

Approved: 3-22-2000
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Senator Barbara Lawrence at 9:00 a.m. on March 16, 2000 in Room 313S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Senators Bleeker, Downey, Hensley & Umbarger - Excused

Committee staff present: Avis Swartzman, Revisor
Ben Barrett, Legislative Research
Carolyn Rampey, Legislative Research
Jackie Breymeyer, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee: Bill Docking, Chairman, State Board of Regents
Dr. Kathy Rupp, Associate Director of Academic Affairs,
State Board of Regents
Dr. Kim Wilcox, Executive Director, State Board of Regents
Carolyn Rampey, Legislative Research

Avis Swartzman, Revisor

Others attending: See Attached List

Chairperson Lawrence called the LEPC and joint meeting of the House and Senate Education Committees to order. She stated this a first for the LEPC to meet in combination with the House and Senate Education committees. She welcomed all those present to the committee. The LEPC decided to have a program review and to have a closer relationship with the Board so as to be mutually helpful in the new endeavor started last summer. She called on Bill Docking, Chairman of the Board of Regents.

Mr. Docking was present to give the long-term plans of the newly constructed Board of Regents. He began by stating the Board used to be an organization that dealt with 6 universities and now deals with 37 institutions. Business was conducted without fanfare. Things are different now. He stated he may be biased, but he believes the Higher Education Coordination Act of 1999 will go down as one of the most important pieces of legislation enacted by the state of Kansas. The Board has just begun to answer the role it will play in the new form of governance and transition and to specifically identify areas of long-term system-wide planning.

After several further comments, Mr. Docking came to the close of his talk by stating enormous comfort is taken from the fact that regardless of the makeup of the Board of Regents, the legislature and whoever occupies the governor's office, the people of Kansas will always be supportive of higher education. It took 25 years to consolidate higher education in Kansas; implementation of all the changes will not occur overnight. The Board is eager to roll up its sleeves and get to work.

Dr. Kathy Rupp, Associate Director for Academic Affairs, Board of Regents, addressed the Committee on the University Program Review Process. Dr. Rupp likened the program review to an annual checkup from a doctor. The review process looks at the large elements of the universities to make sure that they are working smoothly. A program can be continued, certain needs can be specified, monitored, reevaluated or discontinued. Program review's purpose is to support the campus mission and initiatives and to support the efforts of the universities and the Board to maximize the use of resources. Focus is on improvement of curriculum and instruction, but the ultimate goal is to improve the quality of the education that students receive at the universities.

Dr. Rupp, with the use of transparencies, continued through the background and review process and summed up with results of the review process and analysis contained in Program Review (Attachment 1).

The Chairperson called on Carolyn Rampey, Legislative Research, to give a summary of **SB 657**. Ms. Rampey stated the changes were mostly of a technical nature. She went through pages 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 of the bill, explaining the changes.

(Attachment 2)

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE, Room 123S Statehouse, at 9:00 a.m. on March 16, 2000.

Dr. Kim Wilcox, Board of Regents, presented his testimony (Attachment 3), The role and responsibilities of the new Kansas Board of Regents include continued governance of the universities and coordination and supervision of the community colleges, technical schools and Washburn University. He stated that he would not go over the same area since Ms. Rampey had done so in detail. He thanked Ms. Rampey and Avis Swatzman, Revisor, for their assistance in helping with the proposal.

Dr. Wilcox answered questions and the Chairperson called on the Revisor to explain the proposal.

The Revisor stated that in the Carl Perkins federal act, in which Kansas gets federal money, there has to be a state agency to administer the state plan for vocational education. The State Board of Regents and the State Board of Education got together and decided the State Board of Education could have the plan for three years; the Board of Regents would then take it back. What the amendment would do is to put the state plan back with the State Board of Education for three years when it will sunset. That will force the legislature to take a look at it in three years. The amendment will also amend on page 3, the definition of state board so that for the 2001-2003 school years the state board will mean the State Board of Education and after 2003 school year will mean the State Board of Regents. When the community colleges and the vocational technical schools were transferred to the Board of Regents, in the transfer language there are references to the state planning for community colleges and the state plan for vocational technical schools. Those sections were amended to strike those references so there will no longer be a state plan for community colleges and because now the state plan for vocational education will all go back to the State Board of Education. The amendment will repeal 72-4409, 72-4409(a), 72-4410 which refers to the federal advisory committee on vocational education which went defunct about three or four years ago and which the bill now lies in one of the House committees as of this point in time.

Senator Oleen stated she was supportive of the bill, but was hesitant on the amendment at this time.

Representative Reinhardt stated he had spoken with Mr. Dennis of the State Board of Education and other staff and he supports the amendment.

Senator Oleen moved, seconded by Representative Horst to recommend SB 657 by the LEPC favorably to the Senate Education committee. The motion carried.

Senator Emert, seconded by Senator Langworthy recommended SB 657 favorably for passage. The motion carried.

Presidents of the universities and community colleges who were present rose to be recognized.

The meeting was adjourned.

SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE GUEST LIST

DATE: March 16, 2000

NAME	REPRESENTING
Kim Wilcox	KBOR
STEVE CLARK	KBOR
Janice DeBauge	KBOR
Dylina Robinson	"
William Decking	"
Kathy Papp	KBOR
Sherry Farris	"
Mark Desethi	KNEA

PROGRAM REVIEW
2000

KU

PSU

ESU

WSU

FHSU

KSU

Senate Education

*3-16-2000
att. Divert 1*

PROGRAM REVIEW 2000

SUMMARY

In September of 1997, the Board adopted a systemwide plan for program review that required each university to develop its own process for review of all academic programs on an eight-year cycle. This is the second report to the Board under that plan.

BACKGROUND

From 1982 to 1990, the Kansas Board of Regents and Regents universities reviewed every academic degree program in the Regents system. That review resulted in the modification or discontinuance of over 180 degree programs and a documented savings to the State of over \$1 million. In 1992 the Regents conducted another review of all programs as part of the study of the missions, roles, and aspirations of the Regents universities. That review resulted in the modification, merger, or discontinuance of an additional 182 programs or units, and reported reinvestments totaling approximately \$18 million from FY 1994 - FY 1998.

In 1997, the Board of Regents initiated a new system of program review to ensure that all degree programs be evaluated at least once every eight years. That review program was designed to:

- Support campus plans to fulfill institutional missions and initiatives within VISION 2020;
- Support universities in developing and refining their mission and roles within Kansas higher education;
- Support the Board and the universities in aligning academic programs with institutional missions and priorities;
- Support the efforts of the universities and the Board by increasing institutional flexibility;
- Focus on the improvement of curriculum and instruction and the use of faculty time and talent.

The review process includes two components: institutional reviews of academic programs and development of a common program review database. Institutional reviews are conducted for each program on an eight-year cycle, using campus-specific review procedures. This month's report is the second to the Board using the new review process. Included in this report are all programs scheduled for Year 2 of the eight-year cycle. The common program review database has been developed in accordance with the Guidelines for Prompting Intensive Program Review approved by the Board in 1997. Those guidelines rely on enrollment, graduation, and faculty data for identifying programs for intensive review beyond the regular eight-year cycle.

