

MINUTES OF THE HOUSE VISION 2020 COMMITTEE

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Tom Sloan at 3:50 p.m. on January 24, 2011, in Room 144-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Representative Mike Peterson- excused

Committee staff present:

Corey Carnahan, Kansas Legislative Research Department

Jay Hall, Kansas Legislative Research Department

Doug Taylor, Office of the Revisor of Statutes

Sean Ostrow, Office of the Revisor of Statutes

Mary Koles, Committee Assistant

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Dr. Andy Tompkins, Kansas Board of Regents

Others attending:

See attached list.

Chairman Sloan greeted the Committee and announced that the VA Heartland Network, Kansas City, and the KU Medical Center are now linked and providing mental health services to two small Kansas communities, a need which will increase as troops return home. Also, Adjutant General Lee Tafanelli and Secretary Pat George, Department of Commerce, are discussing job skills and training the returning veterans will need and may not have.

Chairman Sloan welcomed and introduced Dr. Andy Tompkins, President, Kansas Board of Regents.

Dr. Tompkins mentioned that the Board's ten year plan for higher education, *Foresight 2020*, was approved September 15, 2010, (Attachment 1, Appendix A) and commented on each of the six goals in the agenda. He then focused on six of eleven requests and concerns posed in a March 16, 2010, letter from the Vision 2020 Committee to him and Reginald Robinson. Those requests and Dr. Tompkin's responses are presented in Attachment 1 and include:

1. tuition strategies,
2. strategies for students to accelerate their academic careers and coordination of articulation agreements between Regents' institutions,
3. the evaluation process of the number of credit hours necessary for graduation,
4. the desirability and feasibility of identifying a dedicated funding stream to maintain infrastructures and upgrade facilities and/or increasing the statewide Educational Building Fund levy,
5. potential benefits and risks of permitting institutions to pursue the MHEC insurance program, and
6. tracking on a systemic basis so education policy makers can better determine the effectiveness of the integrated higher education system – exploration of this topic will continue at our next committee meeting.

Questions, comments, and discussions occurred throughout Dr. Tompkins remarks. Those asking questions include Chairman Sloan and Representatives Ron Worley, Vern Swanson, Bill Otto, and Barbara Bollier.

Representative Bill Otto distributed a letter he sent to Dr. Tompkins in November, 2010, and supporting information regarding credit hours required at Pittsburg State University for a minor in art vs hours required for certification as a K-12 art teacher. He also included an article about the loss of NSF funding at KU. (Attachment 2)

Chairman Sloan introduced Jay Hall our new staff member, Kansas Legislative Research Department.

The next meeting is scheduled for January 26, 2011.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Guest List

House Vision 2020 Committee

Monday, January 24, 2011

[illegible]



KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

January 24, 2011

TO: House Vision 2020 Committee
FROM: Andy Tompkins
SUBJECT: Kansas Board of Regents 10 Year Strategic Agenda and Response to Committee Questions

I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you over the next couple of committee meetings about the Kansas Board of Regents Strategic Agenda, *Foresight 2020*, and to respond to the questions you asked of us last spring.

Over the past two years, the Board has completed an environmental scan and review of national literature on the future of higher education and the role it needs to play in growing the economy of the state and nation. In the fall of 2010, the Board adopted a 10 year strategic agenda for higher education that has been entitled *Foresight 2020*. A copy of the agenda with goals and objectives is included with this memo in Appendix A. The six goals in the agenda are as follows:

- ★ Goal 1: Achieve alignment between the state's preK-12 and higher education systems and continue to enhance alignment between higher education institutions.
- ★ Goal 2: Achieve participation in the state's higher education system that better reflects the state's demography and more fully engages adult learners.
- ★ Goal 3: Achieve measurable improvement in persistence and completion rates for higher education institutions.
- ★ Goal 4: Ensure that students earning credentials and degrees possess the foundational skills essential for success in work and in life.
- ★ Goal 5: Enhance alignment between the work of the state's higher education system and the needs of the Kansas economy.
- ★ Goal 6: Enhance the regional and national reputation of Kansas universities through aspirational initiatives.

You will note in the document that metrics have been established in the objectives for these goals. It is our intent to develop a reporting system and an annual report to the Board which reflects the system's progress on these goals.

The committee gave us a number of questions last spring and asked that we report to you in January of 2011. We have listed each question below and included a response. We look forward to discussing these with you.

★ LEADING HIGHER EDUCATION ★

Request #1: Please provide the Committee or successor committee a comprehensive description of anticipated tuition strategies for the three types of governed and coordinated institutions for the next decade. Such strategies should reflect costs associated with, but not be limited to, on-line versus on-campus course offerings, and technology costs associated with delivering on-line courses versus savings in academic, parking, housing, health care, and recreation facilities. Please address in your response implications of demographic projections that show a declining population of college-age Kansans over the next decade. Other factors such strategies should address include time-of-day pricing of courses to more fully utilize facilities and resources, cost of providing the curriculum, and prospective employment opportunities upon graduation/certification.

The Kansas Board of Regents is the governing board for the six state universities. One of the Board's primary responsibilities, as defined in state law, is to set tuition and fees at the state universities. The Board serves a "coordinating role" for the community colleges, technical colleges and Washburn University. The independent governing board for each of these 26 institutions sets tuition and fees for its respective institution.

