the BLS, job growth for interior design is expected to grow though 2022 at a rate slightly above all occupations. Overall employment in the construction industry is projected to grow through 2022. Employment of interior design professionals in specialized design areas is projected to grow at a 20% rate. Thirty-nine of fifty states require NCIDQ certification for licensure of interior design professionals.

PSU faculty interaction with regional and national firms resulted in information supporting the need for graduate interior design students to have more construction knowledge and graphic design abilities in conjunction with their interior design education. The uniqueness of providing all three major components (interior design, construction, and graphics) at PSU will create a graduate that should be in high demand.
5. Comparative/Locational Advantage

Currently, the only CIDA accredited interior design programs in Kansas are the BS Interior Design and the Masters of Interior Architecture and Product Design both at Kansas State University. While there appear to be other university programs in Kansas with interior design emphases or concentrations, there are no programs located in SE Kansas.

Regionally, the University of Central Missouri offers a Bachelor of Fine Arts in Interior Design, University of Missouri – Columbia offers a BS in HES Architectural Studies, University of Arkansas offers a Bachelor of Interior Design, and Oklahoma State University offers a Bachelor of Science in Interior Design. These regional programs are CIDA-accredited.

The primary uniqueness of the proposed Interior Design program will be its relationship with the School of Construction. The School of Construction is well known and recognized throughout the state as a leader in construction management education and has a reputation of responding to the needs of the construction industry. In addition, the southeast corner of the state is strategically located to attract students from Oklahoma, Missouri, and Arkansas.

6. Curriculum

The interior design curriculum would require 43 hours of interior design coursework, a three credit hour Textile course taken in Family and Consumer Sciences, and a 3 credit hour Ergonomics/Human Factors course taken in the Environmental and Safety Management in the School of Construction. This gives a cumulative major requirement of 49 credit hours. The required support coursework includes 19 credit hours of construction methods courses in the School of Construction and 9 credit hours of graphics courses in the Department of Graphics and Imaging Technologies. These 28 credit hours of support courses and 49 credit hours of major coursework give a total of 77 credit hours for the new interior design major added to the general education requirements totaling 124 credit hours. The degree typically requires four years, or eight semesters, plus one summer session for cooperative education/internship.

7. Faculty Profile

There are two faculty members currently assigned to the interior design emphasis. With the move to the School of Construction, a third FTE will be assigned to the program. The combined experiences of the FTE will include CAD, environmental systems (HVAC, electrical, plumbing), construction methods, construction management, residential design/codes/construction, and commercial building design and construction.

- Denise Bertoncino (1.0 FTE), 25 years in higher education, tenured, associate professor, BS/MFA in Interior Design, National Council of Interior Design Qualifications (NCIDQ) certified, LEED Green Associate, coordinator for interior design emphasis.
- Holly Page-Sagehorn (1.0 FTE), 10 years in higher education, tenure dossier currently in review process, assistant professor, BS in Family and Consumer Sciences (Interior Design emphasis), Masters of Fine Arts – Design.
- Jenny McCool-O’Dell (.25 FTE), 7 years in higher education, non-tenure earning, instructor teaching CAD courses, BS in Technology with a major in Construction Management, MS in Career and Technical Education.
- Justin Honey (.25 FTE), 10 years in higher education, tenured, associate professor teaching residential design and construction, site work and steel, light frame and finishes courses. BS in Construction Management, Masters of Engineering Technology.
8. Student Profile

Students in the Interior Design emphasis are typically Kansas residents with an interest in interior design as a profession. We anticipate that future students entering the BS Interior Design program would be coming from Kansas and the four state region (Gorilla Advantage). They will have an interest in interior design and construction related to residential and commercial building. Typically they are creative and enjoy working with the public and express an interest in using current technology (CAD, iPads, etc.) for design purposes. Students will be admitted to the program based upon regular admission requirements.

9. Academic Support

The proposed Interior Design program will have the same level of support provided to other programs in the School of Construction. This includes support to all university student support services, library services, financial aid services, health services, student wellness, etc. The College of Technology will provide classroom, office, computer lab and general facility support. The School of Construction will provide academic program administrative support, advisement, specialized lab/classroom support, equipment support, faculty development, student organization support, and overall program operating support.

10. Facilities and Equipment

The interior design emphasis was originally housed within the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences. The proposed program will be housed in the Kansas Technology Center within the School of Construction. Existing classroom and computer lab space in the Kansas Technology Center is currently available for use for this proposed program. Plans for additional studio space and faculty offices are in the development stage and should be available by the start of the Fall 2016 semester. The studio lab space is important for the students to experience collaborative design. The cost of any needed renovation will be covered by existing School of Construction funds.

11. Program Review, Assessment, and Accreditation

The interior design program will seek Council for Interior Design Accreditation following their timetable for collection of work and submission of application. The interior design major, upon approval, will be entered into the university rotation cycle for program review. Evaluation of program and learner outcomes will be both formal and informal. Outcomes of techniques for assessment will be reported in the aggregate on a yearly basis. Techniques will include evaluation utilizing: standardized tests, capstone projects, senior exhibitions, alumni survey/employment rate, student exit program surveys, graduation rates, and portfolios. Faculty and course evaluations will be utilized per university protocol. An advisory board will be utilized for industry input.

The program will follow School of Construction guidelines for program review, annual assessment and accreditation as it comes available. Currently, the School of Construction has extensive accreditation experience (30+ years with ABET for our Construction Engineering Technology program and a recent ABET review of our Construction Management program). The expectation is that all programs housed within the School of Construction will become accredited/maintain accreditation.
| 12. Costs, Financing | The cost to provide the proposed Interior Design program is minimal. Beyond the one-time start-up costs of $125,000 - $150,000 to pay for computer equipment, computer workstations, studio space for students and faculty offices, no additional funding is needed. PSU has the academic resources (library, advising, etc) and faculty in place to support the program. |
CURRICULUM OUTLINE
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I. Bachelor of Science with a major in Interior Design

II. Courses for the major:

Core Courses (Required) Credit Hours
IND 110 Interior Design Fundamentals 3
IND 120 Interior Design Studio Fundamentals 3
IND 312 History of Design I 3
IND 313 History of Design II 3
IND 315 Interior Design: Studio I 3
IND 316 Space Planning and Programming 3
IND 323 Materials and Resources 3
IND 324 Applied Color and Lighting Design 3
IND 325 Interior Design: Studio II 3
IND 411 Professional Practice for Interior Design 3
IND 420 Interior Design: Studio III 3
IND 422 Interior Design: Studio IV 3
IND 425 LEED in Interior Design 3
IND 570 Professional Internship Preparation 1
IND 571 Professional Internship 2
IND 572 Interior Design Portfolio Preparation and Senior Exhibit 1
FCS 356 Textiles 3
EST 621 Ergonomics/Human Factors 3
Electives (Optional and not required for completion of degree)
IND 600 Study Tour 3
IND 326 Computer Application for Interior Design 3

Support Courses (Required)
CMCET 133 Construction Graphics 3
CMCET 235 Methods of Construction – Light Frame and Finishes 2
CMCET 330 Mechanical Systems (HVAC) 3
CMCET 340 Building Information Modeling 3
CMCET 350 Mechanical Systems (Plumbing) 2
CMCET 331 Electrical Systems 3
CMCET 332 Residential Design 3
GIT 142 Raster Graphics Software 3
GIT 240 Page Layout Software 3
GIT 221 Web Graphics Software 3

Total 77
Fiscal Summary for Proposed Academic Programs

Pittsburg State University

Bachelor of Science with a major in Interior Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I. Anticipated Enrollment</th>
<th>AY 2017</th>
<th>AY 2018</th>
<th>AY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Full-time, Part-time Headcount:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Total SCH taken by all students in program</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part II. Program Cost Projection</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. In implementation year one, list all identifiable General Use costs to the academic unit(s) and how they will be funded. In subsequent years, please include only the additional amount budgeted.</td>
<td>FY 16</td>
<td>Year 1 (AY 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Budget</td>
<td>$125,000 - $150,000 (one-time costs)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$125,000 - $150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSU will purchase studio work stations ($75,000) and also provide additional studio space and faculty offices ($50,000 - $75,000) in the Kansas Technology Center. These one-time start-up costs range from $125,000 - $150,000 and will be funded through internal reallocation.
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   A. Presentation
      1. Receive Annual Foresight 2020 Progress Report  Blake Flanders,
         President and CEO

Summary

After a year and a half of study, the Board approved a strategic agenda for Kansas higher education in September of 2010. In January of 2012, the first annual report was given and later that year the Board made some revisions to the goals and identified some specific metrics to be used in assessing progress. Additional modifications were made in 2015. In this fifth annual progress report, the Board will find multiple years of data on selected metrics, and for the first time, peer comparison data for each of the six state universities. The published report should be consumed in conjunction with our website, where one can review additional data on individual institutions for many of the metrics outlined.
B. Academic Affairs

1. Receive Annual Report on Qualified Admissions

Regent Van Etten
Gary Alexander,
VP, Academic Affairs

Summary and Recommendation

The report on admission of the 2014-2015 freshmen class and 2014-2015 transfer students are mandated by K.S.A. 76-717. This statute requires the Board to annually submit to the Legislature information on the following categories of student admissions: (1) the number and percentage of freshmen class admissions permitted as exceptions to the minimum admissions standards and (2) the number and percentage of transfer student admissions permitted as exceptions to the minimum admissions standards. This information is found in Tables 1 and 6. Staff notes no state university exceeded the limit on the number of applicants admitted as exceptions to the minimum standards and recommends acceptance of this report for submission to the Legislature to fulfill reporting requirements.

Background

From 1915 to 2001, Kansas had an open admission policy which guaranteed admission to anyone who graduated from an accredited high school in Kansas. In 1996, the Legislature passed K.S.A. 76-717, which established minimum admission standards for state universities. Those became effective in 2001. The statute requires the Board to annually submit to the Legislature information on undergraduate students admitted to state universities who did not meet minimum admission standards.

Minimum Admission Criteria for 2014-2015 Freshmen Applicants

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

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

Exceptions to the Minimum Admission Standards

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

Minimum Admission Criterion for 2014-2015 Transfer Applicants

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

State universities may admit transfer applicants who have earned less than a 2.0 on 24 or more transferable credit hours, but the number of these exceptions is limited by statute. The number of resident transfer exceptions is limited to 10 percent of the university’s resident transfer admissions. The number of non-resident transfer exceptions is limited to 10 percent of the university’s non-resident transfer admissions. Admitting applicants as exceptions is at the discretion of the state university and each student receives an individual success plan.

*Reporting Requirements*

K.S.A. 76-717 requires that on or before January 31 of each year, the Board submit a report that includes the following information on admissions: (a) the number and percentage of **freshmen class admissions** permitted as exceptions to the minimum admissions standards (Table 1) and (b) the number and percentage of **transfer student admissions** permitted as exceptions to the minimum admissions standards (Table 6). The statute specifies this information be disaggregated by institution. Though not required by statute, Tables 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8 are included to place admission, enrollment and denial information in a broader context.

**2014-2015 Freshmen Applicants**

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

Table 1 presents the number and percent of resident freshmen students admitted as exceptions to the minimum admission standards, disaggregated by institution. No institution exceeded the 10 percent limit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptions</th>
<th>Admits</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emporia State University</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Hays State University</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg State University</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Table 2 presents the number and percent of non-resident freshmen students admitted as exceptions, disaggregated by institution. The Board set the maximum number of exceptions under this category as either 10 percent of the total number of admitted non-resident freshmen, or 50 students, whichever is greater. No institution exceeded this limit.
Table 2: Number of Non-Resident Freshmen Exceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Exceptions</th>
<th>Admits</th>
<th>10% or 50 students, whichever is greater (the greater is shown)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emporia State University</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Hays State University</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3,121</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg State University</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>8,913</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 displays the aggregate number of students admitted under the ACT, class rank or precollege curriculum criteria or admitted as exceptions. Students are counted only in the criterion on which they were admitted even though they may have met more than one criterion.

Table 3 shows that of resident students under the age of 21 and who graduated from high school, 74.5% were admitted under the test score criterion; 8.5% were admitted on the class rank criterion; and 11.0% were admitted on the curriculum criterion. Less than one percent of resident freshmen applicants were accepted on the GED criterion and 3.3% of resident freshmen applicants gained admission by virtue of being at least 21 years of age with a high school diploma. Universities chose to admit as exceptions 2.3% of resident applicants who did not meet minimum admission criteria.

Data in Table 3 are similar to data in previous years, except for the GED criterion and the number of students admitted as exceptions. The number of resident and non-resident students admitted on the GED criterion decreased by approximately 50%. A new and more rigorous GED test was implemented January 1, 2014, and the number of test-takers and the number who passed the GED sharply declined. The number of resident and nonresident students admitted as exceptions decreased from the previous year, accounting for 2.5% of students admitted in 2014-2015, as compared to 3.2% in 2013-2014.

Table 3: Freshmen Admitted by Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Non-Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Totals</td>
<td>Percent of Admits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Score</td>
<td>14,527</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Rank</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+ Diploma</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 displays the “yield rate,” or the number of freshmen students admitted under the test score, class rank, precollege curriculum, GED or 21+ diploma criteria, or as exceptions, who actually enrolled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Freshmen Admitted by Categories Who Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resident</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrolled</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+ Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Yield Rate is the number of students who enrolled divided by the number of students who were admitted.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Number of Freshmen Applicant Denials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resident</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denials</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Hays State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2014-2015 Transfer Applicants

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

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

Table 6 presents the number and percent of transfer students admitted by each state university under the 10 percent exception window. This information is disaggregated by institution and by residency status. No institution exceeded the 10 percent limit, though the number of resident and nonresident transfer students admitted as exceptions increased from the previous year by 0.6%.
Table 6: Number of Transfer Students Admitted as Exceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resident Exceptions</th>
<th>Resident Admits</th>
<th>Resident Percent</th>
<th>Non-Resident Exceptions</th>
<th>Non-Resident Admits</th>
<th>Non-Resident Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emporia State University</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Hays State University</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1,821</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg State University</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,184</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State Total: Resident</th>
<th>State Total: Non-Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>7,924</td>
<td>5,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exception</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Yield Rate is the number of students who enrolled divided by the number of students who were admitted.

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

Table 8: Number of Transfer Applicant Denials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resident Denials</th>
<th>Resident Applied</th>
<th>Resident Percent</th>
<th>Non-Resident Denials</th>
<th>Non-Resident Applied</th>
<th>Non-Resident Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emporia State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Hays State University</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg State University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State University</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2,261</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Act on Request for New Certificate of Approval with Degree Granting Authority for Trinity International University

Staff Recommendation

Trinity International University requests approval for a new Certificate of Approval to operate in Kansas with degree granting authority. After a thorough review of staff qualifications, record keeping systems, coursework, materials, and online platforms, the institution demonstrates it meets and complies with all statutorily imposed requirements. Staff recommends issuance of a new Certificate of Approval with degree granting authority.