THE REVIEW PROCESS

Program reviews are initiated by the institution, and assess programs relative to the following criteria:

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

These criteria are appropriate for all degree programs; however, the conceptualization, measurement, and application of the criteria vary by institutional mission and degree level.

Institutions determined their own schedules for program review and previously submitted those to the Board. Institutional strategies for selecting programs for review were shaped by school and college activities, external accreditation cycles, and other factors. As a result, there is significant variability among universities in the number of programs reviewed in any given year. Specific review procedures also varied across institutions, but all reviews began with a departmental self-study followed by faculty and/or administrative review. Self-studies relied on a variety of data sources, including: student learning assessment data, accreditation reports, data on student post-collegiate experiences, data on core and institution-specific performance indicators, and on national or disciplinary rankings of program quality.

Institutional reports are comprised of:

1. A five-page institutional overview describing the review process, how data sources were used to shape program recommendations, and the most significant program changes or recommendations resulting from the program review;
2. A two-page summary assessment and institutional recommendations for each program; and
3. A one-page institutional estimate of the fiscal implications of the recommended program changes for each fiscal year from FY 2001 - FY 2006.

RESULTS OF THE REVIEW

Campus reviews have been previously distributed to the Board. Major recommendations for continuation, discontinuation, additional review, or enhancement of each reviewed program are summarized in Table 1. Of the 78 programs reviewed this year, 44 are recommended for continuation in their present form or with minor changes. Eight programs are recommended for enhancement. Two programs are being discontinued, with 24 others targeted for additional review in the next 2-4 years. Additional review can take the form of submitting plans for change and monitoring of particular program features such as enrollment, or they may require more complete reviews.

More importantly, perhaps, the review process generated a wide range of specific recommendations for program improvement. While these are program-specific, many deal with similar issues. Planning for replacement of computers and instructional equipment was recommended for many programs, and several other recommendations focused on the need for additional faculty. Some departments are concerned about the need to replace retiring faculty. In the late 1950s and early 1960s universities experienced great growth that required the addition of faculty, many of whom were new to academia. These faculty members are now planning on retiring within a relatively short time span and must be replaced. Departments realize that it will be hard to replace faculty with national or international reputations. For the foreseeable future, our universities will need to develop strategies to manage this situation. An abbreviated version of some of these recommendations and notations of unique or zero cost programs may be found in Table 2. Interested readers are directed to the original reports for a complete description of all institutional recommendations.

ANALYSIS

This is the second year of implementation of a comprehensive and complex review program. For it to succeed, all institutions must be earnest in their attempt to objectively review their programs and resources. It would appear that this is the case for all six Regents universities. The care taken in conducting the reviews is evident in both the self-studies and the resultant recommendations.

Table 1. CAMPUS SUMMARIES

Emporia State University

Emporia State University reviewed programs in four areas: Biological Sciences, Business, Library Science, and Physical Sciences. It was recommended that all programs be continued, but that restructuring of the School of Business be considered.

- ◆ Laboratories and equipment in Biological and Physical Sciences should be updated.
- ◆ All reviewed programs need to develop computer/technology replacement plans.
- ◆ A task force should be formed to determine the appropriateness of the structure of the School of Business, and plans developed for increasing appropriate scholarly activity and improving student advising and support services.
- ◆ The master's degree in Business Education is unique in the state and should be continued.
- ◆ The bachelor of science degree in Earth Science is unique in Kansas.
- ◆ Geospatial analysis is an interdisciplinary technology program unique in Kansas.
- ◆ A plan should be devised to add faculty in the Biological sciences and to recruit appropriate Business faculty.
- ◆ Physical Sciences should develop a plan to increase the number of majors and graduates in several areas.
- ◆ The Schools of Business and Library and Information Management need to develop plans to recruit more diverse student populations, with Business pursuing this goal among its faculty as well.
- ◆ The master's degree in Library Science is the only American Library Association accredited program in Kansas, and the doctoral program is the only one at a Regents university.

Fort Hays State University

Fort Hays State University reviewed thirteen programs. Twelve programs will be continued, one will be discontinued, and four of the twelve continued programs will be enhanced. Additional Review was recommended for one program

- ◆ It is recommended that the Economics program be discontinued.
- ◆ It is recommended that the Physical Sciences program receive additional review.
- ◆ Computer Information Systems provides support for a number of other degrees and the general education program
- ◆ There is high demand for graduates of Computer Information Systems, Business Administration, Information Systems Administration, and Business Communication
- ◆ Diverse faculty background is a strength of several programs: Computer Information Systems, Chemistry, Information Systems Administration, and Business Communication
- ◆ A number of programs note a need for additional faculty: Computer Information Systems, Business Administration, Information Systems Administration, and Business Administration.
- ◆ Computer Information Systems, Physics, Chemistry, Information Systems Administration, and Business Administration need plans for updating computer resources and scientific equipment.
- ◆ Physical Science is an interdisciplinary program and a zero cost program.
- ◆ Faculty retirements are a potential problem in the Chemistry Department; a plan needs to be developed for their replacement.
- ◆ Small class sizes facilitate individualized attention for students of Physics, Chemistry, and Business Administration.
- ◆ Finance and Accounting are cooperating to provide students the opportunity to take a double major in Accounting and Finance.

Table 1. CAMPUS SUMMARIES (CON'T)

Kansas State University

Kansas State University reviewed seven programs. Degrees include bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees. Of these programs, it was recommended that one be discontinued and one undergo additional monitoring. All other programs will continue as they are structured.

- ◆ The bachelor's degree in Geophysics and Seismology is to be discontinued.
- ◆ The Geology Department will develop a detailed plan to enhance enrollment and will receive additional review.
- ◆ Chemistry and Mathematics programs carry a heavy service load.
- ◆ Geology, Physics, Chemistry, and Mathematics are involved in the general education program at KSU.
- ◆ Recent retirements, planned retirements, and resignations are a concern to the Geology program, but provide an opportunity to refocus its activities and refine its programs. A thematic emphasis is being built in sedimentary basins.
- ◆ The master's degree programs in Chemistry and Physics are zero-cost programs, as is the Chemical Science Program and the bachelor's degree program in Statistics.
- ◆ The actuarial sciences emphasis in the undergraduate Mathematics program is unique among Regents universities.
- ◆ Chemistry and Physics maintain cost effectiveness despite the necessary use of expensive laboratory equipment. Geology has reduced the percent it uses of the university's instructional expenditures.
- ◆ The Statistics Department is unique in Kansas, with a high demand for Ph.D. statisticians.
- ◆ Several programs, including Chemistry, Physics, and Geology, either have or are developing plans to enhance enrollment.