With regard to the Board's tuition setting process for the state universities, the Board does not take a "one-size fits all" approach to tuition. Rather, the Board's approach recognizes the unique characteristics and aspirations of each university and adopts individual tuition strategies that take into account differing missions, program offerings, geographic locations, competitive environments, level of state support, and a myriad of other considerations that enhance and improve each state university. The process results in a variety of levels of tuition and fees that depends on important factors that impact students, their access to higher education, and programmatic needs. Examples of recent innovative and successful tuition strategies include the KU Tuition Compact, PSU's Gorilla Advantage Program, and the pricing structure for FHSU's Virtual College. Any of the individual universities or colleges would be pleased to meet with the Committee to discuss what they have learned in regards to these issues.

The greatest enrollment growth in the past few years has been in the two year college sector. Some of this growth is in students who will eventually matriculate to four year colleges. However, this growth is also in programs that upgrade skills of persons already employed or programs that prepare people to move directly into skilled jobs in the workforce. One of the difficulties that our institutions face in a "down" economy is continuing to prepare people for jobs that may not currently exist.

Included in Appendix B are three charts which show the enrollment growth of each higher education sector over the past 40 years and the history of high school graduates in Kansas since 1991-92 and the expected number of high school graduates through 2021-22. This data reflects a rather dramatic growth in higher education enrollment and a leveling off of high school graduates. In order to continue to grow the enrollments of the higher education institutions and meet the needs of the Kansas workforce, increases in retention and graduation of higher education students coupled with an effort to get more adults to seek higher education training, credential, or diploma will be essential. This is why the Board has established Goals Two and Three in *Foresight 2020*.

Request #2: *In order to attract increased numbers of enrolled students, increase graduation rates, and increase student success opportunities, please investigate and report strategies by which students may accelerate their academic careers including changing the focus from semester-based courses to skill/knowledge based completion and assessment. If students can learn earlier and pass proficiency/knowledge tests, should they receive credit and take additional courses? In some aspects, this is the format for many on-line courses with flexible testing and for students who test out of courses based on high school or other knowledge.*

Over the past several years, there has been a dramatic growth in the number of high school students taking concurrent classes while in high school. Most of these classes are taken from community and technical colleges. These have played a valuable role in accelerating the time it takes some students to complete college or credential coursework.

Also, with the advent of bandwidth and new technologies, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of online courses offered. The KBOR staff is currently working with all 32 of its institutions to determine the extent of these offerings in Kansas. However, we do know that some community colleges are delivering up to one third of the courses online and that Fort Hays State University has a virtual college. Also, several community colleges in western Kansas have even formed a consortium for the delivery of online instruction. Add to this the unbelievable growth in the private postsecondary sector which the KBOR regulates.

In relation to opportunities for assessment of learning, colleges and universities may grant credit to students via an assessment of prior learning and a review of professional certifications using guidelines prescribed by the Council for Adult and Experiential Learning (CAEL). The intent of this process is to allow a student to acquire credit for previously acquired skills and knowledge which in turn accelerates their progress toward the completion of a degree. In the two year colleges, an additional mechanism exists to facilitate the verification of previous experience. The technical education program alignment initiative is establishing a direct tie between industry-based third party credentials and academic coursework. Hence, a student possessing a third party industry based credential may be eligible to receive some college credit from an institution since the credential is evidence of mastery of the skills and knowledge contained in some of the basic courses.

“Test-out” options for college credit are available via DANTES (subject examinations to earn college credit) and the College Level Examination Program (CLEP). In addition, some colleges and universities have established their own “test-out” options for selected college courses that support institutionally specific programs. For example, KU offers its own program of examinations for advanced credit, with applications available online. Such credits must be approved by the instructor, the chair of the department, and by the student’s dean.

Request #2a: *SB 345 required coordination of articulation agreements between Regents’ institutions. Please report how well that coordination has been accomplished – particularly whether all institutions universally accept the same courses from each other institution.*

Overall, articulation between Regents' institutions since the passage of SB 345 has improved. Regents' institutions conform to the Board's policy on transfer and articulation, which requires reporting of articulation agreements to the Board at the time they are established. In addition, the policy specifies the distribution of a minimum of 45 credit hours of general education that will be accepted in transfer at Regents institutions.

Each Regents university has a transfer articulation guide on the institutional website to help students determine how specific courses will transfer into that institution. For example, KU's "CredTran is a transfer course equivalency system that lists more than 2,200 colleges and universities from which KU has accepted transfer courses in the past." The five other state universities have similar guides.

In the fall of 2010, the KBOR established a system level Transfer and Articulation Task Force for the purpose of improving system level oversight of the transfer and articulation process. This was one of the objectives included in *Foresight 2020*. The task force has been meeting and will submit its findings and recommendations to the Board in spring 2011.

Request #3: *Following the above question regarding the pace by which students may complete degree/certificate programs, please investigate and report strategies by which the number of credit hours necessary to meet graduation requirements are evaluated. For example, is 120 credit hours still the appropriate number for a person to earn a degree that meets both general subjects an educated citizen should know and the career path preparation that is appropriate in a rapidly changing technology-based economy?*

The number of credit hours for an individual program is determined by that program's faculty based on the knowledge and skills necessary to gain entry into the field of the discipline. These include general education and discipline-specific requirements. All degree programs must go through a rigorous process of review before being approved by the KBOR. The KBOR has had a policy for many years which required a minimum of 124 credit hours for a bachelor's degree program. The KBOR in the fall of 2010 changed its minimum credit hour requirement to 120. The 120 credit hour requirement is virtually universal in the United States and brings Kansas in line with most other states. The philosophical basis of college degrees in the United States is to produce not only a person knowledgeable and skilled in a particular field but also with a general knowledge base that is critical to being a participating citizen in this country.