Summary of Institution Requirements

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

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

Trinity International University – Leawood, KS (extension site)

Trinity International University began operations as a not-for-profit organization in 1897. The University offers graduate level masters and doctoral degrees through its Evangelical Divinity School, Trinity Graduate School, and Trinity Law School. The University’s Evangelical Divinity School will operate an extension site located in Leawood, Kansas. The main campus is located in Deerfield, Illinois, where it also offers undergraduate degrees. The school’s religious affiliation is with the Evangelical Free Church of America.

Graduation rate data (based on the data submitted for the Deerfield campus including extension sites) are based on undergraduate students who enrolled full-time and have never enrolled in college before. This may not represent all undergraduates who attend this institution. The U.S. Department of Education reports 66% of entering students at Trinity International University were counted as full-time, first-time students in 2014, and a graduation rate of 46% for students who began their studies in fall of 2006 or 2008. The reported cohort default rate for fiscal year 2012 was 6.1%. Trinity International University’s total enrollment for the fall of 2014 was 2,202; 873 of those were undergraduate students.

Trinity International University is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission, an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). The institution is also accredited by the Association of Theological Schools Commission on Accreditation, a national faith-related accrediting organization recognized by the USDE and CHEA. These accreditations, according to K.S.A. 74-32,168 of the Postsecondary Educational Institution Act, may be accepted as evidence of compliance with the statutory standards for approval.

Degrees Requested by Trinity International University for Approval:
- Master of Arts in Theological Studies
3. Act on Request for Approval of Courses for Systemwide Transfer

Summary and Staff Recommendation

The Transfer and Articulation Council (TAAC) has reviewed reports from the fall 2015 Kansas Core Outcome Group meetings and approved outcomes for ten additional courses to be recognized for transfer across the Kansas Board of Regent System. The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee reviewed the additional courses and recommends approval.

Background

The discipline-based Kansas Core Outcomes Groups established learning outcomes for the courses listed below at the annual fall 2015 meeting at Johnson County Community College. TAAC has reviewed and approved these course outcomes and presents the courses to the Kansas Board of Regents.

2016-17 Courses Presented for Approval

The following list of courses is presented to the Board for approval for system wide transfer:

- Biology I and Lab for Majors
- Engineering Physics I and Lab
- Engineering Physics II and Lab
- General Chemistry and Lab for Non Majors
- Introduction to Criminal Justice
- Introduction to Mass Communication
- Introduction to Social Work
- Personal and Community Health
- Personal Finance
- Physical Geology

Staff Recommendation

The Board Academic Affairs Standing Committee recommends approval to include the ten courses listed above in the system wide course transfer matrix.
C. Fiscal Affairs & Audit

1. Receive Information on Lease of State-Owned Property to Wichita State Innovation Alliance (WSIA) – WSU

Regent Feuerborn
Greg Hoffman,
Director of Facilities

Wichita State University requests Board of Regents authorization to lease space within the Experiential Engineering Building (EEB) to the Wichita State Innovation Alliance (WSIA). The intent to include space in the EEB (formerly named Tech II Facility) for future business tenants was described in the Architectural Program Statement dated December 18, 2013, and was approved by the Board of Regents at the January 2014 meeting. Additionally, bonds sold through the Wichita Public Building Commission anticipated a combination of state and private uses within the building. Within that bond sale, there were both non-taxable and taxable bonds.

Approximately 31,795 square feet of space has now been identified in the 142,661 square foot EEB to accommodate industry needs or requests. Modifications to the areas currently identified may be necessary, but the overall leased square footage will not exceed an additional ten percent.

Authority from the Board to lease the spaces identified to WSIA will allow the University to enter into discussions with potential tenants in an expeditious manner with some assurance that important industry partnerships can be realized. The university will comply with requirements set forth in the Board’s Policy Manual and state law pertaining to leases and notifications. The EEB is currently under construction and the expected completion date is October 14, 2016.

Wichita State University notified the Board in September 2015 that it would request this authorization, although at that time 17,000 square feet of space had been identified in the 123,000 square foot EEB for industry needs or requests. The increase in leased space is for the Maker Space which was to be finished at a later date, but which has now been added as part of the construction of finished space within the building. Once the Board grants authority for WSU to lease the identified space, no further Board action will be required. Board policy requires approval when the university leases from a related organization, but not in the reverse.

2. Authorize Lease with Bromley Naismith, LLC – KU

The University of Kansas requests authorization to enter into a lease agreement with Bromley Naismith, LLC to satisfy intermediate student housing needs beginning in Fall Semester 2016.

While the University is constructing new housing facilities, renovating and replacing others, there is an intermediate need for additional housing options until this process is complete, potentially until 2020. The University desires to enter into a lease for up to approximately 150 beds in Naismith Hall. These units will be operated as part of the KU Student Housing system, with on-site residence life staff assigned to the facilities. The University would sublease the space to the students and be responsible to the landlords for payment of rent and oversight of student occupancy.

KU issued a public Request for Proposal (RFP) on August 28, 2015. All local apartment complexes as well as the Lawrence Apartment Association were notified of the event. The RFP closed on September 18, 2015, with two responses. Bromley Naismith was selected for final negotiations by a Procurement Negotiating Committee that included the Department of Student Housing, the Office of Capital Planning and Space Management, and Procurement Services. Of the two respondents, Bromley Naismith, LLC had the lowest proposed pricing as well as providing the most similar environment to the on-campus Student Housing System, including meal plans and access to the campus bus system, as this facility is immediately adjacent to the south edge of campus.
The lease would take effect with the beginning of the Fall 2016 semester. The rates for these units would be set at $8,450 for a single, $4,990 for a double per year. The students will take one of two options for a Naismith meal plan: all-meals served ($3,790 per academic year) or any two meals/day ($3,390 per academic year). As a point of comparison, the “typical” rate KU will charge students for a renovated double room, plus the Crimson Flex dining plan next year is $9,586.

3. Approve Transfer of Property from KU Hospital Authority and Amendment #7 to Master Ground Lease between the Board of Regents, KU and the KU Hospital Authority – KU

Background
The University of Kansas requests that the Board approve the transfer of property from the KU Hospital Authority as part of the Parking Garage #5 project and amendment #7 to the Master Ground Lease between the Board of Regents, the University and the KU Hospital Authority.

The University of Kansas (KU) plans to construct an approximately 2,200-space parking structure (Parking Garage #5) on the Kansas City campus of the University of Kansas Medical Center. Parking Garage #5 is expected to be complete by December 2017 and will be operated by KU as part of the parking enterprise. It will be used by employees, students, patients, and visitors of KU and University of Kansas Hospital Authority (Hospital).

The land on which Parking Garage #5 is to be constructed is currently owned by the Hospital and must be transferred to KU in order for KU to construct the Parking Garage #5 under K.S.A. 76-7,125–76-7,133 (the State Educational Institution Project Delivery Construction Procurement Act), and because the project will be financed with the sale of revenue bonds. The Hospital has agreed to transfer title to KU at no cost with the condition that ownership of the property and the structure revert to the Hospital five years after the bonds are retired.

Land Transfer and Reversion Agreement
The Hospital has agreed to transfer title through a special warranty deed. After the term of the bonds plus five years, title to the parcel will revert to the Hospital along with ownership of the parking structure. Upon reversion, KU will have the right to lease the land and the garage from the Hospital for a nominal amount for up to fifty years, and to continue to operate the garage as part of KU’s parking enterprise on the Kansas City campus. During the period that the land is owned by KU, the Hospital has agreed not to build, acquire, or utilize parking facilities that would compete with or reduce the Hospital’s utilization of KU’s parking enterprise on the KUMC campus. The parties have agreed to the major terms of a Parking Garage Development and Reversion Agreement that includes the terms outlined above. The final agreement will be reviewed by the KU Office of the General Counsel prior to execution.

The legal description of the property is as follows:

A parcel of land located in Lot 1, KU Medical Plaza, first plat, a subdivision in Kansas City, Wyandotte County, Kansas commencing at the northwest corner of said Lot 1 said corner being at the intersection of the east line of Eaton Avenue and the centerline of 37th Street (40’ wide) as now established; thence N 87°49'07" E (this and all following bearings are referenced to the Kansas State Plan Coordinate System, 1983 North Zone); thence along the north line of said Lot 1 to the west right-of-way line of Cambridge Avenue, as now established; thence S 02’00’45" E along said west line, a distance of 677.78 feet to the centerline of 38th Street (45’ wide) as now established, being the south line of said Lot 1; thence S 87°42’ 43” W along said south line, a distance of 271.98 feet to the east right-of-way line of Eaton Avenue as now established; thence N 02’05’18" W along said east line, a distance of 678.29 feet to the point of beginning. Contains 184,717 square feet or 4.241 acres, more or less.
Amend Master Ground Lease
When the KU Hospital Authority began operations in 1998, the KU Hospital premises were transferred to the KU Hospital Authority through a 99-year Master Ground Lease, executed pursuant to the legislation creating the Authority. In accordance with the enabling legislation, the Board of Regents must approve amendments to the Master Ground Lease in the event other Regents or State premises are determined to be appropriate for lease to the KU Hospital Authority.

In connection with the transfer of land for the Parking Garage, KU also requests approval to amend the 99-year Master Ground Lease between the Board of Regents, KU, and the Hospital, dated September 30, 1998. The Hospital is building a new facility adjacent to the Parking Garage and must locate certain equipment that supports that facility on the Parking Garage site. The purpose of this lease arrangement is to avoid the land setbacks that would be required if there are two separate landowners; such setbacks are not needed for the intended uses by KU and the Hospital.

Upon KU’s acquisition of the land from the Hospital, Lease Amendment No. 7 would add a portion of the parcel to the Hospital’s Master Ground Lease, for the period of KU ownership. Upon reversion of the land to the Hospital, Lease Amendment No. 7 will expire, and the subject land will revert to Hospital ownership.

Summary
Pursuant to the Board of Regents Policy Manual, Chapter II, Section 11.d, KU requests approval from the Board to acquire the parcel of land described above from the Hospital. A Phase I Environmental Assessment will be completed before the land is transferred to the University. In addition, KU requests that the Board approve Amendment #7 to the Master Ground Lease between the Board of Regents, KU and the Hospital.

Conclusion and Recommendation
Board Staff has reviewed the proposed Amendment No. 7 to the Master Ground Lease and has determined that these transactions as explained will support the University’s mission and purpose.
4. Approve Distribution of State Funds for Technical Education (SB 155 and AO-K Proviso) and Postsecondary Education Performance-Based Incentive Fund (GED Accelerator)

Elaine Frisbie
VP, Finance & Administration

Summary

Senate Bill 155 became law in FY 2013, providing state financed college tuition for high school students in postsecondary technical education courses and incentives to school districts for high school graduates earning identified industry-recognized credentials in high-demand occupations. The state appropriation for Tuition for Technical Education is $21,500,000 for FY 2016. Of this amount, $750,000 is for the incentives to school districts, $20.25 million is for tuition for high school students enrolled in postsecondary tiered technical courses and at least $500,000 is for tuition for adults without a high school diploma or GED enrolled in tiered technical courses in designated Accelerating Opportunity-Kansas (AO-K) approved pathways. Funding for tuition is distributed twice a year based on actual student enrollments submitted and certified to the Kansas Higher Education Data System by the colleges. The proposed distribution amounts presented were calculated based on current FY 2016 enrollments (summer and fall enrollments, as of November 6 2015).

The Legislature first provided funding in FY 2015 in support of the Postsecondary Education Performance-Based Incentives fund (known as the GED Accelerator initiative). This fund provides incentives to eligible institutions — community colleges (this year including Johnson County Community College), technical colleges and Washburn Institute of Technology—for adults seeking and earning a GED/high school equivalency diploma and/or an identified industry credential while enrolled in an eligible postsecondary technical education program. Eligible institutions can receive $170 for each adult enrolled in a postsecondary technical program while pursuing a GED/high school equivalency diploma ($150 of which must be used for the GED/high school equivalency tests), $500 for each adult earning a GED/high school equivalency diploma, and $1,000 for each adult earning an identified industry credential while enrolled in an eligible postsecondary technical education program. Funding for these incentives is distributed twice a year based on data submitted and certified by the institutions. The proposed incentive distribution amounts were based on current FY 2016 enrollments (summer and fall enrollments, as of November 6, 2015).

Background

Senate Bill 155, effective July 1, 2012, provides state financed college tuition for high school students in tiered postsecondary technical education courses and incentives to school districts for students earning identified industry-recognized credentials in high-demand occupations. Calculated tuition costs, credential incentives and state appropriations for Tuition for Technical Education have risen steadily since the beginning of this initiative.

Tuition for Technical Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
<th>Proposed 1st Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Student Tuition</td>
<td>20,250,000</td>
<td>$10,761,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO-K Adult Tuition</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>$314,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential Incentives</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$21,500,000</td>
<td>$11,076,379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GD Accelerator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>Amount Available</th>
<th>Proposed 1st Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,798,558</td>
<td>$55,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation
The following proposed distributions are recommended for approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>SB 155</th>
<th>AOK Proviso</th>
<th>GED Accelerator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen Community College</td>
<td>$193,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Community College</td>
<td>$164,077</td>
<td>$10,709</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler Community College</td>
<td>$301,669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud County Community College</td>
<td>$109,443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffeyville Community College</td>
<td>$352,920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby Community College</td>
<td>$11,309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowley Community College</td>
<td>$264,749</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge City Community College</td>
<td>$182,361</td>
<td>$2,433</td>
<td>$2,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Hills Technical College</td>
<td>$404,224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Scott Community College</td>
<td>$296,016</td>
<td>$8,615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City Community College</td>
<td>$29,406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Community College</td>
<td>$423,124</td>
<td>$11,991</td>
<td>$10,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson Community College</td>
<td>$1,231,123</td>
<td>$8,477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Community College</td>
<td>$49,169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County Community College</td>
<td>$846,733</td>
<td>$8,225</td>
<td>$2,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City Kansas Community College</td>
<td>$543,842</td>
<td>$81,930</td>
<td>$8,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labette Community College</td>
<td>$57,695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Area Technical College</td>
<td>$99,333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neosho County Community College</td>
<td>$416,628</td>
<td>$5,742</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Kansas Technical College</td>
<td>$147,890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Kansas Technical College</td>
<td>$444,704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt Community College</td>
<td>$137,234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salina Area Technical College</td>
<td>$389,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seward County Community College/ATS</td>
<td>$550,162</td>
<td>$27,896</td>
<td>$6,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washburn Institute of Technology</td>
<td>$1,510,382</td>
<td>$108,755</td>
<td>$14,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita Area Technical College</td>
<td>$1,604,368</td>
<td>$39,905</td>
<td>$1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$10,761,701</td>
<td>$314,678</td>
<td>$55,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Act on the Kansas Postsecondary Technical Education Authority Recommendation Regarding the Plan to Fully Implement the Postsecondary Tiered Technical Education State Aid Act

Summary

Proviso language was attached to the Tiered Technical Education State Aid appropriation for FY 2016 requiring the State Board of Regents to create a preliminary plan by November 1, 2015, in consultation with community colleges and technical colleges, to fully implement the provisions of K.S.A. 71-1803(a) according to the Postsecondary Tiered Technical Education State Aid Act, and to submit a final plan to the Legislature by February 1, 2016.