University of Kansas

The University of Kansas reviewed eleven programs in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the School of Architecture and Urban Design, the School of Journalism and Mass Communications, and the School of Law. Programs included baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral degrees. The continuation of all degree programs is recommended. The programs are rated from good to excellent.

- ◆ Enhancement is planned for the Geography, Geology, and History of Art.
- ◆ Geography, Geology, History of Art, and Psychology have large service loads.
- ◆ Three programs, Geography, Geology, and Human Development and Family Life voiced concerns about retirements and resignations.
- ◆ Study abroad opportunities are available to students in Geography, History of Art, and Architecture.
- ◆ Geology and History of Art have seen steep increases in the cost per student credit hour (SCH) of their programs.
- ◆ The History of Art program is unique in Kansas, as are the four specializations in Urban Planning.
- ◆ A number of programs have been involved in review and revision of curriculum: Geography, Geology, Human Development and Family Life, Architectural Studies, Journalism and Mass Communications and the School of Law.
- ◆ There is a commitment to add faculty members in the History of Art and Child Psychology programs.
- ◆ Several programs are highly selective in admission to their programs: Human Development and Family Studies, Psychology, Child Psychology, Architecture, and Urban Planning.
- ◆ Classes in Psychology are large and can range from 90 to 1000 students.

Table 1. CAMPUS SUMMARIES (CON'T)

University of Kansas (con't)

- ◆ Employer demand is high for graduates of Human Development and Family Life; Architecture; and Journalism and Mass Communications programs.
- ◆ Bar pass rates for the School of Law have approximated ninety percent for more than five years.
- ◆ The Law School has several innovative clinical law programs, including the Tribal Law Program, the Corporate Counsel Program, and a planned program with ESU to train law librarians.

University of Kansas Medical Center

The Kansas University Medical Center submitted its Basic Sciences program review. This includes seven programs: Anatomy, Biochemistry, Microbiology, Pathology, Pharmacology, Toxicology, and Physiology. Degrees include master's and doctoral degrees. It is recommended that all these programs be continued. The program has ten initiatives for the next five years including:

- ◆ Refine the core Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Biomedical Sciences (IGPBS);
- ◆ Establish a Neuroscience Doctoral Graduate Program jointly with KU-Lawrence;
- ◆ Develop a predoctoral training program in reproduction in Physiology;
- ◆ Obtain additional research laboratory space and maintain state-of-the-art facilities;
- ◆ Increase stipend support for students;
- ◆ Recruit new faculty in Biochemistry, Microbiology, Pathology, Pharmacology;
- ◆ Hire new Pathology Department chairperson--*this initiative was accomplished with the hiring of Dr. Barbara Atkinson who assumed the duties of chair on Jan 5, 2000;*
- ◆ Increase scholarly productivity in Microbiology;
- ◆ Increase enrollment of doctoral students in Pathology;
- ◆ Seek additional funding from public and private sectors to enhance research activities.

Pittsburg State University

Pittsburg State University reviewed the twenty programs in the College of Technology. It was recommended that all programs be continued. Additional review was recommended for eight of the programs.

- ◆ Programs recommended for additional review include: Printing Management; Technology Teacher Education (M); Electrical Technology; Automotive Service; Industrial Education; Technology Management; Vocational Teacher Education; and Air Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration
- ◆ Continued need for equipment is noted for the Construction Engineering Technology; Mechanical Engineering Technology; Manufacturing Engineering Technology; Construction Management; Commercial Graphics; Electrical Technology; Automotive Service; and Air Condition, Heating, and Refrigeration programs.
- ◆ Demands for graduates exceeds supply in Technology Teacher Education (B).
- ◆ Increase in number of faculty is needed in Plastics Engineering Technology (for expansion into new fields of plastics); Technology Teacher Education; and Human Resource Development.
- ◆ It is recommended that the following programs seek national accreditation: Printing Management, Wood Technology, and Automotive Technology.
- ◆ Plastics, Engineering Technology, Printing Management, Wood Technology, and Automotive Technology are recognized as premier programs in the United States.
- ◆ It is recommended that Electrical Technology; Automotive Service; and Air Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration seek eligibility for Carl Perkins funding.

Table 1. CAMPUS SUMMARIES (CON'T)

Wichita State University

Wichita State University reviewed two programs, recommending their continuation with additional review in specific areas.

- ◆ The Elliott School of Communication offers bachelor's and master's degrees, both of which will continue to be offered.
- ◆ Additional review will continue in the areas of enrollment, image of the undergraduate curriculum, structure and emphasis of the master's program, and the relationship of undergraduate and graduate curriculum.
- ◆ Increase in size of the faculty is being considered.
- ◆ Plans are being developed to increase GTA stipends.
- ◆ A long-range plan for facilities will be developed.
- ◆ Development of the Interdisciplinary Communication Research Institute will be nurtured and monitored.

1-7
7-6

Computer Science (110101)	15	3	25		--	--						AR
Mathematics (270101)	54	16	24		8	--						AR
Music (500901/131312)	43	9	22	13	11	3	13		--	--	--	ASP; AR
Nursing (511608)	88	30	20	9	--	--	--		--	--	--	
Physical Sciences				16			16				--	
Chemistry (400501)	26	6	24		1	--			--	--		ASP; ICP; AR
Earth Science (400703)	17	5	21		--	--			--	--		ASP; ICP
Physical Science (400101)	14	5	23		20	5			--	--		ASP; ICP; AR
Physics (400801)	12	2	26		--	--			--	--		ASP; ICP
Social Sciences				14			14				--	
History (450801)	25	8	22		20	7			--	--		ASP
Political Science (451001)	17	8	21		--	--			--	--		ASP
Social Science/Social Science Teacher Education (450101/131318)	76	23	20		6	3			--	--		AR
Sociology and Anthropology (451101/131308)	122	52	19	7	--	--	--		--	--	--	AR

* Major counts for Associate Degree Programs include all undergraduate levels - 1st year through 5th year students.

ESU PROGRAM REVIEW 2000

1-9
7-8

THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

At Emporia State University, administrative units have the freedom and responsibility to organize program review efforts in a manner that best suits their environment and the nature of the program being reviewed. It is considered essential that all faculty connected to the program participate fully and actively in the program review. Individual(s) or committee(s) may be appointed to complete various aspects of the self-evaluation. As a minimum, the faculty make a self-evaluation of the mission, goals, and objectives of the program and report this to the committee or chair.

Gathering quantitative and qualitative program information is important in the self-evaluation process. At the discretion of the administrative unit, groups with an interest in the program are involved and included. Information gathered as to the quality of the program enhances the validity and value of the self-evaluation and resulting recommendations. Units consider the kind and type of budget and financial information they desire and work with Fiscal Affairs in obtaining the information not readily available.

Faculty engage in serious and on-going dialogue about the critical issues impacting the program as part of the self-evaluation process. This includes discussions at faculty meetings and committee meetings, discussions in the hallways and over coffee, and in conversations and communications with other faculty, staff, students, employers, and alumni.