In the two year colleges, accreditation has provided guidance on the number and variety of courses required for receipt of an associate degree. In 2007 the Kansas Legislature enacted legislation creating a Postsecondary Technical Education Authority which has oversight for technical education in Kansas and is advisory to the KBOR. Through its work over the past two to three years, programs leading to credentials as well as associate of applied science degrees have gone through an alignment process that is based on industry standards and has resulted in a narrower range of credit hour requirements.

Request #4: *Committee members are very concerned about the inability of higher education institutions to maintain facilities and request a study and report on the desirability and feasibility of identifying a dedicated funding stream to maintain infrastructures and upgrade facilities to*

meet challenges and opportunities. Specifically, should consideration be given to increasing the statewide Educational Building Fund levy, should community colleges be allowed to seek funding in counties in which satellite campuses are located, and should technical colleges have authority to seek funding within their “home” county and areas of primary service? The Committee encourages consideration of additional funding options – no matter how innovative – so that the Legislature can be better engaged with institutional leaders and the Board of Regents to meet the educational needs of the next decade and beyond.

For many years, the Board has consistently expressed its concern about the deferred and ongoing building maintenance needs of the universities and colleges and appreciated the study and work of the 2007 Legislature that enacted HB 2237 and created both the State University Long-Term Infrastructure Maintenance Program and the Infrastructure Finance Program for the coordinated institutions.

The table below summarizes the 2007 plan and compares the plan to what has actually happened to date.

Institutions	Components of 2007 Plan	Anticipated in 2007 (in millions)	Actual - To Date (in millions)
State Universities	Tax Credits	\$118	\$ 1.3
	Interest Earnings	44	32.7
	SGF through FY 11	80	63.7
	Federal Stimulus	0	45.8
Total		\$242	\$143.5
Coordinated Institutions	Tax Credits	\$ 40.5	\$ 3.2
	PEI Loan Program	100	40.0
	Federal Stimulus	0	17.7
Total		\$140.5	\$60.9

It is important to note, that if fully-funded, the Legislature’s 5-year plan would have addressed 31% of the state university maintenance backlog.

The 2007 legislative Task Force report that led to the legislation outlined a myriad of possible funding sources that the Task Force studied and evaluated to help resolve this problem, including an increase in the mill collected for the Educational Building Fund. However, as of this date the only dedicated state revenue stream for capital improvements at the state universities is the Education Building Fund which is supported by a one-mill statewide property tax levy which currently raises between \$28 and \$30 million annually. Obviously, the KBOR would welcome opportunities to work with the Governor and Legislature on a viable dedicated funding stream to address the backlog of deferred maintenance and ongoing maintenance needs.

The updated 2010 report of the maintenance needs on the six state university campuses indicates that while progress has been made in addressing the maintenance backlog, thanks in part to the 2007 Legislature’s 5-Year Maintenance Plan, federal stimulus funds, and continued work by the

Board and the state universities, campus maintenance needs continue to grow. The "Report on State University Deferred and Annual Maintenance," which has been produced biennially since 2004, indicates the deferred maintenance backlog has grown to \$876 million, a 6% increase since 2008.

2010 Backlog: \$876 million total, + \$51 million (+ 6%) since 2008
2008 Backlog: \$825 million total, + \$162 million (+ 24%) since 2006
2006 Backlog: \$663 million total

The maintenance backlog on the state university campuses is as follows:

	<u>2010</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>Change from 2008</u>
KSU	\$314.3 million	\$290.6 million	+ \$23.7 million (+ 8%)
KU	\$298.9 million	\$316.5 million	- \$17.6 million (- 6%)
PSU	\$79.5 million	\$67 million	+ \$12.5 million (+ 19%)
WSU	\$73.4 million	\$49.3 million	+ \$24.1 million (+ 49%)
ESU	\$57.1 million	\$50.6 million	+ \$6.5 million (+ 13%)
FHSU	\$52.5 million	\$51 million	+ \$1.5 million (+ 3%)
TOTAL:	\$875.7 million	\$825 million	+ \$50.7 million (+ 6%)

In order to produce the report, facilities condition assessments were conducted on the 438 mission-critical academic and academic support buildings located on the state university campuses during the summer of 2010. The assessments followed previously established and uniform methodologies which were validated by an independent national consultant. The report updated building replacement costs, utility and infrastructure replacement costs, building inventories, quantities of utilities and infrastructure, and other data.

Despite the infusion of state funding that was authorized by the 2007 Legislature (funding totaling \$63.7 million has been appropriated for three years of the five year program for the state universities) and the receipt of federal stimulus funding (totaling \$45.8 million for FY 2009 through FY 2011), the deferred maintenance backlog continues to increase. The growth is due primarily to the increased age of the physical plant, and the continued under-funding of both deferred and annual maintenance. However, the backlog would have undoubtedly been higher had the economic downturn not held construction labor and material costs in check. The report indicates that \$92 million is required annually in order for the backlog to stop growing (\$52 million was available in FY 2010). The complete "Report on State University Deferred and Annual Maintenance" can be found on the Board's website at the following link:
<http://www.kansasregents.org/resources/PDF/1097-010ReportonDeferred&AnnualMaintenance-FINAL.pdf>.