One distribution option recommended by the Kansas Postsecondary Technical Education Authority (TEA), conditioned on appropriation of new funding, was accepted by the Board at its October meeting as the preliminary plan. The Board requested additional options, including an implementation plan without new money, which the TEA then recommended and presented to the Board in December. Because further study of the alternative plan was desired, the Board referred the matter to its Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee so the community and technical college presidents’ input could be incorporated within the Board’s communication of the plan to the Legislature.

Background

In 2011, following conversations with community college, technical college and institute leaders, Senate Bill 143 (K.S.A. 71-1801 et seq.) was enacted. The legislation created a new postsecondary education cost model to be used for distribution of technical education state appropriations (postsecondary tiered technical education state aid) and was later determined to be used for determining distribution of state aid for “general education” credit hours (non-tiered course credit hour grant) at the community and technical colleges.

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

The heart of the approach in determining funding under these two pieces of legislation is the KBOR cost model, which calculates a course level cost rate and recognizes the cost differential in delivering technical rather than general education courses. K.S.A. 71-1803 (a) reads as follows:

In each fiscal year, commencing with the 2012 fiscal year, each community college, technical college and the Washburn institute of technology is eligible for postsecondary tiered technical education state aid from the state general fund for postsecondary tiered technical course credit hours approved by the state board and delivered by the institution to students who are residents of the state of Kansas, in an amount to be determined by the state board using a credit hour cost calculation model that: (1) Is tiered to recognize and support cost differentials in providing high-demand, high-tech training; (2) takes into consideration target industries critical to the Kansas economy; (3) is responsive to program growth; (4) takes into consideration local taxing authority for credit hours generated by in-district students; and (5) includes other factors and considerations as deemed necessary or advisable by the state board. The state board shall establish the rates to be used as the state’s share in a given year, as well as in the actual distribution.

Total Course Rate = Instructor Costs + Extraordinary Costs + Instructional Support Costs + Institutional Support Costs
Instructor Costs = Faculty salary costs as reported to the National Community College Cost and Productivity Project conducted by Johnson County Community College (JCCC) annually. Of the 25 two-year colleges in Kansas, nine contribute instructor cost data (36 nationwide) to this project, which is used to determine instructor costs in the KBOR Postsecondary Tiered Technical State Aid Cost Model. Participation in the cost study is voluntary.

Extraordinary Costs = Costs to purchase additional supplies, materials and specialized equipment needed to provide intensive, hands-on learning opportunities within technical education (e.g., welders, patient simulators, cattle feeders, lab supplies). The “extraordinary” amount is an additional per-credit value assigned to each program, based on the needs of the courses within the program. Institutions submit actual expenditure data reflecting these types of expenses in programs identified with intensive extraordinary expenses.

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

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

There are 25 cost model composite rates, which for 2015 range from $162/credit hour to $434/credit hour. The following course example is provided to illustrate the components:

Carpentry Basics is a Tier 3 course offered at eight of the institutions. For this particular four-credit hour course, the institutions would receive $341/student credit hour from the state under the cost model, assuming it was “fully funded”: $151 Instructor Costs + $112 Extraordinary Costs + $35 Instructional Support Costs + $43 Institutional Support costs. The total course rate for the four credit hours would be 4 X $341 = $1,364, of which state would pay 1/3 for in district students or 2/3 for out district or technical college students. Colleges would receive either $455 or $909 per students from the state, depending on the student. Student tuition and local property taxes would make up the difference to $1,364.

Statutory Definitions for Non-Tiered and Tiered Courses

“Non-tiered course” means any postsecondary credit-bearing course offered by an eligible institution and identified by the State Board of Regents as not meeting the definition of a tiered technical course. Non-tiered courses include courses that are generally designed to:

1. Contribute to academic knowledge or skills across multiple disciplines and occupations, such as communication, writing, mathematics, humanities, social or behavioral science and natural or physical science courses, some of which may be considered for transfer as general education credit toward a baccalaureate degree;

2. Contribute to general knowledge or skills in areas such as critical thinking and reasoning, problem solving, use of technology and teamwork skills;

3. Provide instruction in basic or foundational skills necessary for individuals to effectively participate in technical programs;
(4) Prepare individuals for certification or licensure exams or re-certifications and skill updates; or

(5) Allow individuals to explore various career opportunities. Seminars, workshops or other courses that are supplemental to the primary instruction required for the occupationally specific technical program shall be considered non-tiered courses, unless otherwise specified by the State Board.4

“Tiered technical course” means a postsecondary credit-bearing course included in the sequence of courses comprising a technical program. The course must be designed to provide competency-based applied instruction to prepare individuals with occupationally specific knowledge and skills necessary for employment, and which the State Board of Regents has identified as a tiered technical course.5

When a decision is made to move a course from one category to the other, it is done based on the statutory definitions noted above. In 2014 and 2015, two rounds of review were done for tiered courses to determine whether courses were properly categorized according to the statute. For both Round 1 and Round 2 courses, the list of courses was initially generated by staff for discussion and review, then review and discussion occurred through the Process Management Committee6 and then subsequently through the Tiered/Non-Tiered Course Reclassification Subcommittee, who then made the recommendations for identified courses to be moved from tiered to non-tiered status (based on the statutory definitions listed above). These recommendations were approved by the TEA Program/Curriculum Committee, the full TEA and then the Board of Regents. Institutions were provided the opportunity to appeal movement of individual courses. For Round 1 courses, none of the five courses appealed were approved to stay as tiered courses. For Round 2 courses, two of the three courses appealed were approved to remain as tiered courses. A review of courses with non-tiered status will begin in 2016.

Cost Model Funding Calculation

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

The “state’s share”7 of the total calculated cost was to be determined based on student credit hours:

- Community College in district SCH8 = 1/3 student, 1/3 local taxing district, 1/3 state
- Community College out district SCH = 1/3 student, 2/3 state
- All Technical College SCH = 1/3 student, 2/3 state
- Secondary students in SB 155 = 100% state

When the funding assumptions were initially set, they were aspirational—in hopes that the student would contribute only 20% (tuition), the local taxing district 30%, and the state 50% for community college students residing within the college’s taxing district. For technical colleges and community college students residing outside the college’s taxing district, the aspirational assumptions were that students would contribute 20% (tuition) and the state would contribute 80%. As years passed, it became apparent that the reality of the state’s contribution,

6 Composed of presidents of the community and technical colleges, the Process Management Committee (PMC) has served as a resource to the TEA.
7 The calculated share of the state, local community and the state under the cost model are based on a number of assumptions, including “full funding” by the Legislature.
8 An in district community college student resides within the college’s taxing district (which is the local county with the exception of Montgomery County which has two community colleges so the county is divided in roughly half).
the local contribution, and what students were being charged for tuition is actually closer to 1/3 each. In recognition of this current reality, the Process Management Committee\(^9\) and Technical Education Authority (TEA) advised the Board of Regents and the assumptions of the calculated state’s share were changed to reflect what is shown above.

For the most recent year for which IPEDS financial data is available, the community colleges received $227.8 million in local and private funds (\textit{i.e.}, property taxes). Technical colleges do not have authority to levy a property tax, although one institution, Wichita Area Technical College, is the recipient of Sedgwick County support, which totaled $893,000 in FY 2014. Student tuition and fees generated $122.6 million in FY 2014 for the community colleges, and $16.2 million for technical colleges. In visual terms, the chart below outlines the entirety of the colleges’ financial support.

![Chart showing sources of revenue for community and technical colleges.](chart.png)

**Context**

In the 2013-2014 academic year, 56 percent of the community college credit hours were in district, 44 percent out district (generally, 100 percent of technical college credit hours are in district). For all colleges, 72 percent of the credit hours were non-tiered, 28 percent tiered.

\(^9\) Composed of presidents of the community and technical colleges, the Process Management Committee (PMC) served as a resource to the TEA.
The community and technical colleges and WIT generated a combined 1.48 million student credit hours for over 123,000 postsecondary students (headcount); a decrease of 9.9 percent SCH from the peak year of 2010-2011.

**Plan to Implement Cost Model**

From FY 2012 through FY 2017, the Legislature attached a “hold harmless” provision to the appropriation language that holds all state aid for tiered technical education state aid frozen; each college receives at least the same amount as the college received from this fund in the prior year. This provision has kept financing of the colleges static (except as new money was added), with no regard for programs, enrollment or cost model information described above, although the cost data have been collected over the time period from the institutions. The 2015 Legislature asked the Board to provide a plan on how to fully implement the cost model envisioned in the law. A subcommittee of the TEA met on numerous occasions and developed, in concert with the TEA, a plan for the Board of Regents to consider. As it now stands, the plan’s options differ according to the availability of new state funding:
Option A:
- Request additional funding for Postsecondary Tiered Technical Education State Aid to fully fund the gap between what is considered the state share of the calculated costs and the current appropriated amount. The Board has included an amount in its budget request to the Governor and Legislature to fund this gap.
- Any new funding that might be appropriated for Postsecondary Tiered Technical Education State Aid should be distributed to only those institutions with a funding shortfall identified in the cost model calculations. Institutions with no funding shortfall would maintain their current base.
- Begin resolving the remaining funding distribution disparity for institutions still receiving less than their institution’s calculated state share in the following year.
- Address the non-tiered funding distribution since there has been no additional state funding for non-tiered courses since the Non-Tiered Course Credit Hour Grants were established in SB 143 and, using current statutory definitions, a number of courses have been moved from tiered status to non-tiered status during this time.

Option B:
- Address the funding distribution disparity over a four-year period
  - If an institution is currently receiving an amount above their calculated state share, then reduce state aid to those institutions by one-fourth of the amount received over the calculated state share in each year over the four-year period with those funds going into a designated funding redistribution pool for institutions receiving less than their calculated state share.
  - Increase the base amount for institutions receiving less than their calculated state share using funds from the redistribution pool based on each institution’s percentage of the overall funding shortfall.
- Address the calculated state share funding shortfall over a four-year period
  - Request the Legislature appropriate new funding to the tiered technical education state aid appropriation that is equal to or more than one-fourth of the overall calculated funding shortfall each year over the four-year period.
- Revisit full implementation of tiered technical education funding in the fifth year assuming full funding of the calculated state share cost amount.

The Postsecondary Technical Education Authority recommends Option A, which would provide state support consistent with the cost model. A majority of the TEA also voted in support of Option B, in recognition that the model was originally developed to direct state support where the tiered student credit hours are generated. Although Option A makes it appear that several institutions will not experience reduced state funding, a number of those institutions have consistently received less than they would if the cost model were deployed, and Option A continues that pattern.

It should be noted that while no specific dollar amounts have been cited here, the attached charts and graphs do make note of the preliminary estimates, for tiered technical state aid. Readers should note that amounts will vary year to year, as the cost model calculations are updated.

Input from Community College Presidents:
The 19 Community College Presidents support Option A, and do not support Option B. The attached letter from the Kansas Association of Community College Trustees outlines their objections to Option B, and also includes a letter that was previously shared with Board members in November.

Input from Technical College Presidents:
The six Technical College Presidents are united in favor of Option A, but are mixed in their support of Option B. Attached are letters from the Kansas Association of Technical Colleges and Wichita Area Technical College that further explain their positions.
The tables that follow are provided to give a context on the size of the community and technical colleges’ budgets relative to the magnitude of the potential change that could result if either of the options were adopted, using the current year’s cost model calculations.

Option A was the initial plan recommended by the TEA to the Board and would bring the state appropriation to a level that fully funds the calculated state share, as it is currently estimated for next year. Fourteen institutions would receive additional state aid under this option and twelve would remain at the same level. With that option, there remains a disparity in the distribution, to be resolved in FY 2018.

The alternative more recently recommended by the TEA, Option B, would shift state aid among the 26 institutions over a four-year period. To put the estimated amounts in to perspective, it was suggested by the president of Hutchinson Community College that the increment/decrement be compared to the combined revenue total of each college’s general fund and postsecondary technical education fund, where it was available. Technical colleges do not identify their funds in this manner, so the total revenue minus auxiliary revenue from their published budget was used instead as a point of reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option A: Fully Fund State’s Share</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Distribution FY 2017</td>
<td>Eliminate Gap to Finance State’s Share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salina Area Tech Col</td>
<td>$1,902,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest KS Tech Col</td>
<td>$2,167,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowley County CC</td>
<td>$2,522,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen County CC</td>
<td>$1,327,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud County CC</td>
<td>$1,364,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffeyville CC</td>
<td>$1,221,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence CC</td>
<td>$558,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central KS Tech Col</td>
<td>$2,780,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge City CC</td>
<td>$1,175,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City CC</td>
<td>$1,012,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seward County CC</td>
<td>$1,184,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland CC</td>
<td>$1,833,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labette CC</td>
<td>$1,129,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Scott CC</td>
<td>$1,508,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City Kansas CC</td>
<td>$4,327,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton County CC</td>
<td>$3,519,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint Hills Tech Col</td>
<td>$1,782,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt CC</td>
<td>$1,189,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Area Tech Col</td>
<td>$1,888,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler CC</td>
<td>$4,210,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby CC</td>
<td>$686,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washburn Institute of Tech</td>
<td>$2,672,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neosho County CC</td>
<td>$1,346,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson CC</td>
<td>$4,025,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson County CC</td>
<td>$6,331,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita Area Tech Col</td>
<td>$4,631,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Total</td>
<td>$58,300,961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Option B: Recenter State Aid over Four Years | State Distribution FY 2017 | Year 1 Recentering | % of Total Revenue * |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Salina Area Tech Col | $1,902,359 | ($192,447) | -4.75% |
| Northwest KS Tech Col | $2,167,150 | ($188,054) | -2.58% |
| Cowley County CC | $2,522,617 | ($173,332) | -0.83% |
| Allen County CC | $1,327,682 | ($137,360) | -1.23% |
| Cloud County CC | $1,364,544 | ($73,111) | -0.71% |
| Coffeyville CC | $1,221,618 | ($72,111) | -0.52% |
| Independence CC | $558,696 | ($67,405) | -0.77% |
| North Central KS Tech Col | $2,780,418 | ($60,614) | -0.72% |
| Dodge City CC | $1,175,522 | ($50,566) | -0.28% |
| Garden City CC | $1,012,931 | ($91,615) | -0.09% |
| Seward County CC | $1,184,770 | ($11,072) | -0.06% |
| Highland CC | $1,833,643 | ($6,625) | -0.04% |
| Labette CC | $1,129,177 | $9,280 | 0.08% |
| Ft. Scott CC | $1,508,091 | $13,416 | 0.09% |
| Kansas City Kansas CC | $4,327,739 | $30,972 | 0.05% |
| Barton County CC | $3,519,807 | $42,274 | 0.11% |
| Flint Hills Tech Col | $1,782,114 | $46,811 | 0.63% |
| Pratt CC | $1,189,810 | $55,026 | 0.39% |
| Manhattan Area Tech Col | $1,888,581 | $60,101 | 0.95% |
| Butler CC | $4,210,703 | $63,256 | 0.12% |
| Colby CC | $686,652 | $82,952 | 0.81% |
| Washburn Institute of Tech | $2,672,608 | $97,723 | 0.76% |
| Neosho County CC | $1,346,013 | $100,554 | 0.71% |
| Hutchinson CC | $4,025,083 | $112,403 | 0.28% |
| Johnson County CC | $6,331,211 | $117,225 | 0.70% |
| Wichita Area Tech Col | $4,631,422 | $220,318 | 0.90% |
| System Total | $58,300,961 | $0 | | * "Total Revenue" = General Fund + Postsec. Technical Education Fund, except for the following: Independence Community College and the technical colleges. Total revenue adjusted for auxiliaries was used instead for these institutions.}
January 5, 2015

Dear Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee:

Our reasons for opposing the alternative option as a plan to implement the proviso include but are not limited to:

1. Our community colleges are united in believing “recentering” this year with no new money is unacceptable.
2. The proviso does not require redistributing one college’s base funding to another college. The pertinent part says:

“...the state board of regents shall create a preliminary plan to fully implement the provisions of K.S.A. 2014 Supp. 71-1803(a), and amendments thereto, in consultation with technical colleges and community colleges, according to the postsecondary tiered technical education state aid act, K.S.A. 2014 Supp. 71-1801 through 71-1810, and amendments thereto, prior to November 1, 2015:...”