Subsequent to the gathering of information, the Chairs of the Divisions of Biological Sciences and Physical Sciences developed a draft of the program review report that was reviewed by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Chairs of the Divisions of Accounting and Computer Information, Business Education and General Business, and Management, Marketing, Finance, and Economics developed a draft of the program review report that was reviewed by the Dean of the School of Business and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Dean of the School of Library and Information Management in conjunction with the faculty developed a review report that was reviewed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A two-page executive summary of each program review was prepared by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and was shared with the President, appropriate dean, and appropriate chairs and faculty before being finalized. An opportunity was available to appeal any of the recommendations of the program review.

Review Process of Individual Programs

The Division of Physical Science, the Division of Biological Sciences, the School of Business, and the School of Library and Information Management completed the planning and organization for the program review during the beginning months of 1999.

By February 1st of each calendar year, the Campus Report of Statistical Overview is distributed to all divisions by the Office of Institutional Research. Each division is then responsible for reviewing the statistical information, making inquiries where appropriate, and requesting correction or modification of data as needed. The Campus Report of Statistical Overview is returned to the Office of Institutional Research accompanied by any additional information, corrections, or modifications. The finalized Campus Report of Statistical Overview is submitted to the Board of Regents by March 16th of each year.

1-10
19

Quantitative and qualitative information and other data gathered by the faculty and/or division committees in the program review process is submitted to the chair of the respective divisions. During this review year, the information gathered was submitted to the Dean of the School of Library and Information Management since there is no chair within the school. The division chair/dean and faculty interacted as to the quality of the information gathered, the need for additional or modified data, and the appropriateness of the information and recommendations.

Drafts of the program review reports for the Divisions of Biological Sciences and Physical Science were submitted to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and review reports for the business programs were submitted to the Dean of the School of Business. These included recommendations for the program. The deans, division chairs, and the faculty interacted, as necessary, relative to the quality of the information gathered, the need for additional or modified data, and the appropriateness of the information and recommendations.

Drafts of the program review reports were submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, the deans of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the School of Business, and the School of Library and Information Management and division chairs interacted, as necessary, relative to the quality of the information gathered, the need for additional or modified data, and the appropriateness of the information and recommendations.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs returned the revised draft of the program review report to the division faculty through the appropriate dean and division chairs for additional modification and revision.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs prepared a preliminary two-page executive summary for the review of Biological Sciences, Physical Science, and Library and Information Management. For the School of Business all majors and degrees were combined into one executive summary. All documents included the university's recommendations relative to the respective programs.

All units desiring to appeal any item in the Executive Summary or the program review recommendations were eligible to do so through the regular administrative channels of the dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. If agreement had not been reached, the appeal could have been made to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate.

The Campus Report and Recommendations is submitted to the Kansas Board of Regents by January 15th each year.

Minimum Components of Program Review

The information gathered for program review is meant to be helpful, informative, and instructive. It is a vehicle to change, improve, and enhance programs. While the review includes statistical and quantifiable information, equally important are qualitative and "value added" information. Education and learning, in and of itself, is important and relevant aspects should be conveyed. Under each of the following required components is information descriptors that will help define the component. Additional data was gathered and reported.

1. Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution.

Relation to ESU mission
Service role to university (importance of courses/major/degree to other programs or units of the university)
Uniqueness of program
Interdisciplinary programs
Accreditations

2. The quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty.

Effective teaching (class size, use of appropriate technology)
Service activities (participation and leadership in disciplinary organizations,)
Scholarly activities (research projects, funded grants, presentations, books, journal articles)
Honors/awards
Narrative by chair

3. The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students.

Goals and objectives of the program (national disciplinary trends)
Mission statement of program
Student assessment data
Student achievement (academics, participation or leadership in disciplinary organizations and activities, honors/awards, grants, research and creativity, technology skills)
External evaluations (accreditation reports, advisory committees, external professional colleagues, employers, alumni)
Summary of student feedback

4. The quality of the program as assessed by resources made available.

Access to information (i.e., library collections, Internet access)
Appropriate facilities
Appropriate technology
Faculty support
Specialized centers or institutes

5. Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program.

Employer survey
Projected needs
Societal demands
Evaluation of program by alumni

6. The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond.

Labs for students/public
Clinics for public/students
Service to school district/community groups
Service to constituents
Conferences division holds
Publications (state, regional, national)
Speakers bureaus
Staff development
Consulting
Interdisciplinary programs
General education requirements

7. The program's cost effectiveness.

Financial resources/external funding.

8. Additional features of the program not covered by the previous items.

Major Recommendations from Program Review

Biological Sciences

1. Funding and support should be maintained at current levels.
2. The position in microbiology should be filled as soon as possible.
3. The division should prepare a master plan for the following:
 - The natural areas should be better utilized throughout the academic program.
 - Laboratories need to be updated so additional funding needs to be secured that includes equipment demands.
 - Additional research labs and appropriate space for new faculty need to be secured.
 - A computer/technology update plan needs to be developed to replace hardware and software and increase usage.
 - Student growth areas need additional faculty so programs can be expanded.
 - Students with qualities desired by faculty should be recruited.

Physical Sciences

1. The programs and funding in Physical Sciences should be maintained.
2. Plans needs to be developed to replace/obtain scientific equipment such as the NMR spectrometer and meet future technological needs.

3. A plan needs to be developed to increase the number of majors and graduates in Earth Science, Physical Science, and Physics. Although chemistry meets the Board of Regents minimal criteria for program maintenance, additional students could be accommodated within existing resources.
4. A different location for the "dirty laboratory" is needed. This may necessitate locating the lab in a different section of campus.
5. This division offers programs that provide for the needs of other programs, such as general education, within the university. Therefore, no additional review is recommended.

School of Business

1. The School of Business must develop a task force to determine the appropriateness of the school's structure. The following items must be considered. A report recommending restructuring facets is due to the Vice President for Academic Affairs on March 13, 2000.
 - a. The number of divisions and faculty alignment should be reexamined. This may result in the continuation of three divisions or result in two divisions with better faculty alignment or no divisions. Restructuring to two divisions could incorporate the elimination of poorly enrolled majors. The elimination of divisions would make it easier for faculty to teach courses in their areas of strength. A different administrative structure could then be developed and implemented.
 - b. Several majors have too few students enrolled and graduating. Some majors may need to be restructured, eliminated, or combined to form a critical mass of students. An emphasis rather than a major could then be considered.
 - c. New, emerging areas of study need to be considered. However, development of new programs cannot take place until older ones are eliminated and restructuring has occurred.
2. Faculty who have been involved in appropriate scholarly activities should continue and those who have peripherally been involved, need to embrace the act of scholarly activity more completely. A plan for increasing appropriate scholarly activity should be developed individually and for the School. A possibility exists for increasing reassigned time for research/scholarly activity where needed and when it cannot be accomplished while teaching a full load. Additional graduate research assistants may also be necessary.
3. Advising and other support services need to be improved. The School of Business must develop a more comprehensive advising process that incorporates the Board of Regents requirements. A centralized advising process should be considered for on-campus students. Enhanced advising in Johnson County should also be considered.
4. Gender and ethnic diversity should be emphasized in both faculty and students. The school plan on diversity should be modified to be more creative and incorporate new ideas and methods of accomplishment.