In terms of the community and technical colleges, the Legislature passed KSA 71-201d in 2010 that gives the community colleges authority to own buildings in counties other than the home county as long as it is a part of the service area. In the past, community colleges leased space for classes in satellite campuses and many still do. Community colleges already have authority to propose a bond issue in the home county. This new law provides an option for community colleges to use if needed. Technical colleges have a different scenario since they do not have

levy authority even in the county in which they are located. Four of the six technical colleges were originally a part of a unified school district and the school district had authority to build and repair facilities. Now, all six of the technical colleges are independent of the school districts and have no statutory authority for building or repairing buildings except through the general operating fund or issuance of bonds that may not be secured by a pledge of any property tax revenues. Clearly, there needs to be some mechanism enacted to support the technical colleges in building and repair of buildings.

The condition of college and university buildings plays an important role in the state's economic success. The condition of university buildings also influences where students decide to pursue higher education. An Association of Physical Plant Administrators' survey found that 73% of students said facilities related to their major were extremely or very important in deciding where they would attend college. Therefore, attention to the construction and maintenance/repair of buildings for the colleges and universities is a critical need in the system.

Request #5: Please analyze potential benefits and risks to Regents directed and coordinated institutions, and ultimately the Kansas taxpayer, of permitting institutions to pursue the MHEC insurance program.

The Regents have looked at this issue. It is our understanding that the barrier to considering the MHEC property insurance program is the insurance carrier utilized by the MHEC program, Lexington/Chartiss, is not admitted to do business in Kansas. K.S.A. 75-4101(d) requires the universities to purchase insurance only from a company authorized to transact business in the state of Kansas. Utilizing a carrier that has been admitted by the Insurance Commissioner to do business in this State assures availability of regulatory protections. If the MHEC carrier was admitted to do business in Kansas, we would welcome another competitive insurance carrier to bid for this business.

The state universities currently enjoy a favorable rate on property insurance. This rate was obtained by utilizing a broker to find good coverage at the best rate possible. Our broker is currently Lockton Companies and our current insurance carrier is Travelers Insurance Company. The universities are insuring just over \$7 billion in property values (building only, not including contents or other campus specific coverage).

As a point of comparison, we currently pay \$0.022 per \$100 of insured value with a \$500,000 deductible. We have the option to buy down the deductible to \$100,000 with the premium increasing to \$0.025 per \$100 insured value. Our current rates are already competitive with MHEC. Overall, the average MHEC account rate is .0302 with a range from .0154 to .0628.

With regard to the coordinated institutions, purchase of property insurance is a responsibility of the individual local governing boards.

Request #6: The Committee requests a report regarding implementation of programs that permit, within federal privacy guidelines and requirements, the tracking on a systemic basis, rather than on an individual institution basis, so that education policy-makers can make better decisions regarding the effectiveness of the integrated higher education system. Furthermore,

the Committee encourages implementation of programs with the Departments of Labor and Commerce to facilitate identification of persons who will benefit from job training opportunities and making relevant information available to them.

A system-wide tracking system already exists at KBOR which is known as the Kansas Higher Education Data System (KHEDS). As you may know, K.S.A. 74-3205d charges the Kansas Board of Regents with “collect[ing] and analyz[ing] data and maintain[ing] a uniform postsecondary education data base”. The Board uses this database to fulfill the purpose of this act [which] is to “provide for the general improvement of postsecondary education in the state of Kansas and to provide leadership, supervision and coordination for postsecondary educational institutions so that enhanced accessibility, quality, excellence, accountability, research and service may be achieved in the postsecondary educational system for Kansas residents through the efficient and effective utilization and concentration of all available resources and the elimination of costly and undesirable duplication in program and course offerings, faculties, and physical facilities at postsecondary educational institutions.” This database assures that common methodology and analysis is used when identifying what is happening in all postsecondary education, a benefit that did not exist prior to 1999 and the passage of the Higher Education Coordination Act.

Development of this database began in FY 2003 and was first utilized to conduct live data collection for both the fall census day and full academic year enrollments. Additionally, completion data was collected. Some of the outcomes that have been possible with this data are as follows:

1. Performing studies on transfer patterns of postsecondary students among the public institutions. Information from studies like these will help in determining the accessibility and, when coupled with student performance, quality of our institutions.
2. Performing studies on students enrolled in multiple institutions during the same semester to evaluate the affects of things like distance education. Information from studies like this will again help in determining accessibility.
3. Performing studies on student success based on developmental courses and beginning studies based on qualified admissions and underserved populations.

In phase two of development of the database which was in FY 2004, information for program inventory, program review, student financial aid applications, adult basis education, and Carl D. Perkins technical education programming was collected. Some of the outcomes of the data collected in this phase are as follows:

1. Creating web-based reports and data submission forms for the Carl D. Perkins program. This new reporting mechanism simplifies the data submission routines for the institutions and provides KBOR staff with an easy and effective way to monitor the institutions.
2. Creating reports required by the federal government for the Carl D. Perkins program and the Technical Education Authority.
3. Creating web-based reports for institutions and KBOR staff to track students through the ABE program. Once again this new reporting mechanism simplifies the data submission routines for the institutions and it allows ABE staff to easily and effectively regulate their programs.
4. Creating reports required by the federal government for the ABE program.

5. Creating a web-based list of all KBOR approved degree programs in the state. This will eventually be available to the public. Once available to the public it will provide residents of Kansas, and anyone else interested in Kansas schools, a list of all programs available and where those programs are offered amongst our public institutions.
6. Creating a tracking mechanism so KBOR staff and institutions can follow a program as it is modified over the years. Being able to track changes will assure program efficiency measures like enrollment and expenditures are always linked to the correct program when analysis is performed on multiple years at one time.