3. The same proviso that has caused this proposed approach, also states:

“...no eligible institution shall receive an amount of money from the postsecondary tiered technical education state aid account (PSTTESAA) in fiscal year 2016 that is less than the amount such eligible institution received from such account in fiscal year 2015, unless the amount of moneys appropriated for the above agency for fiscal year 2015 in the PSTTESAA for fiscal year 2016 is less than the amount of moneys appropriated for the above agency for fiscal year 2015 in the PSTTESAA...”
The legislature approved this same language year after year. There is no need for KBOR to take an action that would hurt eleven of our colleges when it is not required by the legislature.

4. The Community colleges are interested in reforming the funding formula but do not support the alternative option being presented at KBOR's request.

5. We had agreed to any new funds being distributed according to the formula; any cuts being taken across the board for each college; and if there is no new funding and no cuts, funding remains as it now is.

6. To understand how unjust such a "redistribution of funds" as the alternative option proposes could be, let me give you a real college example of what changing assumptions and moving courses from tiered to non-tiered has done.

   - By KBOR figures in 2013, Allen was to receive $1,616,100 in tiered funding and $1,604,098 in non-tiered funding.
   - By KBOR figures in 2014, Allen was to receive $1,425,064 in tiered funding and $1,504,278 in non-tiered funding.
   - By KBOR figures in 2015, Allen was to receive $1,328,937 in tiered funding and $1,453,626 in non-tiered funding.
   - By KBOR figures in 2016, due to the new assumptions, now that KBOR wishes to "recenter", Allen is to lose $493,450 in tiered funding over two years and gain $1,104,144 in non-tiered funding. However, there is not even a plan to ask for and support new funding for non-tiered funding. So Allen will not recover those funds. Those students and that college stand to lose half a million dollars in two years if this idea contained in those spreadsheets moves forward.

   The newest spreadsheet by KBOR, FY 15, now seeks to redistribute $549,439 from Allen to other colleges. It only receives $1,327,682 now. That is a 41% reduction!

7. All colleges who grew enrollments ever had was a hope that they would get new money appropriated.

We ask that you DO NOT adopt the alternate option, but instead agree to implement the plan with new money and agree to review the formula prior to any serious consideration of redistributing money that is currently in colleges' base funding.

Sincerely,

Linda Fund, Executive Director of KACCT
on behalf of all nineteen community colleges and KACCT

attachment
November 17, 2015

Dear Dr. Flanders,

Thank you for meeting with Allie and I last Thursday to discuss the importance of funding. We discussed the position of the community colleges regarding following the subcommittee process and TEA recommendation on implementing the proviso, and on a KBOR proposal for "recentering" without new funding. We also discussed the nineteen colleges' position with regard to the three pronged approach they support, which is:

1. Any new funds would be distributed according to the formula;
2. Any cuts would be taken across the board for each college;
3. If there is no new funding and no cuts, funding remains as it now is.

As you know, the community colleges believe the process should be allowed to work. The TEA appointed a subcommittee to work on tiered and non-tiered issues. Among the topics the subcommittee was tasked with was deciding how to meet the terms of the proviso attached to an appropriations bill last year.

The proviso in pertinent part says:

"...the state board of regents shall create a preliminary plan to fully implement the provisions of K.S.A. 2014 Supp. 71-1803(a), and amendments thereto, in consultation with technical colleges and community colleges, according to the postsecondary tiered technical education state aid act, K.S.A. 2014 Supp. 71-1801 through 71-1810, and amendments thereto, prior to November 1, 2015: And provided further, That the state board shall submit the final plan to the house committee on appropriations and the senate committee on ways and means no later than February 1, 2016."

Kansas Association of Community College Trustees
700 SW Jackson, Suite 1000, Topeka KS 66603, 785.357.5156
The subcommittee met many times and spent many, many hours on this very topic. This subcommittee had representatives from the technical colleges and the community colleges on it as well as TEA members. Their final decision was the way to meet the terms of the proviso and implement the statutes is to ask for $8.3M to be appropriated and distributed to the colleges who are not fully funded according to the formula. The subcommittee additionally decided that if the legislature or Governor cut the two year sector, the cuts would be taken across the board. The subcommittee specifically decided not to suggest "recentering" if no new money was received. The sub-committee decision meets the terms of the proviso and addresses how the TEA and KBOR will implement the statutes for post-secondary technical aid. This was the recommended to the TEA, and on September 24, the TEA moved to unanimously accept that recommendation and provide it to KBOR.

It is our understanding that KBOR indicated it did not wish to accept that decision or recommendation. It is also our understanding that KBOR staff was instructed to bring back a method to implement the statutes without any new funding and to do it over 3 to 5 years. The spreadsheets from KBOR staff that we saw prior to the last TEA meeting had no vetting with the colleges prior to their distribution. We believe that decisions with huge impact to colleges, involving the taking of their funds, should not occur without thorough vetting with the affected colleges. Under the scenarios provided in those spreadsheets, eleven colleges would get cut, some deeply. We strongly oppose this proposal.

The same proviso that has caused this proposed approach, also states:

"...no eligible institution shall receive an amount of money from the postsecondary tiered technical education state aid account (PSTTESAA) in fiscal year 2016 that is less than the amount such eligible institution received from such account in fiscal year 2015, unless the amount of moneys appropriated for the above agency for fiscal year 2015 in the PSTTESAA for fiscal year 2016 is less than the amount of moneys appropriated for the above agency for fiscal year 2015 in the PSTTESAA..."

The legislature approved this same language year after year. There is no need for KBOR to take an action that would hurt eleven of our colleges when it is not required by the legislature. None of our colleges are overfunded. It is important to remember each
college brought money with them in 1999 when they came under KBOR coordination. They have received no new money for non-tiered courses since FY 2008, and they took a 2.5% cut two years ago. We are grateful the Legislature has left us unharmed and given us SB 155 funding. Those actions are MOST welcome and necessary. To this point, post-secondary tiered technical funding has only had one appropriation of $8 million which only went to one half of our colleges according to an agreed upon formula.

To understand how unjust such a cut could be, let me give you a real college example of what changing assumptions and moving courses from tiered to non-tiered has done.

- By KBOR figures in 2013, Allen was to receive $1,616,100 in tiered funding and $1,604,098 in non-tiered funding.
- By KBOR figures in 2014, Allen was to receive $1,425,064 in tiered funding and $1,504,278 in non-tiered funding.
- By KBOR figures in 2015, Allen was to receive $1,328,937 in tiered funding and $1,453,626 in non-tiered funding.
- By KBOR figures in 2016, now that KBOR wishes to “recenter”, Allen is to lose $493,450 in tiered funding over two years and gain $1,104,144 in non-tiered funding. However, there is not even a plan to ask for and support new funding for non-tiered funding. So Allen will not recover those funds. Those students and that college stand to lose half a million dollars in two years if this idea contained in those spreadsheets moves forward.

As for non-tiered general education courses and funding, no vetting has occurred with regard to assumptions, the appropriate state subsidy for a credit hour and other such issues. We hope we can begin those discussions so that harm is not done by a KBOR recommendation.

Our community colleges are united in believing “recentering” this year with no new money is unacceptable. We ask that KBOR accept and follow the recommendation of the TEA subcommittee. The Community colleges are interested in reforming the funding formula but do not support the proposal presented.
Dr. Blake Flanders
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Our Tiered Non-Tiered Subcommittee members just received nine spreadsheets from your staff for a meeting on Monday. At first blush, none of them seem to even take into consideration our position.

I am hopeful our request will be given consideration.

Sincerely,

On behalf of the nineteen community colleges in KACCT,
Linda Fund, Executive Director
Date: January 8, 2016

To: Fiscal Affairs & Audit Committee of the Kansas Board of Regents

From: Eric Burks, President
K Kansas Association of Technical Colleges

Re: Postsecondary Tiered Technical State Aid

The 2015 Kansas legislature passed a budget proviso in House Substitute for Senate Bill 112 regarding postsecondary tiered technical state aid as follows:

And provided further, That the state board of regents shall create a preliminary plan to fully implement the provisions of K.S.A. 2014 Supp. 71-1803(a), and amendments thereto, in consultation with technical colleges and community colleges, according to the postsecondary tiered technical education state aid act, K.S.A. 2014 Supp. 71-1801 through 71-1810, and amendments thereto, prior to November 1, 2015: And provided further, That the state board shall submit the final plan to the house committee on appropriations and the senate committee on ways and means no later than February 1, 2016.

The Kansas Board of Regents requested the Kansas Association of Technical Colleges (KATC) provide input on behalf of the technical colleges regarding the aforementioned proviso. KATC is a seven member consortium made up of six technical colleges and Washburn Institute of Technology. Our members deliver high demand, hands-on, industry-driven education and training to develop a strong workforce for Kansas. Our collective focus is to provide Kansas companies with the skilled employees they need to succeed.

KATC member institutions produce the highest graduation rates in Kansas, place over 90% of those graduates into jobs, and over 90% of those jobs are in Kansas! Technical colleges are also experiencing the fastest enrollment growth in Kansas. Increasing demand for our services to the Kansas workforce is a positive indicator that we are providing the relevant programs needed by Kansas employers.

This increased demand, coupled with the postsecondary tiered technical state aid cost model not being fully funded, places a tremendous strain on our resources and jeopardizes the ability for us to sustain our current levels of success for Kansas. We encourage you to recommend and vigorously support the full funding of the postsecondary tiered technical state aid.
The Kansas Board of Regents has been presented two suggested approaches for consideration for inclusion in its report pursuant to the above proviso.

1. **KATC members unanimously support the preferred option which provides additional $4.2M in state funding for the cost model.** The methodology used to calculate the amount needed was developed in response to a previous legislative request to determine the cost of providing technical education and indicates current funding levels are insufficient.

2. **As a secondary option to additional state funding, KATC membership stands 4-3 in support of the alternative option to commence in FY2017.** Within our membership are the institutions whose current funding levels would be most dramatically impacted both positively and negatively by implementing this option.
   a. **The four member institutions supporting the alternative option include:**
      i. Flint Hills Technical College
      ii. Manhattan Area Technical College
      iii. Washburn Institute of Technology
      iv. Wichita Area Technical College
   b. **The three member institutions opposing the alternative option include:**
      i. North Central Kansas Technical College
      ii. Northwest Kansas Technical College
      iii. Salina Area Technical College

We are sensitive to the financial struggles of the state and realize the extreme challenges you face in balancing an already strained budget. Even with this knowledge, we request that you find a way to provide the necessary funding for technical education so we can assist in turning around the state's economy.
Date: January 6, 2016

To: The Kansas Board of Regents  
    Fiscal Affairs & Audit Committee

From: Lyndon Wells, Chairman of Board of Trustees  
      Wichita Area Technical College

Re: Support for Re-distribution of Post-Secondary Tiered Technical State Aid

As the Chairman of the Board of Trustees for the Wichita Area Technical College and as a local business leader, I am providing this letter of support for the immediate re-distribution of tiered technical education funding.

Post-secondary tiered technical state aid funds should follow student enrollment, funds due to WATC under the current formula are going to other institutions. Prohibiting the formula to work as designed hinders the ability of our College to meet the needs of our students and local businesses, resulting in a direct, negative impact to the local economy.

Sedgwick County is experiencing a resurgence in aviation, and the industry has expressed to us a desperate need for trained employees in the next year. We need funding to train skilled workers in sheet metal assembly, composites, avionics, and airframe and power plant mechanics. Funding is also needed for the expansion of labs for healthcare, construction and advanced manufacturing where the demand for trained, skilled labor is outpacing supply.

WATC has a high student placement rate and a proven ability to train and certify students with the skills needed to succeed in industry. The funding due to WATC under the tiered technical education formula will help supply the skilled workers needed by our industry partners. On behalf of our Board, I respectfully request that re-distributing of the tiered technical education state aid be implemented so that our College has the resources to meet the needs of our industry partners. The success of these great companies and continued presence in our county is critical to the Kansas economy.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Lyndon Wells  
Chairman of the Board of Trustees  
Wichita Area Technical College
Summary and Recommendations
As part of the Board goal to address possible inconsistencies in the way state universities handle Title IX investigations and proceedings, the Governance Committee is proposing a new policy to require notification of the Board President and Chief Executive Officer before a state university initiates certain actions in state or federal courts. The proposed policy also incorporates the statutory Attorney General’s office notice requirement. The proposed amendments have been reviewed and are recommended for approval by the Board Governance Committee.

Background
In November of 2013, the University of Kansas expelled a student, after an investigation and hearing, for violation of the University’s sexual harassment policy. The University’s policy was crafted, in part, to ensure that the University complied with responsibilities imposed by Title IX. The student appealed the expulsion decision to the state district court in Douglas County, arguing that the conduct for which he was expelled occurred off campus and therefore the University lacked jurisdiction over that conduct. The district court agreed, based on the court’s interpretation of language in the University’s student code of conduct and the evidence that had been presented. The University appealed the district court’s ruling to the Kansas Court of Appeals, arguing that the district court’s interpretation of the code of conduct was in error and that the University policy needed to be read in conjunction with Title IX mandates, which the University argued included the responsibility to investigate and act on student complaints of any sexual harassment resulting in an on-campus hostile environment for the complainant, unreasonably interfering with his or her learning environment regardless where the acts of harassment occurred.