5. In light of the accreditation report, realignment of some faculty to more appropriate responsibilities must be considered.
6. A plan should be developed to replace outdated computers and technology on a rotational basis in the computer lab. Computers from the lab should continue to replace the computers being used in the classrooms so they will be as advanced as possible.
7. Although there is a need for change, it is recommended that at the current time no decisions be made about resources. To make such wide ranging changes, faculty input is imperative. After recommendations have been made and changes approved, economic savings can then be recognized. Until that time, it is impossible to determine what effect the changes will have economically.
8. If restructuring changes do not include International Business and Office Systems Management, then a full review for these two programs is warranted as per the directions for Program Review by the Board of Regents. Although Economics has few majors and graduates, it is a service area for general education for the university. The Master's in Business Education is unique as it is the only one in the state and thus elimination would deprive a segment of teachers the opportunity to obtain advanced study in their teaching field.

School of Library and Information Management

1. The programs and funding within the School of Library and Information Management should be maintained.
2. A computer/technology replacement plan needs to be developed. A decision should be made about requiring students to bring a computer to class.
3. A plan should be developed to attract ethnic diversity and low income students.
4. The current initiatives of providing programs across Kansas should be maintained and additional initiatives generated.
5. The capital improvement plan for an addition to the William Allen White Library to house SLIM should be maintained.
6. If the Board of Regents approves the Bachelor of Information Resource Studies degree, a doctoral graduate assistant will need to be hired to coordinate the program.

FHSU PROGRAM REVIEW 2000

1-16
~~1-15~~

Introduction

Program Audits vs. Quality of Educational Outcomes

Academic program review can serve a variety of purposes. It can help us learn about a curriculum's structure for the purpose of improvement. A review process could be aimed at producing higher levels of efficiency and effectiveness in an effort to make the best use of scarce resources. Some review approaches are designed to publicize a program and help market its most attractive selling points. Perhaps what comes to mind for most faculty when they are asked to conduct program review are the concepts of accountability, selection and even discontinuance. Although academic program review can be used for a host of sometimes conflicting purposes, its ultimate goal as stated in the current Regents guidelines adopted in September, 1997 is to establish a continuous process aimed at improving the quality of academic programs offered by the Regents universities. The key question, of course, is how to conduct this process in a way which increases the "self-consciousness of faculty members and administrators about their educational practices so they can improve the quality of teaching and learning." (Program Review and Educational Quality in the Major, AAC&U, p. 1)

All too often, a program review asks the form of a "program audit." As suggested by much of the literature on program review practices, the focus is on quantitative data: student credit hours produced, degrees conferred, number of majors and so on. There is no doubt this is important information. *But does it really capture the quality of a program?* Most faculty would argue that a review carried out as an audit of the quantitative data has more to do with administrative questions of efficiency, a reallocation of resources or downsizing than issues of quality. *The point to be made is that program review is done best when it focuses ultimately on the educational outcomes of a program.* Simply put, is the program producing the kinds of high quality learning outcomes that meet the needs of students, employers and the public at large? To answer this type of question, a program review must go beyond the audit approach to an examination of a program's organizing principles, goals, course sequencing, accessibility of classes, common core of learning and a whole host of quality-oriented issues and concerns that are often missed in a simple review of the "numbers." The criteria/indicators under item 3 in the attachment to this section is an attempt to encourage the use of qualitative measures.

The review of programs in this report is more a reflection of the audit approach than a focus on quality educational outcomes. *Thus, the results and recommendations should be seen as preliminary and designed to bring our attention to potential areas of concern and improvement.* In a way, it is a first-cut at a more continuous and structured effort to initiate a cycle of generating information, examining that information, teasing out inferences and applying those findings to alter the learning environment and produce a better educational outcome the next time around. This seems like a simple process. But institutions of higher education can be some of the worst learning organizations in the world. In addition, we often view this structured process of review as an intrusion. The audit approach, therefore, substitutes for what we know should be a more complex and difficult process of critical examination that takes time and self-study.

Fort Hays State University is committed to the use of program review for purposes of accountability and improvement with an emphasis on the latter. In pursuit of these objectives, we must continually refine the review process in terms of the three phases: Regents program review, intensive program review and program discontinuance at the institutional level. Phase II, intensive program review, provides the opportunity to amplify the qualitative focus.

Institutional Summary: Overview and Recommendations

TO: Ed Hammond, President
FROM: Larry Gould, Provost
DATE: January 18, 2000
SUBJ: Report on Program Review Year 1999

I. Background

The Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) eight year cycle of academic program review approved in September, 1997 was initiated in the Fall 1998 semester. In contrast to other institutions in the Regents System, Fort Hays State University (FHSU) has elected to review all of its academic programs over a four-year period ending in Fall, 2001. As a result of this choice, FHSU will have a larger number of programs included in our report to the KBOR each year than the other regional, comprehensive universities in the system. This year, we have conducted a review of 13 academic programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels (see the attached matrix for a complete list). Several of these programs offered more than one version of either the baccalaureate or master's (e.g., the Master's in Business Administration can have a concentration in Management or Accounting). All 13 programs can be found in two colleges: Arts and Sciences; and Business and Leadership.

In addition to the programs reviewed for the first time this year, we have two programs from last year's process that failed Regents minima by a large enough margin to trigger "intensive program review." The undergraduate Philosophy degree and the in-service master's curriculum in English are under scrutiny in Phase II of the overall review process. The departments are completing this analysis and we will have recommendations for you by the March KBOR meeting as to whether a request for Phase III, Program Discontinuance should be submitted (see Appendix A).

Utilizing the six Regents criteria that have relevance for all degree programs, I have combined the three most easily defined of the six with four of the Regents minima to develop the attached matrix for system level program review decision making. The key explains each of the cell descriptors for the seven criteria. Some modifications have been made to better reflect certain areas as they apply to FHSU. For example, I split the "centrality" variable into two categories: (1) how the program relates to FHSU's traditional mission as a liberal and applied arts institution; and (2) how a program currently supports or contributes to the distance education component of the FHSU mission. Again, the matrix is simply a tool for making *preliminary* decisions about programs and whether or not their status relative to the criteria "trigger" the next phase in the overall process—that is, intensive program review. My annual recommendations

found in the last column in the matrix are drawn from the same list of summative descriptors I used in last year's review process. In evaluating and balancing the eight criteria against one another, a program could be identified as one that FHSU should:

1. Maintain
2. Strengthen
3. Reduce
4. Discontinue
5. Combine

For example, a recommendation to "Maintain" a degree involves four assumptions: (1) the department can continue to offer the program(s) with current resources; (2) FTE allocations remain the same; (3) the department is willing to make internal reallocations or changes in teaching workload or methodology that allow program maintenance; and (4) the opportunity costs of maintaining the program are greater than the costs of discontinuing the program. A decision to "Strengthen" a program might also be accompanied by the element needing primary attention, e.g. Computer Information Systems should be enhanced with another faculty member. Finally, a recommendation to discontinue or initiate intensive program review (IPR) is offered if a program fails the Regents minima by a wide margin and the weaknesses are not offset by other factors such as its "marketability" and "centrality" to the FHSU distance education mission. For example, Chemistry has 23 majors at the senior/5th year level (minima is 25), but meets or is strong on other criteria. I did not recommend it for IPR. The department, however, will use this finding to address the failed minima and devise ways to improve its standing, quality, and performance.