In phase three of the database which was initiated in FY 2007, additional data was collected on course and registration data, employment, and business, training, and enrichment. Additionally, the framing of what would become a preK-20 database was formed. Some of the outcomes of this phase are as follows:

1. Creating reports for the Technical Education Authority on technical education enrollments in programs, short programs and business and industry courses.
2. Creating reports for the Technical Education Authority showing student course taking patterns and similarities/differences of the course make-up in programs across institutions.
3. Beginning studies to determine how postsecondary education institutions are assisting in the economic development of Kansas.
4. Creating web-based tools that will allow the tracking of Kansas students from kindergarten through college.
5. Beginning studies to evaluate the entire educational system in Kansas, kindergarten through college.

In phases four and five (future), additional data will be collected on institutional financial aid and financial reporting. Some of the outcomes of these phases are as follows:

1. Beginning studies to determine how tuition costs are affecting the amount students pay for college. A net cost for college will be calculated.
2. Beginning analysis to assure accurate and complete data is submitted in the event the database is used as a source for funding calculations.
3. Beginning studies to determine how changes in program standards will impact institutional funding.

The outcomes described above have allowed education policy-makers to make better decisions regarding the effectiveness of the integrated higher education system. In fact, the Legislative Division of Post Audit has used the database for two separate audits over the last couple of years. State Universities: Reviewing Issues Related to Students' Excess Credit Hours and State Universities (September, 2010): Can State Universities Provide Postsecondary Education More Efficiently to Reduce Costs? (August, 2009).

Beginning in FY 2011, Kansas was awarded \$9.1 million federal recovery dollars over three years to continue to improve our educational data systems. The grant calls for continuing the development and implementation of our educational statewide longitudinal data system enabling examination of student progress from early childhood into the workforce. It is estimated that

approximately \$3 million of this grant will be expended to enhance the postsecondary and workforce systems.

This grant will assist with continuing to develop our capacity to effectively monitor the educational progress of our students from early childhood through higher education and into the workforce, while protecting privacy. Accurate longitudinal data will enable our state's educators, policy makers, and workforce development leaders to have a more meaningful and comprehensive picture of how students are progressing through each stage of the educational process. This data will also provide an enhanced, and data-based, capacity for us to identify and address performance gaps in our systems.

***Request #7:** With almost 50,000 Kansans currently attending private career education colleges (almost equal to the number attending KU and KSU), we are concerned that opportunities for collaboration are not being adequately pursued. We encourage the Board of Regents and staff to review and report back to us the role that private post-secondary institutions have in job training and identify ways in which Regents' coordinated educational programs can benefit from shared resources and strategic planning to ensure that Kansas employers/workforce needs are met. Specifically, is the Board willing to have the System Council of Chief Academic Officers and Academic Officers from the private sector develop a process for private post-secondary schools and Regents' institutions on a course credit transfer agreement to better ensure a seamless transition for students; and is the Board willing to have the Kansas Post-Secondary Technical Education Authority and the private post-secondary technical institution collaboratively identify best educational practices to meet employer needs and to stimulate economic growth in Kansas?*

The Kansas Board of Regents' Private Postsecondary Education Department statutorily authorizes private and out-of-state institutions to operate in Kansas with a Certificate of Approval that must be renewed annually. All schools operating with a physical presence in Kansas, or that are actively soliciting enrollment of prospective students to receive instruction in the state of Kansas, must apply for a Certificate of Approval or an exemption. The Private Postsecondary Education Department is responsible for ensuring that the overall educational quality of the programs offered will provide Kansas students with the necessary skills to secure meaningful employment while protecting students' financial interests during their enrollment in approved institutions. To carry out its responsibilities, the Private Postsecondary unit, as required by statute, works with an Advisory Council that meets regularly to address issues within the sector.

Additionally, independent higher education institutions in Kansas have a long history of working with the public colleges and universities in credit transfer. In fact, each of the colleges and universities has identified course equivalencies that students can refer to when considering a move between public and private Kansas institutions.

However, with the growth of the private, for-profit postsecondary sector located outside of Kansas, the issue of transfer and articulation between these institutions and Kansas institutions is very difficult. Currently as with other sectors, Kansas public higher education institutions make

individual decisions on requests for transfer of credit. The central challenge of articulation between these institutions is to develop a common currency.

One promising practice that could help mitigate this challenge for technical education is program alignment. Program alignment targets the identification and implementation of standardized outcomes in the form of industry-based third party credentials for students. Private postsecondary institutions often promote the acquisition of third party industry based credentials for their students. For example, private postsecondary institutions offering “welding” promote the acquisition of skills equivalent to or exceeding the American Welding Society standards. Our public two-year colleges are in the process of implementing these same standard outcomes for their students. The acquisition of third party industry based credentials by students to demonstrate skill and knowledge acquisition requisite for employment is considered to be the pre-eminent “best practice” nationally to verify for employers that graduates do indeed have the skills necessary to be successful. Nationally third party industry-based credentials represent a “common currency” that transcends dissimilarities between different public and private educational systems and structures. Students who complete industry credentials have a documented validation of learning and performance and should find it easier to transfer into other postsecondary programs.

***Request #8:** We specifically want to know: 1) what are the 10 programs most in demand by students and employers for which there are inadequate resources to meet the demand, 2) why are the student/employer needs not being met in a timely fashion, and 3) what is the plan to address those needs.*

Program areas with the strongest enrollments (student demand) include health science, business and administration, law and public safety, transportation/distribution/logistics, and information technology. However, based on requests from colleges and input from business/industry, the program areas with the strongest potential need for expansion (continued and/or new enrollments) include: engineering; education—specifically, teachers in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields; nursing and allied health; dental hygiene; wind energy; electric power and natural gas transmission; biotechnology and laboratory technician; veterinarian technician; composites, aircraft airframe and powerplant technician; and computer networking/administration/cyber security.