Kansas State University attorneys had been following the case from the time it had been filed in the district court. They were interested in the case primarily because they had made the determination that Title IX did not require the University to investigate and hear student complaints of sexual harassment when the harassing activity did not occur on campus or at a campus sponsored event. Their concern was heightened when the case was appealed to the Court of Appeals, the ruling of which could have impacted all the universities by the Court’s interpretation of Title IX responsibilities.

Though the attorneys for both institutions had discussed the situation and attempted to come to terms, they were unsuccessful in reaching a mutual understanding of the law and/or the practical effects of interpreting the law in various ways. Accordingly, Kansas State University filed an amicus brief with the Court of Appeals taking a position contrary to that of the University of Kansas. Board members became aware of the controversy only when it was reported in the news.

The Court of Appeals ultimately upheld the district court’s ruling, declining to decide the issue of Title IX’s reach, and the University of Kansas did not further appeal the decision.

The Policy
One of the Board’s goals for the 2015-2016 academic year is to “study current campus Title IX practices, policies, and procedures and develop a Board policy to add uniformity to current university practices, policies, and procedures.” This goal was established partly in response to the controversy described above. The Board believed that having state universities disagree about the parameters of this federal law was unacceptable.

After reviewing this issue, the Governance Committee determined that a policy should be adopted providing that before two or more state universities take opposing positions in any court, the Board should be made aware of that
intended action. Thus, the below proposed addition to Board Policy would require notification of the Board regardless of the issue and level or jurisdiction of the court involved.

F. OTHER

1 INTERACTION WITH LEGISLATURE, COURTS, AND OTHER STATE AGENCIES

a Legislative Appearances and Committee Hearings

State university employees should make every effort to accommodate legislative committee requests to provide expert testimony on proposed legislation. The university shall notify the Board President and Chief Executive Officer of the invitation.

b Legislative Requests and Proposed Legislation (Also see FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION)

i All requests for funds, programs, changes in legislation and new legislation affecting the Board and system institutions shall be submitted to the Board for consideration no later than the November meeting of the Board. Emergency situations may warrant special exceptions, but to the extent possible, no request for legislation during the ongoing legislative session shall be submitted after the March meeting of the Board. Requests for funds, programs, changes in legislation and new legislation that are approved by the Board shall be included in the Board’s annual legislative proposals. Requests that are not approved by the Board shall not be submitted to the Legislature for introduction.

ii Once approval has been granted, all institutions are authorized to work for these requests and each institution is expected to support the entire request. Conversely, all institutions are prohibited from requesting or working for additional legislation or funds.

iii When legislation having an effect on the operation of the higher education system, proposed by someone or some group other than the Board, is brought to the Board’s attention, it shall be the responsibility of the Board to make a decision as to whether the position of the system is that of support, non-support, or opposition.

c Legislative Post Audit Reports

i Each state university, upon receiving notification from the Legislative Division of Post Audit that a performance or financial audit of the university is to be conducted, shall forward such notification to the Board President and Chief Executive Officer. Each state university shall submit a written report to the Board, in accordance with the schedule maintained on the Board of Regents’ website, detailing progress during the preceding calendar year toward implementation of accepted Post Audit recommendations. This report shall be made on an annual basis until all accepted recommendations have been fully implemented.

ii Discussion of pending or anticipated Legislative Post Audits shall be a standing item on the Board’s Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee agenda.

d Information Requests from Other State Agencies

i System-wide Requests: Requests directed to state universities for system-wide information from other state agencies or other branches of state government shall be transmitted through the Board office. State universities receiving requests directly from other state agencies or branches of state government shall advise the requesting party of this policy and advise the Board office of the request. When time is not sufficient to allow transmission of responses through the Board office, responses may be submitted directly to the requesting party with copies to the Board office.
ii University-Specific Requests: Responses to requests received by a state university for information related specifically to that university may be sent directly to the requesting party, with a copy to the Board office.

c Attorney General Opinions

Any state university or state university official wishing to seek an opinion from the Attorney General shall do so by making a request through the office of the General Counsel of the Board.

f Kansas Governmental Ethics Commission Opinions

Any state university or state university official wishing to seek an opinion from the Kansas Governmental Ethics Commission shall do so by making a request through the office of the General Counsel of the Board.

g Briefs Filed with State and Federal Courts

i Any state university intending to sue another state university or submit a brief in opposition to another state university in a case that is pending before any state or federal court shall, before filing suit or as soon as aware of the opposition but no later than requesting leave to file a brief, notify the Board President and Chief Executive Officer. The university chief executive officer shall fulfill this notification responsibility.

ii Any state university intending to appeal a state court or federal court decision shall, before the notice of appeal is filed, notify the Attorney General’s office.

Recommendation
The proposed policy was reviewed by the Board Governance Committee and that Committee recommends approval.
2. Act on Proposed Amendments to the State University Weapons Possession Policy

Summary and Recommendation

One of the Board’s goals for academic year 2015-2016 is to “develop policy to address concealed carry and open carry laws on state university campuses in Kansas, in advance of the July 1, 2017 expiration of the legal exemption now in place.” The Governance Committee directed staff to develop a policy that comports with current Kansas law, with input and feedback from various campus constituencies. That work was conducted in October, November and December. The proposed amendments to Board policy have been reviewed by the Board Governance Committee, which now recommends them for Board approval.

Background

The 2013 Kansas Legislature enacted a statute to preclude state and municipal entities from prohibiting eligible individuals from the concealed carry of handguns in state and municipal buildings, except those buildings having adequate security measures (as defined by the statute) at all public entrances. The 2013 enactment, codified at K.S.A. 2014 Supp. 75-7c20, allowed the governing body of certain government entities, including the state universities, to exempt buildings from application of the law, allowing a delay in implementation of the new provisions for a period of up to four years. The Kansas Board of Regents, on behalf of the six state universities, acted to exempt all state university buildings for up to the maximum period allowed. This exemption period expires, in accordance with the statute, on July 1, 2017. Accordingly, concealed carry remains prohibited in all university buildings until July 1, 2017 and the proposed Board policy amendments do not alter the established exemption period in any way. Rather, the proposed amendments provide for implementation of K.S.A. 2014 Supp. 75-7c20 once the exemption period expires.

In 2014, the Kansas Legislature enacted K.S.A. 75-7c24, which allows state and municipal entities to prohibit open carry (i.e. the carrying of an unconcealed firearm) into any building that has signs posted in accordance with legal requirements. Attorney General Opinion No. 2014-06 concludes that at least some public entities (in that case a community college) may also prohibit open carry from other areas on campus. K.S.A. 75-7c24 took effect on July 1, 2014 and all state universities have posted the appropriate signage to prohibit open carry in all buildings and elsewhere on those campuses. The proposed Board policy amendments do not alter that prohibition and, if the proposed policy is adopted by the Board, the prohibition will continue beyond July 1, 2017 unless changed by law.\(^{10}\)

Policy

The Board believes it is in the best interests of universities and campus communities to now begin planning for 2017 implementation of the concealed carry law, given the amount of time remaining before the July 1, 2017 statutory expiration date for the Board’s exemption of state university buildings from application of the concealed carry law. Should the applicable law be amended between now and July 1, 2017, the Board and universities will certainly make adjustments to accommodate those changes, but in order to give the campuses sufficient time to develop policies, write procedures, train constituencies and otherwise prepare for implementation, amendments to the Board’s policy on weapons possession need to be made sooner rather than later.

In developing the Board policy, the Governance Committee invited campus groups to review proposed amendments and provide feedback to the Board office. All six of the state universities, as well as faculty and staff groups on those campuses, submitted written comments and suggestions, all of which were shared with the Board Governance Committee during their consideration of the proposed change in policy. Based on these comments and suggestions a number of changes were made to the originally proposed language.

\(^{10}\) However, the statutes do require that new signage be posted for buildings within which concealed carry will be allowed but open carry will not. The signs currently in place are for buildings in which both concealed and open carry are prohibited.
While the following version of the proposed policy appears to consist of mostly new language, some of the underscored provisions are not new and are shown as such only because they have been moved from another location within the policy. The definition of the term “weapons” is largely unchanged. The only differences between what is set out below and what is in the current policy are the inclusion of a catch-all category at the end of the definition and a change in paragraph (2) to reflect that the term “weapons,” as used in this policy, encompasses all firearms, including handguns that may be lawfully carried in accordance with the Private and Family Protection Act. Staff also notes that the paragraphs dealing with knives in this definition section will be further reviewed by staff to determine whether changes need to be made to remain consistent with state law. It was decided that the review of knives should be done separately from the review focusing on concealed carry of handguns and open carry of firearms.

Key provisions in the proposed new policy include:

- Weapons in general continue to be prohibited on the state university campuses (the Board has had a no-weapons policy since 2008, and individual universities have had such policies for many years prior to that)
- A new exception to this general rule, which will take effect after July 1, 2017, recognizes the ability of any individual aged 21 or older and who otherwise meets statutory eligibility requirements to carry a concealed handgun except in buildings or areas of buildings where “adequate security measures” have been provided
- Open carry of any firearm anywhere on any state university campus will continue to be prohibited
- Provisions for safe storage of concealed carry handguns when not being carried
- Each state university is required to
  - develop policies and procedures for the safe possession and storage of lawful concealed carry handguns and submit those to the Governance Committee for review
  - determine which buildings and areas of buildings on campus should provide for “adequate security measures” and submit a listing of those buildings/areas for Governance Committee review
  - notify students, faculty and staff of the Board policy through means of university policies and housing contracts and, where applicable, on tickets to events
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a To the extent allowed by law and except as otherwise provided herein, the campus of each state university shall be weapons-free. Each entrance to each building and facility on each campus shall be posted in accordance with K.S.A. 2007 Supp. 75-7c10, 75-7c11, K.A.R. 16-11-7, K.S.A. 21-6309 and K.A.R. 1-49-11, and amendments thereto. Additional signs may be posted as appropriate. Notice of this policy shall also be given in each state university’s student code of conduct, housing contracts and employee policies. Pursuant to the authority vested in the Board of Regents by Article 6, Section 2 of the Kansas Constitution, K.S.A. 76-712 and other state laws, and in accordance with K.S.A. 75-7c20 allowing concealed carry and K.S.A. 75-7c24 authorizing prohibition of open carry, concealed carry of handguns shall be permitted on each state university campus, while open carry of firearms and possession of weapons other than concealed handguns shall be prohibited on each state university campus.

b For purposes of this policy:

i The term “weapons” includes:

1. Any object or device which will, is designed to, or may be readily converted to expel bullet, shot or shell by the action of an explosive or other propellant;

2. any handgun, pistol, revolver, rifle, shotgun or other firearm of any nature, including those that are concealed or openly carried;

3. any BB gun, pellet gun, air/C’O2 gun, stun gun or blow gun;

4. any explosive, incendiary or poison gas (A) bomb, (B) mine, (C) grenade, (D) rocket having a propellant charge of more than four ounces, or (E) missile having an explosive or incendiary charge of more than ¼ ounce;

5. any incendiary or explosive material, liquid, solid or mixture equipped with a fuse, wick or other detonating device;

6. any tear gas bomb or smoke bomb; however, personal self-defense items containing mace or pepper spray shall not be deemed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;

7. any knife, commonly referred to as a switch-blade, which has a blade that opens automatically by hand pressure applied to a button, spring or other device in the handle of the knife, or any knife having a blade that opens or falls or is ejected into position by the force of gravity or by an outward, downward or centrifugal thrust or movement;

8. any straight-blade knife of four inches or more such as a dagger, dirk, dangerous knife or stiletto; except that an ordinary pocket knife or culinary knife designed for and used solely in the preparation or service of food shall not be construed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;

9. any martial arts weapon such as nunchucks or throwing stars;

10. any longbow, crossbow and arrows or other projectile that could cause serious harm to any person; or

11. any other dangerous or deadly weapon or instrument of like character.

ii The term “handgun” means:

1. A pistol or revolver which is designed to be fired by the use of a single hand and which is designed to fire or capable of firing fixed cartridge ammunition; or
(2) any other weapon which will or is designed to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive and which is designed to be fired by the use of a single hand.

iii The term “firearm” includes any handgun, rifle, shotgun, and any other weapon which will or is designed to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive.

iv The term “adequate security measures” shall have the same meaning as the term is defined in K.S.A. 75-7c20, and “building” shall have the same meaning as the term “state building” is defined in K.S.A. 75-7c20.

v The term “campus” means any building or grounds owned by a state university or the Board and any building or grounds leased by a state university or the Board for state university use.

c. Nothing in this section policy shall be read to prohibit possession of weapons on campus (1) as necessary for the conduct of Board approved academic programs or university approved activities or practices, or (2) by university police or security officers while acting within the scope of their employment. Each university shall develop and follow policies and procedures for the safe possession, use and storage of such weapons and shall notify the Board in writing of any activities or practices involving weapons that are approved by the university under subparagraph c(1) of this subsection 14.b.

d. Beginning July 1, 2017, any individual who is 21 years of age or older and who is lawfully eligible to carry a concealed handgun in Kansas shall not be precluded from doing so on state university campuses except in buildings and areas of buildings for which adequate security measures are provided, and except as otherwise prohibited by law.

i Each individual who lawfully possesses a handgun on any state university campus shall be wholly and solely responsible for carrying, storing and using that handgun in a safe manner and in accordance with the law, Board policy and university policy. Nothing in this policy shall be interpreted to require individuals who lawfully possess a handgun to use it in defense of others.

ii Each university shall develop and follow policies and procedures for the safe possession and storage of lawfully possessed handguns, and shall submit such policies and procedures to the Board office for review and approval by the Board’s Governance Committee prior to publication or implementation. Each university’s policies and procedures shall include detailed provisions regarding how and where to report suspected violations of this policy, how faculty, staff and students shall be notified of the laws and policies pertaining to concealed carry on campus, and shall also provide interested students, faculty and staff with information about any known locally or regionally available firearm safety instruction.

c-e. Open carry of any firearm anywhere on any campus shall be prohibited. Each entrance to each building and facility on each campus shall be conspicuously posted with appropriate signs indicating that openly carrying a firearm into that building or facility is prohibited. Additional signs may be posted as appropriate.

f. Except in those instances where necessary for self-defense or transferring to safe storage and except as otherwise provided in subparagraphs c(1) and c(2), it shall be a violation of Board policy to openly display any lawfully possessed concealed carry handgun while on campus.