II. Overview

A. Undergraduate Academic Programs

Five out of 11 undergraduate programs reviewed "triggered" Regents minima: Physical Sciences (two out of four criteria), Physics (two out of four criteria), Chemistry (two out of four criteria), Economics (three out of four criteria), and Business Communication (two out of four criteria). The remaining six undergraduate programs exceeded all Regents minima and ranked average to reasonably strong on the other four variables used in the decision making matrix.

Although failure to meet any one or a combination of the Regents' thresholds can initiate a more intensive review, let me offer the following observations as to why it is not necessary in every case. As defined, the minima for majors is 25. Two programs, Chemistry and Business Communication, were very close to the minima. Physics, although below minima on the junior, senior, 5th year level, has a total of 52 majors and there is a growth trend in the data. Because the review process has provoked thinking in these departments and programs about their status, and because they appear strong on other criteria, I do not recommend the initiation of the intensive program review process. On the other hand, the Physical Sciences degree fell exceptionally short on at least two

criteria, I am recommending it for the intensive review phase (Phase II). I suspect the Phase II study will demonstrate that because the degree uses exactly the same courses as the Physics program, there is no cost savings by eliminating it. There may be other considerations revealed by the more detailed evaluation, however. The Economics program fails on three out of the four Regents minima and comes through as weak on "marketability" and "centrality" relative to the university's distance education mission. Although the department can improve on this last criterion, it simply does not appear to be a viable, attractive offering any longer. I have consulted with the department members and the college dean. There is agreement that the program should be discontinued. In addition, students who desire some degree program with an economics concentration can pursue the Bachelor of General Studies or the economics minor.

I am recommending three undergraduate programs for enhancement, primarily to strengthen the off-campus element. Computer Information Systems, on the other hand, is in desperate need of another faculty member. Further growth of this program without additional faculty jeopardizes its quality.

B. Graduate Programs

In reality, only one graduate program with two concentrations was reviewed this year, the Master's in Business Administration. It meets or exceeds all minima. The one area, I believe, that needs attention is providing access to MBA course offerings to our off-campus population. As you know, our negotiations with at least one international institution of higher learning may stimulate this process.

C. Final Thoughts

The current Regents Program Review process and criteria do not encourage measurement or establishment of standards for off-campus programs or distributed learning environments. This is a serious weakness. It is reflected in my decision to divide the "centrality" criterion into two dimensions. Certainly, a program's role in FHSU's distance education mission has become an increasingly important consideration.

Finally, the current web-based information system for program review is valuable, but the inability of the software to link specific instructors with discrete programs in multi-discipline departments needs to be addressed. In addition, the data for multi-discipline departments is provided at an aggregated level for several variables, e.g. percentage of departmental SCH taken by non-majors. This department focus is not helpful when looking at the mission and performance of individual degree programs. Both of these deficiencies need to be addressed at the Regents level.

KSU PROGRAM REVIEW 2000

1-22
~~7-20~~

Kansas State University Program Review - 1999

INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW

Kansas State University is a comprehensive, research, land grant institution first serving students and the people of Kansas, and also the nation and the world. Since its founding in 1863, the University has evolved into a modern institution of higher education, committed to quality programs, and responsive to a rapidly changing world and the aspirations of an increasingly diverse society. Together with other major comprehensive universities, Kansas State shares responsibilities for developing human potential, expanding knowledge, enriching cultural expression, and extending its expertise to individuals, business, education, and government. These responsibilities are addressed through an array of undergraduate and graduate degree programs, research and creative activities, and outreach and public service programs. In addition, its land grant mandate, based on federal and state legislation, establishes a focus to its instructional, research, and extension activities which is unique among the Regents' institutions.

Program review serves the purpose of attainment of future goals, development of fresh curricula, and meeting the needs of students, faculty, and the Board of Regents (BOR). In developing a review process, the Program Review Task Force at K-State seriously considered what faculty and department administrators should provide to make the review useful while avoiding unnecessary work. The materials used to prepare the review were consistent with the six criteria identified by the BOR in their program review document. Departments provided information on their instructional, scholarly, and service activities and programs. Deans have received a detailed Statistical Overview prepared by the Office of Planning and Analysis and specified by the Board of Regents. In response to the Program Review process, each Department prepared a Program Review Report (PRR) containing common information. In preparing the PRR, the Colleges and Departments were aware of degree standards for the number of majors, number of degrees granted annually, number of faculty supporting a degree, and quality of undergraduate students suggested by the Board of Regents. After a review of the Program Review Report and the information in the Statistical Overview by the College Dean, the Graduate School Dean and the College Committees on Planning, additional information could also be requested. The Deans are responsible for preparing the two page summaries. Drafts of the PRR and the two page summaries were provided to the Provost for review and comment.

As part of the annual Board of Regents Program Review process, Kansas State University reviewed the academic programs for the Departments of Chemistry, Geology, Mathematics, Physics, and Statistics. The two page summaries for each degree program are attached to this report. The following materials provide short reviews for each department and their related degree programs, a summary of the major issues, and summaries of major changes and plans.

CHEMISTRY

The Department of Chemistry is central to both the instructional and research missions of the university. Among twenty-five academic units within the College of Arts and Sciences, the Department of Chemistry ranked fourth in total student credit hour production and third in extramural research funding in 1998. Chemistry is a foundation course required in many degree programs. Freshman level chemistry and organic chemistry courses are required by majors offered in the Colleges of Agriculture, Arts and Sciences, Education, Engineering, and Human Ecology as well as majors in pre-medicine, pre-dentistry, and pre-veterinary medicine. Analytical and physical chemistry courses appear in curricula for

biochemistry, chemical engineering, textiles, physical science, and pre-medicine. Non-majors take more than 93 percent of the department's student credit hours. Chemistry is a science that responds to societal needs. According to the National Academy of Science, the discipline is critical for developing new materials, feeding the world's population, conquering disease, monitoring and protecting the environment, and keeping our nation economically competitive. Chemistry is essential for providing the educational and research capabilities expected of new industries interested in locating in Kansas.