Matching the demand side (employer needs) with the supply side (educational production) has always been a challenge. Generally, higher education institutions are meeting workforce needs in many occupational areas. In order to sustain graduates in needed employment areas, the Board has focused on areas of long-term shortages. For example, the nursing initiative resulted in nursing program expansion of over 500 nursing students in Kansas. Utilizing a similar strategy, the Board’s latest legislative request (the Kansas Commitment/Kan-Grow), includes a strategy to increase the number of engineering graduates.

At the technical occupation level, the Technical Education Authority and the Board have identified the resources necessary to address funding inadequacies through the new technical education tiered funding model, which when implemented will fund high-cost, high-demand technical programs at a higher rate. In addition, KBOR and the Kansas Department of

Commerce are working jointly to target a limited amount of existing resources to support current and anticipated areas of workforce needs. For example, KBOR and the Department of Commerce have recently combined limited financial resources to increase training opportunities for persons seeking employment in the energy industry. Unfortunately, there are few dedicated funding sources administered by KBOR that specifically address the challenges and “start-up” costs necessary for the development of new programs. As a result, institutions must seek external funding sources and/or reallocate existing resources in order to start new programs.

Looking forward and in response to high-demand workforce needs, the Board’s strategic agenda includes a goal to “enhance alignment between the work of the state’s higher education system and the needs of the Kansas economy.” To assist in determining how production (number of graduates) aligns with industry workforce needs in technical occupations, the Kansas Postsecondary Technical Education Authority receives an annual report on the number of graduates, job placement, and wages. In addition beginning in 2011, the Board will begin receiving an annual report on the state’s workforce needs, both in technical level and professional level occupations, and the number of persons educated in the higher education system to fill those needs. Based on this information, Board staff will determine alignment and gaps and work with system institutions to respond to the identified needs.

***Request #9:** Specifically, is there a process within the Regents system for technical programs to be offered through other locations (e.g., community colleges, technical colleges, other public facilities) via the Internet or by other means to meet the State’s needs for technically trained persons? If there is, how can it be expanded to more effectively meet the needs of more Kansas? If there is not such a program, should one be created?*

As noted above, KBOR has partnered with the Department of Commerce in an innovative project to increase the ability of institutions to deliver educational programs statewide. The Energy Network of Education and Training (EnergyNET) project will enhance the ability of the Kansas public higher education system to meet the training needs of the energy industry throughout the state and rely heavily on a hybrid (both on-line and face-to-face) method of educational delivery.

Industry experts will guide the project and training will be designed to deliver industry-defined skills and credentials. The system will utilize flexible learning formats, especially high-quality interactive online learning courseware. The cooperative model will meet the energy training needs across the state and allow many institutions to participate in training in an efficient manner. Fort Hays State University, working with KBOR and Commerce staff, will convene industry advisory committees, coordinate curriculum enhancements, and identify industry credentials. Partnering colleges will deliver the technical training, general education and foundational skills necessary for a skilled workforce. The training will include emerging energy, such as wind, solar, photovoltaic and biomass; traditional energy; electric power transmission and distribution; smart grid and energy security; and energy efficiency in residential, commercial and industrial applications.

Our two year colleges are known for being innovative in delivery of courses and programs and have developed a number of programs offered through satellite campuses or via the Internet. For

example, Highland Community College which merged with the technical school in Atchison is in the process of expanding technical program offerings in Holton. Also, North Central Kansas Technical College has a number of technical programs offered in Hays in cooperation with Fort Hays State University and just developed a new underground technology program in cooperation with Ditch Witch. Further, Coffeyville Community College has an electric technology program that they are offering in Pratt in cooperation with Pratt Community College. These are but a few examples of how the two year colleges are developing new programs and cooperating to meet workforce needs.

***Request #10:** What evaluation process is used by the individual institutions to identify those degree programs/departments best situated to achieve national prominence in terms of teaching and research excellence? What process is used by the individual institutions to identify those programs in need of additional resources to achieve greater prominence/excellence? What process is used by the individual institutions to identify programs/departments which will be unable to achieve such national prominence/excellence and what steps are involved in shifting resources devoted to such programs to those better positioned to achieve excellence with benefits to the people of Kansas? Similarly, what role does the Board of Regents have in evaluating or reviewing program evaluations at the individual institutions?*

As a part of the Board's strategic agenda, each Regents university is required to benchmark its performance against its peers with the expectation of improving its regional and national standing. Additionally, the Board approves a mission for each Regents university which identifies areas of major emphasis that distinguishes each institution.

Further, KBOR policy requires that it "maintain a program review cycle and a review process that will allow the universities to demonstrate that they are delivering quality programs consistent with their mission." Each academic program is reviewed at least once every eight years. In addition, KBOR maintains a data system that collects information on individual programs and establishes minima for specific categories at both the undergraduate and graduate levels (number of majors, number of graduates, number of faculty headcount to deliver the program). Programs falling below the minima established for each of these categories may be targeted for intensive review beyond that required as part of the regular review cycle.

Based on the program review, institutions determine whether a program shall be continued, discontinued or placed under more intensive review. Review results include assessment of the program in relation to its discipline and are also used to determine how the university allocates its resources. The Board receives an annual report on the results of the campus-based program reviews. In addition, staff monitors institutional progress in dealing with programs identified as requiring intensive review.