g. Regardless whether the individual is otherwise lawfully eligible to carry a concealed handgun, it shall be a violation of Board policy to commit any of the following offenses on a university campus:

i. Possess a firearm under the influence of alcohol or drugs, as defined by K.S.A. 21-6332, and amendments thereto;

ii. discharge a firearm in violation of K.S.A. 21-6308, and amendments thereto;

iii. discharge a firearm within or into the corporate limits of any city in violation of K.S.A. 21-6308a; or

iv. otherwise possess, store, transport, trade, sell, or in any other way use a firearm in violation of any applicable law.
h. Beginning July 1, 2017, each individual who lawfully possesses a concealed handgun on campus shall at all times have that handgun in their custody and control, and shall either keep it on their person with safety mechanism, if any, engaged, or stored 1) in any secure storage location provided by the university specifically for that purpose, 2) at their residence, or 3) in their vehicle. If stored in a vehicle on campus, the handgun must be secured and concealed from view. For any dormitory or scholarship hall that does not have adequate security measures, each resident who lawfully possesses a handgun on campus and elects to store the handgun they possess in the room to which they are assigned when not carrying it on their person in a concealed fashion shall secure the handgun in a secure storage device that conceals the gun from view. Such storage devices shall be provided by the individual who possesses the handgun and must meet minimum industry standards for safe-keeping of handguns.

i. Beginning July 1, 2017, each state university shall determine whether and to what extent otherwise lawfully possessed concealed handguns will be prohibited in any campus buildings or areas of buildings by provision of adequate security measures, permanent or temporary, at each public entrance to the building or area. Each entrance to each building where concealed carry is prohibited as provided in this paragraph shall be conspicuously posted with appropriate signs indicating that carrying a concealed handgun into that building is prohibited. Additional signs may be posted as appropriate. Each state university that prohibits concealed carry pursuant to this paragraph shall submit to the Board office for review and approval by the Board’s Governance Committee a list of the buildings and areas of buildings so restricted, the rationale therefor, and a description of the adequate security measures to be provided.

   i. The list shall be provided at the time such buildings and areas are first identified as requiring adequate security and, as buildings or areas of buildings are added to the list, at the time so amended. Once the Governance Committee has approved a building or area for provision of adequate security measures, re-approval of that building or area is not required.

   ii. Because safety and security considerations may warrant a university implementing adequate security measures on an as-needed, temporary basis that are intended to address a specific concern, each university shall include in its annual security report to the Board information regarding all instances in which adequate security measures were implemented on an as needed, temporary basis during the previous year and the reasons therefor.

j. Any individual who violates one or more provisions of this policy may be issued a lawful directive to leave campus with the weapon immediately. Any individual who violates the directive shall be considered to be in trespass and may be cited accordingly. Any employee or student of the university who violates one or more provisions of this policy shall be subject to discipline in accordance with applicable university codes of conduct. Any individual who violates state or federal law may be detained, arrested or otherwise subjected to lawful processes appropriate to the circumstances.

(a) For the purpose of this policy, “weapons” means:

i. Any object or device which will, is designed to, or may be readily converted to expel bullet, shot or shell by the action of an explosive or other propellant;

ii. any handgun, pistol, revolver, rifle, shotgun or other firearm of any nature, including concealed weapons licensed pursuant to the Personal and Family Protection Act, and amendments thereto;

iii. any BB gun, pellet gun, air/CO2 gun, stun gun or blow gun;

iv. any explosive, incendiary or poison gas (A) bomb, (B) mine, (C) grenade, (D) rocket having a propellant charge of more than four ounces, or (E) missile having an explosive or incendiary charge of more than ¼ ounce;

v. any incendiary or explosive material, liquid, solid or mixture equipped with a fuse, wick or other detonating device;
vi—any tear gas bomb or smoke bomb; however, personal self-defense items containing mace or pepper spray shall not be deemed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;

vii—any knife, commonly referred to as a switch-blade, which has a blade that opens automatically by hand pressure applied to a button, spring or other device in the handle of the knife, or any knife having a blade that opens or falls or is ejected into position by the force of gravity or by an outward, downward or centrifugal thrust or movement;

viii—any straight-blade knife of four inches or more such as a dagger, dirk, dangerous knife or stiletto; except that an ordinary pocket knife or culinary knife designed for and used solely in the preparation or service of food shall not be construed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;

ix—any martial arts weapon such as nunchucks or throwing stars; or

x—any longbow, crossbow and arrows or other projectile that could cause serious harm to any person.

k. Notice of this policy shall be given in each state university’s weapons policy and housing contracts. To the extent adequate security measures are used to prohibit concealed carry into stadiums, arenas and other large venues that require tickets for admission, the tickets shall state that concealed carry will be prohibited at that event.

Recommendation
The proposed amendments were reviewed by the Board Governance Committee and that Committee recommends approval.
E. Other Matters
   1. Receive Budget and Legislative Update

   Elaine Frisbie
   VP, Finance & Administration
   Matt Casey,
   Director, Government Relations

Background

The Board will receive a preview of the 2016 legislative session. The Governor’s State of the State on Tuesday, January 11th will officially unveil the administration’s budget adjustments for the second year of the two year budget cycle. An update will be given on any adjustments made to higher education.

VI. Adjournment
AGENDA

KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE
11:00 a.m.

1. Approve January 5, 2016 Minutes

2. Discussion
   a. Performance Funding – Gary Alexander and Jean Redeker
   b. Ad Astra Conference – Tony Vizzini

3. Updates
   a. Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) - Karla Wiscombe and Connie Beene
   b. Higher Learning Commission Faculty Qualifications – Gary Alexander
   c. Changes to Qualified Admissions precollege curriculum BAASC approved December 16, 2015 – Jean Redeker

4. Other Matters
The Academic Affairs Standing Committee of the Kansas Board of Regents met by Conference Call at 11:00 a.m. on Tuesday, January 6, 2016.

In Attendance:

Members:  
Regent Helen Van Etten  
Regent Zoe Newton  
Regent Daniel Thomas  
Regent Ann Brandau-Murguia

Staff:  
Gary Alexander, Karla Wiscombe, Jean Redeker, Jacqueline Johnson, Rita Johnson, and Julene Miller

Others:  
Jim Otter, Pittsburg State University; Denise Bertoncino, Pittsburg State University; Sara Rosen, University of Kansas; Stuart Day, University of Kansas; Randy Pembrook, Washburn University; Lori Cook-Benjamin, Fort Hays State University; Ruth Dyer, Kansas State University; Rick Muma, Wichita State University; Lynette Olson, Pittsburg State University

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

Approve December 16, 2015 Minutes

Regent Newton moved, and Regent Thomas seconded the motion, to approve the December 16, 2015 minutes as written. Motion carried.

Agenda Planning

Gary Alexander asked discussion agenda item 4 be moved to the consent agenda.

Regent Thomas moved, and Regent Newton seconded the motion, to move discussion agenda item 4 to the consent agenda. Motion carried.

Consent Agenda

Request Approval for a Bachelor of Science in Interior Design - PSU

Lynette Olson, Jim Otter, and Denise Bertoncino from Pittsburg State University briefly explained the nature of the proposed Bachelor of Science in Interior Design.

Regent Newton moved, and Regent Thomas seconded the motion, to recommend placing the Request Approval for a Bachelor of Science in Interior Design on the Board’s January 2016 agenda. Motion carried.
Discussion Agenda

Request for New Certificate of Approval with Degree Granting Authority for Trinity International University - Leawood, KS.

Jacqueline Johnson gave an overview of Trinity International University request for approval for a new Certificate of Approval for degree granting authority in Master of Arts in Theological Studies.

- Board staff reviewed the institution’s:
  - Staff Qualifications
  - Record Keeping Systems
  - Coursework, Materials
  - Online Platform

- This institution demonstrates it meets and complies with all statutorily imposed requirements.

After discussion, clarification of graduation rate percentage was requested.

Regent Thomas moved, and Regent Newton seconded the motion, to place the Request for New Certificate of Approval with Degree Granting Authority for Trinity International University on the Board’s January 2016 agenda. Motion carried.

Annual Report on Exceptions to the Minimum Admission Standards at State Universities

K.S.A. 76-717 mandates an annual report on the exception to the minimum admissions standards. Jean Redeker gave an overview of the annual report which is based on the 2014-2015 freshmen class and 2014-2015 transfer students on the following categories of student admissions: (1) the number and percentage of freshmen class admissions permitted as exceptions to the minimum admissions standards and (2) the number and percentage of transfer student admissions permitted as exceptions to the minimum admission standards.

After discussion, academic success trend was requested.

Regent Brandau-Murguia moved, and Regent Thomas seconded the motion, to recommend placing the Annual Report on Exceptions to the Minimum Admission Standards on the Board’s January 2016 agenda. Motion carried.

Request for Approval of Courses for System Wide Transfer

Karla Wiscombe presented the Transfer and Articulation Council course recommendations for inclusion in the System Wide Transfer Matrix:

- Biology I and Lab for Majors
- Engineering Physics I and Lab
- Engineering Physics II and Lab
- General Chemistry and Lab for Non Majors
- Introduction to Criminal Justice
- Introduction to Mass Communication
- Introduction to Social Work
- Personal and Community Health
Personal Finance
Physical Geology and Lab

Regent Newton moved, and Regent Thomas seconded the motion, to recommend placing the above listed ten courses for inclusion in the System Wide Course Transfer Matrix on the Board’s January 2016 agenda. Motion carried.

Other Business

There being no other business, Regent Newton moved, and Regent Brandau-Murguia seconded the motion, to adjourn. Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.
AGENDA

Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee
Wednesday, January 20, 2016
10:15am – Noon, Board Room

I. OLD BUSINESS
   A. Follow up on issues raised during the January 5 teleconference regarding FAA items on the Board’s agenda and any other questions/clarifications about Board agenda items

II. NEW BUSINESS
   A. Receive External Management Review from BKD, LLP on Emporia State University
   B. FAA 15-06, Receive Internal Audit Plans and Meet with State University Internal Auditors
   C. Review Fiscal Affairs and Audit Items from full Board Agenda
   D. Audits for committee review and discussion (standing item)
   E. Other Committee Business
      a. Plan to Implement Cost Model for Tiered State Aid

III. OTHER COMMITTEE ITEMS
   A. Next meeting dates
      1. February 2, Noon (Agenda planning conference call)
      2. February 17, 10:15 a.m.
AGENDA

Board Governance Committee
Wednesday, January 20, 2016
8:45-10:00, Conference Room B

I. APPROVE MINUTES FROM DECEMBER 16, 2015

II. BOARD APPROVED TOPICS FOR THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
   A. GOV 15-04, Final Review of Weapons Possession Policy
   B. GOV 15-05, Receive University Annual Campus Security Reports
      a. KSU
      b. PSU

III. NEXT MEETING DATES
   A. February 17, 2016
   B. March 23, 2016
MINUTES

GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
December 16, 2015 Minutes

The Kansas Board of Regents’ Governance Committee met on Wednesday, December 16, 2015. Chair Shane Bangerter called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. Proper notice was given according to law.

Members Present: Shane Bangerter, Chair
Zoe Newton
Bill Feuerborn
Helen Van Etten

MINUTES
Regent Feuerborn moved to approve the minutes of November 18, 2015. Regent Van Etten seconded, and the motion carried.

LITIGATION POLICY
General Counsel Julene Miller presented the proposed policy language regarding litigation. She incorporated the language that requires the university CEO to notify the Board President and CEO if the university intends on suing another state university or if the university intends on filing a brief in opposition in any state or federal court. Regent Van Etten moved to forward the proposed policy to the Board for consideration. Following a second by Regent Feuerborn, the motion carried. The following policy will be forwarded:

F OTHER

1 INTERACTION WITH LEGISLATURE, COURTS, AND OTHER STATE AGENCIES

a Legislative Appearances and Committee Hearings

State university employees should make every effort to accommodate legislative committee requests to provide expert testimony on proposed legislation. The university shall notify the Board President and Chief Executive Officer of the invitation.

b Legislative Requests and Proposed Legislation (Also see FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION)

i All requests for funds, programs, changes in legislation and new legislation affecting the Board and system institutions shall be submitted to the Board for consideration no later than the November meeting of the Board. Emergency situations may warrant special exceptions, but to the extent possible, no request for legislation during the ongoing legislative session shall be submitted after the March meeting of the Board. Requests for funds, programs, changes in legislation and new legislation that are approved by the Board shall be included in the Board’s annual legislative proposals. Requests that are not approved by the Board shall not be submitted to the Legislature for introduction.

ii Once approval has been granted, all institutions are authorized to work for these requests and each institution is expected to support the entire request. Conversely, all institutions are prohibited from requesting or working for additional legislation or funds.

iii When legislation having an effect on the operation of the higher education system, proposed by someone or some group other than the Board, is brought to the Board’s attention, it shall be the
responsibility of the Board to make a decision as to whether the position of the system is that of support, non-support, or opposition.

c Legislative Post Audit Reports

i Each state university, upon receiving notification from the Legislative Division of Post Audit that a performance or financial audit of the university is to be conducted, shall forward such notification to the Board President and Chief Executive Officer. Each state university shall submit a written report to the Board, in accordance with the schedule maintained on the Board of Regents’ website, detailing progress during the preceding calendar year toward implementation of accepted Post Audit recommendations. This report shall be made on an annual basis until all accepted recommendations have been fully implemented.

ii Discussion of pending or anticipated Legislative Post Audits shall be a standing item on the Board’s Fiscal Affairs and Audit Committee agenda.

d Information Requests from Other State Agencies

i System-wide Requests: Requests directed to state universities for system-wide information from other state agencies or other branches of state government shall be transmitted through the Board office. State universities receiving requests directly from other state agencies or branches of state government shall advise the requesting party of this policy and advise the Board office of the request. When time is not sufficient to allow transmission of responses through the Board office, responses may be submitted directly to the requesting party with copies to the Board office.

ii University-Specific Requests: Responses to requests received by a state university for information related specifically to that university may be sent directly to the requesting party, with a copy to the Board office.

e Attorney General Opinions

Any state university or state university official wishing to seek an opinion from the Attorney General shall do so by making a request through the office of the General Counsel of the Board.

f Kansas Governmental Ethics Commission Opinions

Any state university or state university official wishing to seek an opinion from the Kansas Governmental Ethics Commission shall do so by making a request through the office of the General Counsel of the Board.

g Briefs Filed with State and Federal Courts

i Any state university intending to sue another state university or submit a brief in opposition to another state university in a case that is pending before any state or federal court shall, before filing suit or as soon as aware of the opposition but no later than requesting leave to file a brief, notify the Board President and Chief Executive Officer. The university chief executive officer shall fulfill this notification responsibility.

ii Any state university intending to appeal a state court or federal court decision shall, before the notice of appeal is filed, notify the Attorney General’s office.