The undergraduate and graduate students in chemistry are highly qualified. The faculty in the Chemistry Department possess impressive academic credentials including three University Distinguished Professors. Many of the undergraduate students go on to graduate school programs and graduates are employed in research positions in universities, industry and government. The B.S. program in general chemistry (CIP 400501) is certified by the American Chemical Society.

The Chemistry Department offers the BS, MS, and Ph.D. degrees in general chemistry (CIP 400501) and the BS degree in chemical science (CIP 400599). Enrollment levels and graduation rates for the Ph.D. degree in General Chemistry have been strong and more than meet BOR' guidelines. The M.S. degree is offered to students who either decide to not complete the Ph.D. or for students who are judged to be unable to complete the Ph.D. The number of graduates tends to meet BOR' guidelines, however, enrollments are low. The costs associated with the M.S. degree program are part of the Ph.D. program. The two B.S. degrees, General Chemistry (CIP 400501) and Chemical Sciences (CIP 400599) serve different career tracks for students and no additional courses are offered because of the two degrees. The degree program for Chemical Sciences does not meet the certification requirements of the American Chemical Society, thus this program must be kept separate from the other. Together the two degree programs meet BOR' guidelines. All degrees will be continued as they are currently structured.

The two page Summaries for the two degree programs in Chemistry can be found in the Appendix.

MATHEMATICS

The Department of Mathematics plays a central role in the mission of Kansas State University: mathematics is now employed in a fundamental way in almost every area. Few careers these days do not require sophisticated quantitative skills. Today, even artists and musicians use mathematically based computer algorithms to enhance their scholarly work. The Department of Mathematics has a pervasive presence in the curriculum of the University and quantitative reasoning is required of all students regardless of their discipline.

The quality of undergraduate and graduate students in mathematics is very high. Some undergraduates have been named Goldwater Scholars and others engaged in research programs at Argonne and Oakridge National Laboratories, the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, and at many universities, both in the United States and abroad. Recent Kansas State mathematics graduates have been accepted to advanced degree programs at the most prestigious universities in the world, such as Princeton and Oxford University. Graduate students go on to a variety of industry and academic positions. During the last five years, the faculty have produced more than 280 articles in referred journals, and their work and that of their graduate students is an important part of the research programs of the National Science Foundation, the Office of Naval Research, and the Los Alamos National Laboratory. One of the faculty members is a Regents Distinguished Professor, and another is a University Distinguished Professor.

The Department of Mathematics offers the B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. in mathematics (CIP 270101). Enrollment levels in all three degree levels exceed BOR' guidelines. All degrees will be continued as they are currently structured.

The two page Summary for the degree programs in Mathematics can be found in the Appendix.

PHYSICS

Kansas State University has the responsibility to provide all students an understanding of the physical world. These fundamental notions of the workings of the world come from the discipline of physics and form the essential underpinning of scientific, technical, and engineering education. The Physics Department has traditionally served a large and varied clientele from other departments across the University. The Physics Department also has the responsibility to maintain undergraduate and graduate programs of high quality in order to educate future generations of scientists. Undergraduate majors are provided the skills needed to contribute effectively in the chosen career, and will produce through its graduate education an individual able to function confidently as a professional physicist. The Physics Department maintains a very active research program which contributes to society through the generation of a better understanding of the physical world and our relationship to that world.

The Physics Department has a small but very high quality undergraduate program with almost half of the students going on to graduate training. One of its teachers was named the CASE Professor of the year by the Carnegie Foundation. Doctoral students have had no difficulty securing careers in industry and in higher education. The James R. McDonald Laboratory, operated through the Physics Department, has been designated a national user facility by the Department of Energy. The High Energy Group, which only started at K-State in 1993, is now a mature and well funded research group engaged in several experiments at the FERMI National Accelerator Laboratory. The condensed matter group is multi-disciplinary in nature and has strong on-going collaborations not only with faculty in chemistry and engineering at Kansas State, but also with research groups around the world. Funding for this group comes from individual grants from the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy, and other federal agencies.

The Physics Department offers the B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. in General Physics (CIP 400801). Enrollment levels and number of graduates for the B.S. degree do not currently meet BOR' guidelines. The program has developed plans to double the number of undergraduates in the next seven years. The training model in the Department of Physics is very similar to that in Chemistry, the M.S. degree is offered to students who want to quit at this level or for students who are judged to be unable to complete the Ph.D. Therefore, the number of graduates and enrollment levels are low. The costs associated with the M.S. degree program are part of the Ph.D. program. All degrees will be continued as they are currently structured.

The two page Summary for the degree programs in Physics can be found in the Appendix.

GEOLOGY

Geology is concerned with activities that develop and protect natural resources including water, oil, gas, stone, coal, sand, and salt; thus, preserving the natural resources of Kansas. A thorough understanding of the structure of the earth is necessary for well-educated students, particularly for those contemplating careers in engineering and agriculture. Geology is heavily involved in the University's General Education Program and attracts over 1,000 students from all disciplines across the university in supporting the general education classes each semester.

The faculty in Geology are moving into a transitional stage. In the review period we have seen two retirements and one faculty resignation, and in the next few years we anticipate more turnover, particularly through retirement. Given the number of faculty members in the department (seven), the turnover is very substantial and creates a unique opportunity for the Department to refocus its activities and refine its programs. Since 1995, two new faculty members have been recruited who are both excellent teachers and have research interests which assist the Department in its goal of building strength in the research area of sedimentary basins. In building a thematic emphasis in sedimentary basins, the department will maintain

and enhance its expertise in hydrogeology, basin tectonics, and basic stratigraphy resulting in a vital dynamic program with a unique focus among Regents' Institutions. The quality of the masters program is high and students graduating from the masters program have succeeded with placement either into geology careers or in Ph.D. programs at other universities.

The Department of Geology offers degrees at the BS and MS level in geology (CIP 400601) and a BS degree in geophysics and seismology (CIP 400603). Enrollment levels in the BS degree in geophysics and seismology have consistently fallen below BOR' established guidelines. The department has asked to discontinue the degree in geophysics and seismology (CIP 400603). The request to drop the degree is being processed by the Faculty Senate and, if approved, will be forwarded to the BOR for action. Both the BS and MS degrees in geology (CIP 400601) will be continued. However, enrollment levels and number of graduates for the MS program have not meet the BOR' guidelines. The College of Arts and Sciences has required the Department of Geology to develop and submit in the Fall of 2000 a detailed plan to enhance enrollments. This plan will be implemented for recruitment of students entering in the Fall of 2001. Progress will be closely monitored and the department expects to meet BOR guidelines by the Fall of 2003.

The two page Summary for the degree programs in Geology can be found in the Appendix.

STATISTICS

The Department of Statistics was created in 1959 and is the only statistics department in the State of Kansas. The mission of the department includes: training and educating future generations of statisticians at the bachelors, masters and doctoral levels; providing quality undergraduate and graduate education through its service courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels; pursuing both theoretical and applied research; and contributing to research in science and engineering through active collaboration. The Department is an innovator in the implementation of computer assisted approaches for the enhancement of undergraduate education in statistics. Statistics plays a unique role within the College of Arts and Sciences with respect to its close collaboration with, and statistical consulting for, researchers in the Agriculture Experiment Station over five colleges.