***Request #11:** What process do the individual institutions and the Board of Regents have to expand the endowments of the respective institutions? Do the Board of Regents and institutions have plans to legislatively address restrictions on the use of funds contributed to institutional endowments (e.g., after 10, 20 years)?*

Each endowment/foundation is a non-controlled, affiliated corporation of a university, the purpose of which is to enhance or support the mission and activities of that state university. As such, the Board and university leaders do not control the endowment/foundations and have no process or authority to expand the endowments/foundations of the respective state universities. The Board does not have plans to legislatively address restrictions on the use of funds contributed to foundations/endowments, but at the request of the endowments/foundations, has sought and obtained legislation in recent years to facilitate getting gifts to the endowments/foundations so that those entities may administer those gifts for the benefit of the university.

This question was forwarded to foundation/endowment officials. Board staff received the following comments:

- In terms of legislation to address restrictions on the use of contributed funds, I know of no particular problem in this area, nor of any need for legislation. All contributed funds can and are used to support the university in keeping with the donor intent, or if conditions have changed relative to a donor restriction, the appropriate steps are taken to use the funds in a manner which is in keeping with the spirit of the donor's intent. We would not favor legislative intrusion into donor agreements.
- The legislature should never restrict donor intentions, and this would inhibit donors from making contributions to the endowment as the primary motive is perpetuity.
- I honestly don't know anything about plans to legislatively address restrictions on use of endowed funds but if I understand it correctly, I would be strongly opposed.
- The foundations currently work with donors to adjust restrictions where needed.
- Most donors provide guidance as to how money is to be used from their donations (most gifts come with restrictions). We cannot re-direct their gifts as they are given in perpetuity.
- In the absence of more information, it would probably be best to emphasize that the Regents don't have a great deal of influence over what people donate their money for. And attempting to impose such is likely to curtail donations. The donor "memoranda of understanding" governs what restrictions are placed on the donation.

It does not appear that foundation/endowment officials see a need for reform in this area.



FORESIGHT 2020

A STRATEGIC AGENDA FOR KANSAS HIGHER EDUCATION

Approved by the Kansas Board of Regents
September 15, 2010

A STRATEGIC AGENDA FOR KANSAS HIGHER EDUCATION

In the spring of 2009, Reginald Robinson, President and CEO of the Board of Regents, presented five strategic questions and associated data related to issues that would directly affect the future of higher education in Kansas. After more than a year of study, Foresight 2020 emerged as a new strategic agenda for higher education in Kansas. Five strategic goals, initially characterized as “pillars”, form the foundation for this agenda.

Specific objectives were then developed to serve as the initial focus for each goal. In some instances specific dates were identified for achievement of the objectives and in other instances long term objectives were established. As certain objectives are accomplished and new data gives greater focus to achievement of the goals, additional and/or revised objectives will be proposed.

This strategic agenda and its associated objectives will now be used as the focus of performance agreements with each of the state’s public higher education institutions. Also, it will serve as the framework for creating a systematic monitoring of progress that will result in an annual report to the Board of Regents on these strategic goals.

Strategic Goal #1

Achieve alignment between the state’s preK-12 and higher education systems and continue to enhance alignment between higher education institutions.

Objectives

- 1.1 By December of 2010, the Board of Regents and its staff in cooperation with the P-20 Education Council and the Kansas State Department of Education will identify gaps that currently exist between preK-12 completion and higher education preparation expectations.
- 1.2 By August of 2011, all higher education institutions will have had discussions with local preK-12 partner high schools regarding these gaps and a plan to eliminate them.
- 1.3 By June of 2011, the Board of Regents will adopt a revised set of university admissions standards designed to identify a level of high school preparation that significantly enhance student success at the state’s higher education institutions.
- 1.4 During the 2010-11 academic year, the Board will create a task force to review progress on alignment of higher education institutions and charge the task force with developing recommendations for additional enhancements needed to ensure greater alignment.

Strategic Goal #2

Achieve participation in the state’s higher education system that better reflects the state’s demography and more fully engages adult learners.

Objectives

- 2.1 By 2020 or before, Kansas will improve levels of participation, within each higher education institution and across the system, that reflect the racial, ethnic, and economic demography of the

state with a special focus on the most underrepresented students as measured by biannual progress on the baseline year of 2010.

- 2.2 By 2020 or before, Kansas will achieve “first in the nation” state status for in-state postsecondary participation among “traditional” students, which currently would require an increase from the current participation rate of 53 percent - which is third in the nation – to approximately 59 percent.
- 2.3 By 2020 or before, Kansas will achieve “top five” state status for participation of adults between the ages of 25-39 with only a high school diploma, which currently will require an increase from the current participation rate of 238 per 1000 - which is above the national average – to approximately 317 per 1000.
- 2.4 By 2020 or before, Kansas will achieve “top five” state status for participation of adults between the ages of 40-64 with only a high school diploma, which currently will require an increase from the current participation rate of 48 per 1000 - which is above the national average - to approximately 103 per 1000.
- 2.5 By 2020 or before, Kansas will achieve the national average for enrollment of those with less than a high school diploma in the state-administered Adult Basic Education (ABE) programs with an immediate goal of removing waiting lists, which will require an increase from the current enrollment of 55 per 1000 to approximately 101 per 1000.
- 2.6 By 2020 or before, Kansas will achieve the national average for enrollment of those with limited or no English language proficiency in English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, which will require an increase from 83.3 per 1000 to approximately 101 per 1000.
- 2.7 By 2020 or before, Kansas will double the percentage of Kansas ABE participants who achieve the goal of continuing on to postsecondary education after completion of their ABE programs, which will require an increase from 14 percent to 28 percent.
- 2.8 By January of 2011, the Board of Regents will develop and submit for legislative consideration a proposal that would authorize new state funding to provide need-based assistance to students at public universities.
- 2.9 By September of 2012, the Board of Regents, in cooperation with state university leaders, will develop an initiative aimed at bringing additional out-of-state students into Kansas to pursue their postsecondary studies.
- 2.10 By January of 2012, the Board of Regents will develop and submit for legislative consideration a proposal that would authorize new state funding to expand the state’s Comprehensive Grant Program to provide need-based student assistance for two-year, certificate, and part-time students with an initial focus on those students who pursue studies that lead to jobs in high demand areas of the state’s economy.
- 2.11 By the summer of 2012, Regents’ institutions will have an approved plan to meet the Regent’s policy on distance education which includes the use of alternative delivery systems to accommodate the variety of student educational needs.