WEAPONS POLICY

General Counsel Miller stated she received feedback from the campuses regarding the amendments to the Board’s Weapons Possession policy and incorporated some of the suggestions. She reviewed the proposed policy and noted in paragraph d.i the word “encourage” should be changed to “require.” General Counsel Miller also noted
Board staff needs to review the definition of knives because the statutes dealing with knives have changed. If changes need to be made to the definition of knives, the policy can be brought back to the Committee after the Board approves the concealed carry/open carry provisions. Regent Bangerter stated this policy gives guidance to the universities as they formulate their campus level policies. The Committee discussed the timeline for the universities to submit their campus level policies for review and set a target date for the June 2016 Governance Committee meeting. Regent Newton moved to forward the proposed policy as amended to the Board for consideration. Regent Van Etten seconded, and the motion carried. The following policy will be forwarded:
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a To the extent allowed by law Pursuant to the authority vested in it by Article 6, Section 2 of the Kansas Constitution, K.S.A. 75-7c20 and K.S.A. 75-7c24, and except as otherwise provided herein, the Board hereby declares that the campus of each state university shall be weapons-free. Each entrance to each building and facility on each campus shall be posted in accordance with K.S.A. 2007 Supp. 75-7c10, 75-7c11, K.A.R. 16-11-7, K.S.A. 21-6309 and K.A.R. 1-49-11, and amendments thereto. Additional signs may be posted as appropriate. Notice of this policy shall also be given in each state university’s student code of conduct, housing contracts and employee policies.

b For purposes of this policy:

ii. “Weapons” means:

(12) Any object or device which will, is designed to, or may be readily converted to expel bullet, shot or shell by the action of an explosive or other propellant;

(13) any handgun, pistol, revolver, rifle, shotgun or other firearm of any nature, including those that are concealed or openly carried;

(14) any BB gun, pellet gun, air/C'O2 gun, stun gun or blow gun;

(15) any explosive, incendiary or poison gas (A) bomb, (B) mine, (C) grenade, (D) rocket having a propellant charge of more than four ounces, or (E) missile having an explosive or incendiary charge of more than ¼ ounce;

(16) any incendiary or explosive material, liquid, solid or mixture equipped with a fuse, wick or other detonating device;

(17) any tear gas bomb or smoke bomb; however, personal self-defense items containing mace or pepper spray shall not be deemed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;

(18) any knife, commonly referred to as a switch-blade, which has a blade that opens automatically by hand pressure applied to a button, spring or other device in the handle of the knife, or any knife having a blade that opens or falls or is ejected into position by the force of gravity or by an outward, downward or centrifugal thrust or movement;

(19) any straight-blade knife of four inches or more such as a dagger, dirk, dangerous knife or stiletto; except that an ordinary pocket knife or culinary knife designed for and used solely in the preparation or service of food shall not be construed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;

(20) any martial arts weapon such as nunchucks or throwing stars;

(21) any longbow, crossbow and arrows or other projectile that could cause serious harm to any person; or
(22) any other dangerous or deadly weapon or instrument of like character.

ii The term “adequate security measures” shall have the same meaning as the term is defined in K.S.A. 75-7c20, and “building” shall have the same meaning as the term “state building” is defined in K.S.A. 75-7c20.

iii “Campus” means any building or grounds owned by a state university or the Board and any building or grounds leased by a state university or the Board for state university use.

c. Nothing in this section policy shall be read to prohibit possession of weapons on campus (1) as necessary for the conduct of Board approved academic programs or university approved activities or practices, or (2) by university police or security officers while acting within the scope of their employment. Each university shall develop and follow policies and procedures for the safe possession, use and storage of such weapons and shall notify the Board in writing of any activities or practices involving weapons that are approved by the university under subparagraph c(1) of this subsection 14.b.

d. Beginning July 1, 2017, any individual who is 21 years of age or older and who is lawfully eligible to carry a concealed handgun in Kansas may not be precluded from doing so on state university campuses except in buildings and areas of buildings for which adequate security measures are provided, and except as otherwise prohibited by law.

i Each individual who lawfully possesses a handgun on any state university campus shall be wholly and solely responsible for carrying, storing and using that handgun in a safe manner and in accordance with the law, Board policy and university policy. Nothing in this policy shall be interpreted to require individuals who lawfully possess a handgun to use it in defense of others.

ii Each university shall develop and follow policies and procedures for the safe possession and storage of lawfully possessed handguns, and shall submit such policies and procedures to the Board office for review and approval by the Board’s Governance Committee prior to publication or implementation. Each university’s policies and procedures shall include detailed provisions regarding how and where to report suspected violations of this policy, how faculty, staff and students shall be notified of the laws and policies pertaining to concealed carry on campus, and shall also provide interested students, faculty and staff with information about any known locally or regionally available firearm safety instruction.

e.g. Open carry of any firearm anywhere on any campus shall be prohibited. Each entrance to each building and facility on each campus shall be conspicuously posted with appropriate signs indicating that openly carrying a firearm into that building or facility is prohibited. Additional signs may be posted as appropriate.

f. Except in those instances where necessary for self-defense or transferring to safe storage and except as otherwise provided in subparagraphs c(1) and c(2), it shall be a violation of Board policy to openly display any lawfully possessed concealed carry handgun while on campus.

g. Regardless whether the individual is otherwise lawfully eligible to carry a concealed handgun, it shall be a violation of Board policy to commit any of the following offenses on a university campus:

v. Possess a firearm under the influence of alcohol or drugs, as defined by K.S.A. 21-6332, and amendments thereto;

vi. discharge a firearm in violation of K.S.A. 21-6308, and amendments thereto;

vii. discharge a firearm within or into the corporate limits of any city in violation of K.S.A. 21-6308a; or

viii. otherwise possess, store, transport, trade, sell, or in any other way use a firearm in violation of any applicable law.

i. Beginning July 1, 2017, each individual who lawfully possesses a concealed handgun on campus shall at all times be in control of that handgun, and shall either keep it on their person with safety mechanism engaged or stored 1) in any secure storage location provided by the university specifically for that purpose, 2) at their residence, or 3) in their vehicle in a secure storage device that conceals the gun from view. For any dormitory
or scholarship hall that does not have adequate security measures, each resident who lawfully possesses a handgun on campus and elects to store the handgun they possess in the room to which they are assigned when not carrying it on their person in a concealed fashion shall secure the handgun in a secure storage device that conceals the gun from view. Such storage devices shall be provided by the individual who possesses the handgun and must meet minimum industry standards for safe-keeping of handguns.

i. Beginning July 1, 2017, each state university shall determine whether and to what extent otherwise lawfully possessed concealed handguns will be prohibited in any campus buildings or areas of buildings by provision of adequate security measures, permanent or temporary, at each public entrance to the building or area. Each entrance to each building where concealed carry is prohibited as provided in this paragraph shall be conspicuously posted with appropriate signs indicating that carrying a concealed handgun into that building is prohibited. Additional signs may be posted as appropriate. Each state university that prohibits concealed carry pursuant to this paragraph shall submit to the Board office for review and approval by the Board’s Governance Committee a list of the buildings and areas of buildings so restricted, the rationale therefor, and a description of the adequate security measures to be provided.

The list shall be provided at the time such buildings and areas are first identified as requiring adequate security and, as buildings or areas of buildings are added to the list, at the time so amended. Once the Governance Committee has approved a building or area for provision of adequate security measures, re-approval of that building or area is not required.

Because safety and security considerations may warrant a university implementing adequate security measures on an as-needed, temporary basis that are intended to address a specific concern, each university shall include in its annual security report to the Board information regarding all instances in which adequate security measures were implemented on an as needed, temporary basis during the previous year and the reasons therefor.

Any individual who violates one or more provisions of this policy may be issued a lawful directive to leave campus with the weapon immediately. Any individual who violates the directive shall be considered to be in trespass and may be cited accordingly. Any employee or student of the university who violates one or more provisions of this policy shall be subject to discipline in accordance with applicable university codes of conduct. Any individual who violates state or federal law may be detained, arrested or otherwise subjected to lawful processes appropriate to the circumstances.

For the purpose of this policy, “weapon” means:

i. Any object or device which will, is designed to, or may be readily converted to expel bullet, shot or shell by the action of an explosive or other propellant;

ii. any handgun, pistol, revolver, rifle, shotgun or other firearm of any nature, including concealed weapons licensed pursuant to the Personal and Family Protection Act, and amendments thereto;

iii. any BB gun, pellet gun, air/C’O2 gun, stun gun or blow gun;

iv. any explosive, incendiary or poison gas (A) bomb, (B) mine, (C) grenade, (D) rocket having a propellant charge of more than four ounces, or (E) missile having an explosive or incendiary charge of more than ¼ ounce;

v. any incendiary or explosive material, liquid, solid or mixture equipped with a fuse, wick or other detonating device;

vi. any tear gas bomb or smoke bomb; however, personal self defense items containing mace or pepper spray shall not be deemed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;

vii. any knife, commonly referred to as a switch blade, which has a blade that opens automatically by hand pressure applied to a button, spring or other device in the handle of the knife, or any knife having-a
blade that opens or falls or is ejected into position by the force of gravity or by an outward, downward or centrifugal thrust or movement;

viii any straight-blade knife of four inches or more such as a dagger, dirk, dangerous knife or stiletto; except that an ordinary pocket knife or culinary knife designed for and used solely in the preparation or service of food shall not be construed to be a weapon for the purposes of this policy;

ix any martial arts weapon such as nunchucks or throwing stars; or

x any longbow, crossbow and arrows or other projectile that could cause serious harm to any person.

k. Notice of this policy shall be given in each state university’s weapons policy and housing contracts. To the extent adequate security measures are used to prohibit concealed carry into stadiums, arenas and other large venues that require tickets for admission, the tickets shall state that concealed carry will be prohibited at that event.

EXECUTIVE SESSION
At 9:10 a.m., Regent Newton moved, followed by the second of Regent Feuerborn, to recess into executive session for 60 minutes to discuss matters relating to security measures pursuant to K.S.A. 75-4319(b)(13). Participating in the executive session were members of the Governance Committee, President Flanders, General Counsel Julene Miller, and designated university staff. The motion carried. At 10:10 a.m., the meeting returned to open session. Regent Newton moved to extend 2 minutes, and Regent Van Etten seconded. The motion carried. At 10:12 a.m., the meeting returned to open session.

ADJOURNMENT
The Chair adjourned the meeting at 10:12 a.m.
AGENDA

System Council of Presidents
Suite 530
10:00 a.m.

1. Approve November 18, 2015 minutes
2. Discuss proposed policy on Credit for Prior Learning
3. Other matters
MINUTES

System Council of Presidents
Kansas Board of Regents
Wichita State University
November 18, 2015
10:00 am

1. President Inbody called the meeting to order at 10:00 am.

2. Minutes of September 16 were approved.

3. Live Safe App demonstration by Chief Ronnie Grice, Assistant Vice President, Public Safety, and Major Oscar Ruiz Price, Assistant Director, Patrol Commander, Kansas State University.

   A discussion was held after the demonstration. The question was raised if this app was a duplication of the RAVE app used by other universities.

   The costs of the Live Safe App will be based on the number of universities and community colleges that will participate.

   Dr. Joey Linn, Vice President for Student Affairs, Fort Hays State University will be the contact person for those wishing to participate.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:38 am.
AGENDA

Council of Presidents
Suite 530
11:00 a.m. or Adjournment of SCOPs

1. Approve minutes from December 16, 2015
2. Report from Council of Chief Academic Officers
3. Report from Council of Chief Business Officers
4. Report from Council of Government Relations Officers
5. Report from Council of Chief Student Affairs Officers
6. Report from Regents Information Technology Committee
7. Report from University Support Staff
8. Other Matters
MINUTES

Council of Presidents
Kansas Board of Regents Office
1000 S.W. Jackson
Topeka, KS
December 16, 2015
Suite 530

1. Chancellor Gray-Little called the meeting to order at 11:06 am.

2. Minutes from November 18, 2015 were approved.

3. Report from Council of Chief Academic Officers, Dr. Graham Glynn, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, Fort Hays State University
   New Program Requests
   PSU- Approval for a Bachelor of Science in Interior Design
   Approved by Council of Presidents
   Program Name Change Requests
   KSU- Approval to change the name of the Department of Human Nutrition to the Department of Food, Nutrition, Dietetics and Health
   Information Items
   PSU- New Career and Technical Education Administrator Graduate Certificate
   PSU- Discontinue Master of Science in Special Education, Adaptive PreK-12

   President Martin arrived to Chair the meeting.

4. Report from Council of Chief Business Officers, Mr. Mike Barnett, Vice President for Administration and Finance, Fort Hays State University

   The USS Leave Policy was discussed. Motion by President Scott, seconded by President Schulz. Motion passed and policy approved.

5. Report form Council of Government Relations Officers, Ms. Debra Prideaux, Government Relations Officer, Fort Hays State University

   The Government Relations team met and had the opportunity to meet with the PIOs prior to the SCOGRO/COGRO meeting. Predictions are that since we already have a budget (2nd year of a biennial budget) and this is an election year, the session will end in a considerably shorter time than last year. The session begins January 11 with the Governor’s state-of-the state address scheduled for January 12.

   Legislative messaging continues to be a priority of the liaisons and development of a list of institutional efficiencies and collaborations as it relates to the investment of state resources and return on investments.

   The conversation regarding guns on campus is anticipated to continue in the coming session but, it is unlikely that the current gun legislation will become less stringent. Institutions will implement the laws of the state as they apply to policies established by the Kansas Board of Regents.
January 20, 2016  Council of Presidents

Higher education legislative breakfasts will be held weekly on Wednesday mornings in the Lt Governor’s conference room on the 2nd floor of the statehouse. A reception is being planned prior to the state-of-the-state address in the statehouse. Regent institutions have scheduled their respective days in the statehouse in January and February as have the students as well as the Undergraduate/Graduate research days and the Community College Scholarship Day.

6. Report from Council of Chief Student Affairs Officers, Dr. Joey Linn, Vice President for Student Affairs, Fort Hays State University

The Chief Student Affairs Officers discussed concerns for students with gender identity issues, gender transitioning students and effects on campus life and residential life. Discussion on three initiatives being developed for transition to college algebra courses that will work for 4th math course for qualified admissions. Discussion on qualified admissions updates in the spring. Live Safe App- two community colleges and two universities are interested in the application. Dr. Linn will start discussions with Live Safe on cost of those wanting to participate.

7. Report from Regents Information Technology Committee, Dr. Joy Hatch, Vice President for Technology

RITC met with representatives from almost all the schools. Topics of discussion were generally around operational items and governance for technology at the institutions. There was discussion on the life-cycle management of computers and when to replace computers and how to handle the trickle down of "older but usable" computers. This is a security-related issue, once systems reach their end of life there are no longer updates, which means that potential security holes are not fixed. Participants traded the various ways this is being handled at each institution, and most institutions allow the individuals to select when they are upgrading. The majority of the discussion was held on issues related to KITO, and the state efficiency study. Several of the institutions had meetings with Alvarez and Marsal, and Phil Wittmer, the state CIO. Some of the ideas that were discussed included doing more together, using more cloud solutions, questioning why higher education cannot use the same ERP systems, and others. Phil Wittmer discussed an idea he wants to pursue to use the universities and students to provide help desk services for the state. Students would be paid by the state, remain at the university, and all calls would be routed to them. This system is based on the success experienced by K-State with its current help desk system, the large number of students used, and the continued excellent service that is provided.