Strategic Goal #3

Achieve measurable improvement in persistence and completion rates for higher education institutions across the state.

Objectives

- 3.1 By September of 2012, the Board of Regents, in cooperation with higher education institutional leaders, will develop an initiative aimed at identifying and recruiting back into the higher education system working adults who have earned substantial credit but have not finished the work necessary to earn a credential or degree.
- 3.2 By 2020 or before, Kansas will achieve a 10 percentage point increase in first-to-second year retention rates across the higher education system.
- 3.3 By 2020 or before, Kansas will achieve a 10 percentage point increase in the six-year graduation rate for public universities and the three-year graduation rate for community and technical colleges.
- 3.4 By 2020 or before, Kansas will achieve “top 10” state status for the percentage of students who have earned an associate degree or higher, which currently will require an increase from 39.2 percent to approximately 43.4 percent.

Strategic Goal #4

Ensure that students earning credentials and degrees across the higher education system possess the foundational skills essential for success in work and in life.

Objectives

- 4.1 During the 2010-11 academic year, the Board of Regents’ system-wide learner outcomes task force, in consultation with the university Chief Academic Officers, shall make recommendations regarding the identification and measurement of foundational skills (such as oral and written communication, technical and numerical literacy, critical thinking and problem-solving) which institutions will report to the Board.
- 4.2 By June of 2011, the Board of Regents will adopt a framework that enables each institution to report on the measurement of the foundational skills identified as essential to success in work and in life.
- 4.3 By September of 2012, the Board of Regents will receive its first report on the measurement of foundational skills across the higher education system.

Strategic Goal #5

Enhance alignment between the work of the state's higher education system and the needs of the Kansas economy.

Objectives



- 5.1 By December of 2011, the Board will begin receiving an annual report on the workforce needs of the state and the number of persons educated in the higher education system to fill those needs to determine alignment and gaps.
- 5.2 By December of 2012, the Board will begin receiving an annual report on university research initiatives designed to meet the needs of the Kansas economy.
- 5.3 By 2020 or before, Kansas will achieve or exceed the regional average for percentage of credentials or degrees awarded in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields.


Strategic Goal #6

Enhance the regional and national reputation of Kansas universities through aspirational initiatives.

Objectives

- 6.1 By June of 2011, Regents' universities will identify benchmarks of excellence in comparison with peer institutions and establish goals to pursue in order to increase regional, national, and/or peer rankings.
- 6.2 By June of 2012, Regents' universities, according to mission, will identify areas for expansion of research capacity and/or focus and will establish goals to pursue.
- 6.3 Regents' universities will demonstrate increased collaboration including alignment within the Kansas higher education system through a biennial report.





STATE OF KANSAS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SERVING: ALLEN, ANDERSON, FRANKLIN

COFFEY, AND WOODSON COUNTIES

9th District
State Capitol, Room 180-W
Topeka, KS 66612-1504
785-296-7636
otto@house.state.ks.us

102 9th Street
LeRoy, KS 66857
620-964-2355



November 9, 2010

Dr. Andy Tompkins CEO
Kansas Board of Regents
1000 S W Jackson
Suite 520
Topeka, KS 66612-1321

BILL OTTO

Dear Dr. Tompkins;

Your phone system just dropped my call so I feel it is necessary to write this letter. My youngest daughter is a Junior at PSU and does not know what she wants to do so we were looking at various options when I learned that to be an art teacher out of PSU takes over 70 hours of art. No teaching minor, just a bunch of hours. I talked to Dr. Scott and he directed me to you. I am thinking we need to pass a law that NO state institution should be allowed to require more than, say 45 college hours in any one subject to teach it in the state of Kansas, or perhaps the Regents could fix this type of problem itself.

A second matter is left over from the person who had your job before. I am sending you an article about the University of Kansas losing a grant but no one getting fired. I ask him about this, he said he would get back to me, and he did not. My question is why does it cost so much money to go to KU and KSU, is it because students are paying for this type of thing?

Third I had a bill to freeze tuition at KU until such time as the cost could be justified or the other smaller schools caught up with them. At hearings they gave us the impression that a program to freeze tuition at a level so that it did not go up in a student's four years in college. Our thinking was it stayed at whatever it was when you started but I do not think that is what happened, I understand freshman are given a higher price and then the inflated one will not change. I know and respect you, I hope you can fix some of these things.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Bill Otto".

Bill Otto
Cc Speaker Mike O'Neal Chairman Clay Aurand