8. Report from University Support Staff, Ms. Marcia Tacha, President USS, Fort Hays State University

USS met via conference call last Thursday. Discussed the conceal carry issue and importance of completing the survey that closes Dec 31. CBIZ meeting for FHSU will be in January.

9. Review proposed non-academic misconduct notations policy, Julene Miller, General Counsel, Kansas Board of Regents

University attorneys worked on the proposed draft. Copies of the draft were distributed. The Policy will become effective July 1, 2017. Motion by President Schulz, seconded by President Scott. Policy approved by Council of Presidents as written.

10. Adjournment at 11:44 am
AGENDA

System Council of Chief Academic Officers

Wednesday, January 20, 2016
8:30 a.m. – 9:15 a.m.
or upon adjournment

Kathy Rupp Conference Room
Kansas Board of Regents
1000 SW Jackson, Suite 520
Topeka, Kansas

1. Approve Minutes December 16, 2015

2. Updates
   a. 2+2 Program Articulations – Gary Alexander
   b. Transfer and Articulation Council - Karla Wiscombe
   c. Credit for Prior Learning – Karla Wiscombe
   d. Developmental Education – Susan Fish

3. Discussion
   a. Higher Learning Commission Faculty Qualifications– Karla Wiscombe
   b. Transfer and Articulation Policy – Karla Wiscombe
      policy is available at www.kansasregents.org

4. Other Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA MATERIALS DUE</th>
<th>MEETING DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 20, 2016</td>
<td>February 17, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 19, 2016</td>
<td>March 23, 2016 – KUMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23, 2016</td>
<td>April 20, 2016 – K-State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20, 2016</td>
<td>May 18, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The System Council of Chief Academic Officers met in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room, Kansas Board of Regents, Topeka, Kansas, at 8:15 a.m. on Wednesday, December 16, 2015.

Members Present:
Jon Marshall, Allen Community College  
Jeff Vitter, University of Kansas  
Lynette Olson, Pittsburg State University  
David Cordle, Emporia State University  
Tony Vizzini, Wichita State University  
Peggy Forsberg, Highland Community College  
Danny Gillum, Dodge City Community College  
Graham Glynn, Fort Hays State University  
Bill Backlin, Cloud County Community College  
April Mason, Kansas State University  
Robert Klein, University of Kansas Med Center  
Randall Pembrook, Washburn University  
Steve Loewen, Flint Hills Technical College

Board Staff:  
Gary Alexander, Jean Redeker, Karla Wiscombe, Jacqueline Johnson, Rita Johnson, Connie Beene, Cynthia Farrier, and Susan Fish

Others Present:  
Sara Rosen, University of Kansas; Ruth Dyer, Kansas State University; Rick Muma, Wichita State University; Julie Samuels, Pittsburg State University; Deanna Manin, Dodge City Community College; Peer Moore-Jansen, Wichita State University; Regena Lance, Fort Scott Community College; Stuart Day, University of Kansas; and Robin Garrett, Barton Community College.

Jon Marshall announced Karla Fisher has been named Chancellor of Arkansas State University-Beebe and Sheree Utash has been named Wichita Area Technical College President.

Approve Minutes of November 18, 2015 Meeting Minutes

April Mason moved, and Steve Loewen seconded the motion, to approve the November 18, 2015 minutes as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

Updates:

Transfer and Articulation Council (TAAC)

Karla Wiscombe updated SCOC AO on actions by the Transfer and Articulation Council:  
- Ten new courses were approved for recommendation to the Board in January  
- Three of the recommended courses are listed as upper level by some universities, but most are required in the freshman or sophomore year  
- Definition of upper and lower level courses will be discussed at today’s meeting (12/16/15).
Proposed Standard Cut Scores for Credit By Examination Policy

Gary Alexander reminded SCOCAO the Board has requested a policy and Dr. Alexander is working with Council of Faculty Senate Presidents at 11:30 today. Dr. Alexander and Karla Wiscombe requested input from SCOCAO members to assist in drafting the policy. Connie Beene is gathering information from the Community Colleges and Technical Colleges for inclusion in the proposed policy.

Discussion

Proposed Revisions to Transfer and Articulation Policy

Karla Wiscombe informed SCOCAO of the revision to the policy to align it with the Board’s vision for transfer and articulation. In order to address confusion with the multiple areas of transfer, the policy was reorganized by Julene Miller, General Counsel, and general education and other areas were placed in a separate sections with no change to that language.

Steve Loewen moved, and Graham Glynn seconded the motion, to approve the proposed revision to Transfer and Articulation Policy.

SCOCAO brought forward several concerns regarding the proposed revisions and requested further time to review and gather input.

Lynette Olson moved, and April Mason seconded the motion, to table the Proposed Revisions to Transfer and Articulation Policy until the February 17, 2016 meeting. Motion carried.

Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) Guidelines Annual Review Feedback

Karla Wiscombe advised SCOCAO the Credit for Prior Learning Task Force will meet on January 29, 2016. A copy of the Task Force membership was distributed. The Task Force has representation from all the universities and from each of the two-year sectors. If others would like to serve, please inform Karla.

SCOCAO requested the following changes to the Guide:
Pg. 15 – needs a separate line for G
Pg. 18 – Add U excel exams to the definitions

Proposed Credit for Prior Learning (CPL) Policy

Gary Alexander informed SCOCAO the policy to establish the Task Force and guidelines is in the proposed policy. Karla Wiscombe provided background information.

David Cordle moved, and Tony Vizzini seconded the motion, to approve the proposed Credit for Prior Learning Policy. Motion carried.

Proposed Revision to Reverse Transfer Policy

Gary Alexander spoke with Julene Miller, General Counsel, who recommended revising the Reverse Transfer Policy’s “opt out” clause to “opt in” for compliance with FERPA.

Tony Vizzini moved, and David Cordle seconded the motion, to approve the proposed revision to Reverse Transfer Policy. Motion carried.
Other Business

SCOCAO requested notification of meeting location changes as early as possible and consider spacing remote meeting every other month.

Graham Glynn moved, and Lynette Olson seconded the motion, to adjourn. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:21 a.m.
AGENDA

Council of Chief Academic Officers

Wednesday, January 20, 2016
9:15 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
or upon adjournment of SCOCAO
Kathy Rupp Conference Room
and reconvene at noon

1. Approve Minutes of December 16, 2015

2. New Program Requests
   a. KSU - Master of Arts in Teaching (FIRST READING)

3. Program Requests
   a. PSU – change the name of the BS in Vocational Technical Education to a
      BS in Career and Technical Education
   b. KU - change the name of the MA degree in Germanic Languages and
      Literatures to an MA degree in German Studies

4. Informational Items
   a. PSU - new emphasis of Liberal Studies to the Bachelor of Integrated Studies
      - new emphasis of Innovation Engineering to the Master of Science in Technology
      - changed the name of the minor and emphasis in Technical/Professional Writing to
      Professional Writing (BA in English)
   b. KSU - discontinuance of Avionics Option for the Bachelor of Aeronautical Technology
      - new Precision Agriculture Option for the BS in Agronomy
      - new secondary major in Global Food Systems Leadership

5. Discussion
   b. Follow up on January BAASC discussion of students admitted as exceptions – Jean Redeker

6. Other Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA MATERIALS DUE</th>
<th>MEETING DATES</th>
<th>LUNCH ROTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 21, 2015</td>
<td>February 11, 2015</td>
<td>KU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 18, 2015</td>
<td>March 11, 2015</td>
<td>KUMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 2015</td>
<td>April 15, 2015</td>
<td>WASHBURN U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 22, 2015</td>
<td>May 20, 2015</td>
<td>FHSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 27, 2015</td>
<td>June 17, 2015</td>
<td>KSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please Note: New Program Proposals are to be submitted 4 weeks prior to the next COCAO meeting for review and processing purposes.*
The Council of Chief Academic Officers met in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room, Kansas Board of Regents, Topeka, Kansas, at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, December 16, 2015 and reconvened at noon in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room.

Members Present:
Graham Glynn, Provost, FHSU
David Cordle, Provost, ESU
Lynette Olson, Provost, PSU
Randy Pembrook, VPAA, Washburn U
April Mason, Provost, KSU
Jeff Vitter, Provost & EVC, KU
Tony Vizzini, Provost, WSU
Robert Klein, Vice Chancellor, KUMC

Staff Present:
Gary Alexander, Jean Redeker, Karla Wiscombe, Jacqueline Johnson, and Susan Fish

Others Present:
Sara Rosen, University of Kansas; Ruth Dyer, Kansas State University, Rick Muma, Wichita State University; Julie Samuels, Pittsburg State University; Peer Moore-Jansen, Wichita State University; Stuart Day, University of Kansas; Regena Lance, Fort Scott Community College; James Otter, Pittsburg State University; Denise Bertoncino, Pittsburg State University; Robin Garrett, Barton County Community College

Approve Minutes of November 18, 2015

David Cordle moved, and Tony Vizzini seconded the motion, to approve the November 18, 2015 minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

New Program Requests

PSU – Request approval for a Bachelor of Science in Interior Design program [SECOND READING]

Lynette Olson introduced Denise Bertoncino and James Otter from Pittsburg State University to answer any questions regarding the proposed program. Denise Bertoncino gave a brief description of the program.

David Cordle moved, and Tony Vizzini seconded the motion, to recommend placing PSU’s Bachelor of Science in Interior Design on the Council of Presidents agenda for approval. Motion carried unanimously.

This proposed program will be reviewed by the Council of Presidents at its meeting today (December 16, 2015).

Program Requests

KSU – Request approval to change the name of the Department of Human Nutrition to the Department of Food, Nutrition, Dietetics and Health.

Tony Vizzini moved, and Lynette Olson seconded the motion, to approve K-State’s request to change the name of the Department of Human nutrition to the Department of Food, Nutrition, Dietetics and Health. Motion carried unanimously.
Informational Items

a. PSU – New Career and Technical Education Administrator Graduate Certificate
b. PSU – Discontinue Master of Science in Special Education, Adaptive PreK-12

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

Discussion

2+2 Programs

Gary Alexander advised the Council of the Board’s request for an update on the status of their 2+2 Programs. Dr. Alexander will e-mail COCAO last year’s report for its review and requested the members provide him an updated report prior to COCAO’s February meeting.

Draft Academic Policy Revisions

Jean Redeker reiterated the proposed policy revisions which are for clarification. After discussion, COCAO by consensus requested modifications:

- Removal of Section b.
- Clarification of language in Section d.

April Mason moved, and Tony Vizzini seconded the motion, to table the Draft Academic Policy Revision until the January 2016 COCAO meeting. Motion carried.

Other Business

Non-Academic Misconduct Notation Policy

Gary Alexander reported on Julene Miller’s request concerning the Non-Academic Misconduct Notation Policy. Gary Alexander advised COCAO to bring its recommendation on the Non-Academic Misconduct Notation policy to the Council of Presidents today (December 16, 2015).

Qualified Admissions – BAASC agenda item

The Council discussed the following:

- Current Board policy regarding reporting of junior high / middle school students taking high school courses on the high school transcript.
- COCAO’s position is regardless of when the course is taken if the student has achieved overall outcome for the course, it should count for Qualified Admissions

Gary Alexander will advise BAASC of COCAO’s position.

April Mason moved, and Tony Vizzini seconded the motion, to recess until noon. Motion carried.

COCAO reconvened at noon in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room

The Council expressed its appreciation to Jeff Vitter for his contribution to higher education and his involvement with COCAO.
The Council thanked Sherry Farris for her dedication and service to COCAO.

**First Generation Program**

Wichita State University is sponsoring a First Generation Student Conference. Rick Muma presented a slide show from the Ivy Trailblazers from which Wichita State University is modeling their future Ad Astra Conference after. As Wichita State University plans this conference, they are seeking endorsement from the Kansas Board of Regents and participation from the other Regents universities. The Council gave its endorsement for the conference and will ask BAASC for its endorsement.

Graham Glynn moved and David Cordle seconded the motion, to seek BAASC’s endorsement of the Ad Astra Conference as a state wide initiative before approaching the full Board. Motion carried.

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

Meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

Sincerely,
Graham Glynn
Provost, Fort Hays State University
### CURRENT FISCAL YEAR MEETING DATES

#### Fiscal Year 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Dates</th>
<th>Agenda Material Due to Board Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 11-13, 2015</td>
<td>August 26, 2015 at noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16-17, 2015</td>
<td>September 23, 2015 at noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14-15, 2015</td>
<td>October 28, 2015 at noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 18-19, 2015</td>
<td>November 24, 2015 at noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 16-17, 2015</td>
<td>December 30, 2015 at noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 20-21, 2016</td>
<td>January 27, 2016 at noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17-18, 2016</td>
<td>March 2, 2016 at noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23-24, 2016</td>
<td>March 30, 2016 at noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20-21, 2016</td>
<td>April 27, 2016 at noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18-19, 2016</td>
<td>May 25, 2016 at noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15-16, 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TENTATIVE MEETING DATES

#### Fiscal Year 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 21, 2016 – Budget Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 9-11, 2016 – Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 14-15, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 19-20, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16-17, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 14-15, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 18-19, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15-16, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15-16, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19-20, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 17-18, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14-15, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# COMMITTEES (2015-2016)

Shane Bangerter, Chair  
Zoe Newton, Vice Chair  

## Standing Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Affairs</th>
<th>Fiscal Affairs and Audit</th>
<th>Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helen Van Etten, Chair</td>
<td>Bill Feuerborn, Chair</td>
<td>Shane Bangerter, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe Newton</td>
<td>Joe Bain</td>
<td>Zoe Newton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Thomas</td>
<td>Dave Murfin</td>
<td>Bill Feuerborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Brandau-Murguia</td>
<td>Dennis Mullin</td>
<td>Helen Van Etten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Regents Retirement Plan

Ann Brandau-Murguia, Chair  
Shane Bangerter  

## Board Representatives and Liaisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Commission of the States</th>
<th>Zoe Newton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Postsecondary Technical Education Authority | Tom Burke  
| | Ray Frederick |
| Kansas Bioscience Authority | Kenny Wilk  
| | Jerry Boettcher |
| Midwest Higher Education Compact (MHEC) | Helen Van Etten  
| | Blake Flanders |
| Washburn University Board of Regents | Bill Feuerborn |
| Transfer and Articulation Advisory Council | Joe Bain |
| KSDE/KBOR Coordinating Council | Dennis Mullin  
| | Helen Van Etten |