Four faculty members have been elected Fellows of the American Statistical Association; one has completed a five-year term as the founding editor of the *Journal of Agricultural, Biological and Environmental Statistics*, and several faculty members serve as associate editors for various journals. All faculty members are actively engaged in research and have collectively published over 120 articles in professional journals during the review period. A 1993 National Research Council survey of graduate faculty in statistics ranked Kansas State third in the Big 12 after programs at Iowa State and Texas A&M. The average ACT score of junior and senior majors over the past two years is 29.6. One of the department's seven-year goals is to increase the number of undergraduates majoring in Statistics. The purpose of the Master's degree program is to train students who will become outstanding applied statisticians with exceptional consulting and communication skills. The doctoral program in Statistics has distinguished itself nationally and internationally by providing a blend of applied and theoretical statistics, coupled with hands-on exposure to real world problems. Graduate students are encouraged to obtain collaborative consulting experience. They have the opportunity to obtain formal training in consulting for credit whereby they receive supervised experience with campus researchers. Graduate students are well prepared to work in government, industry, and academia.

The Department of Statistics offers degrees at the BS, MS, and Ph.D. level in Mathematical Statistics (CIP 270501). Enrollment levels in the BS degree program are below BOR established guidelines. The programmatic focus in the Department of Statistics is on the graduate program rather than

on the undergraduate major. This is typical of the situation at other major public universities in the United States. Some institutions do not even offer the bachelor's degree in statistics while those that do tend to have very small programs. Importantly, no statistics courses at K-State are specifically designated just for statistics undergraduate majors. The current service offerings for other majors suffice for undergraduate statistic majors and no additional instructional resources are required by undergraduate statistics majors. The enrollment level for the MS is slightly below BOR' standards, but the number of graduates is more than adequate. Both enrollment levels and number of graduates for the Ph.D. program meet BOR standards. All degrees will be continued as they are currently structured.

The two page Summary for the degree programs in Statistics can be found in the Appendix.

SUMMARY

The five departments in the physical sciences and quantitative areas and their associated seven degree programs generally represent a strong set of academic programs. Four of the departments offer degrees at the baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral level and the fifth offers degrees at the baccalaureate, and master's level. Collectively, the instructional, research and service activities of these departments is very high and they make major contributions to producing high quality graduates both within their own departments and for other academic programs. The faculty's ability to produce high quality research and secure grant funding is high. Collectively, these departments historically account for over 15% of the University's extramural funding. The research programs in chemistry and physics are among the premier programs at Kansas State University. The departments and their faculty provide high quality services to the university, profession, and the community and, together, the faculty members contain 9 University Distinguished Professors (40% of the total at Kansas State University).

The majority of the degrees programs meet BOR' standards at all degree levels. The graduate education models in Chemistry and Physics create the illusion that the master's program are under-enrolled. The majority of graduate students in these areas are not expected seek a master's degree, but move directly to a Ph.D. The master's degree is needed for those students who want it and for the limited number of graduate students who will not continue on for a Ph.D. The low enrollment levels in each of the two BS degrees in Chemistry reflect the need to differentiate two sub-populations of undergraduates and allow proper recognition of one of the programs. The majority of the undergraduate courses for majors are required for both degrees. Minimal costs are required by having the two degrees and collectively the programs meet BOR' guidelines. The undergraduate degree in Statistics has very low enrollments, however other than time required to advise these students it incurs no additional cost. No additional courses other than those offered for service purposes are required and the cost of the degree is, therefore infinitesimal. In Geology, the faculty propose to drop one very low enrollment BS degree in geophysics and seismology (CIP 400603) and the master's degree program will be closely monitored and the department expects to meet BOR guidelines by the Fall of 2003.

Thus one degree program will be discontinued and one will be closely monitored.

KU PROGRAM REVIEW 2000

1-28
A-26

1999 Program Review Report
University of Kansas, Lawrence Campus
January 2000

I. Overview of the Review Process

A. Development of Program Review

The criteria developed by the Board of Regents form the core of program review. Criteria include: (1) *Centrality to mission*; (2) *Strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty*; (3) *Curriculum and impact on students*; (4) *Student need and employer demand*; (5) *Service provided by the program*; (6) *Cost-effectiveness*; and (7) *Overall program quality*.

The current program review draws heavily on the format developed for the 1992 Regents review. KU's review schedule was developed by the deans and the provost based, in part, on the established program accreditation cycles to streamline the process for those units that are able to use materials for more than one review.

Information gained from the reviews is used on campus to guide budget decisions for program management, and to help shift funds from programs of lower priority to programs of higher priority within the University's mission. KU's program review aims at: (1) ***program improvement*** as faculty reflect upon programs in the context of academic fields and national trends; (2) ***building a better university*** as a whole by improving individual programs and cooperation among programs; and (3) ***self study and assessment by the academic unit***, the place where programmatic change can be effected and improvement demonstrated.

B. Review Procedures

A detailed review is conducted by departmental faculty. Data and summary information are reviewed by the reporting dean, the dean of the graduate school and *ad hoc* review committees appointed by the graduate school. Recommendations are forwarded to the Provost.

1. ***Data Analysis.*** Departments review and use data to substantiate qualitative judgments about their programs. Three sources of data are used--the Regents program review data, Vision 2020 performance indicators, and departmental information (see Attachment A). Departments must address specific measures in the self study. Supplemental data may be submitted from the academic unit.
2. ***Self Study by the Academic Unit.*** Each unit forwards an executive summary and a written review of each program to the reporting dean and the graduate dean by June 1 of the review year.
3. ***Administrative Review.*** The self studies are reviewed by *ad hoc* committees of the graduate council, the dean of the graduate school, the reporting dean, and the provost. Recommendations from the reporting deans are due to the provost on September 1. The graduate school's findings are reported on October 15. (***Option for External Review.***

In cases where external review is recommended, the reports from external reviewers are considered with departmental self studies.

4. *Report to the Board of Regents.* The office of the provost in consultation with the deans develops recommendations for each program and reports these to the Board.

II. Summary of Institutional Assessments of Programs Reviewed

A. *Geography (450701).*

Baccalaureate Program. The bachelor's program is very good. Degree production has improved since the 1992 review. The faculty are commended for their increased efforts to obtain external support. Research productivity and grant support are variable, although outside of GIS/remote sensing areas, external resources are difficult to obtain and awards are lower. The department maintains a heavy service load with over 80% of its credit hours taken by non-majors.

Master's Program. The master's program is very good. The master's degree is generally the terminal degree according to surveys, which indicate only about 20% of program graduates pursue education beyond the master's. The department is concerned that the quality and size of the program is slipping as indicated by the number of students enrolled as well as the decrease in GRE scores and GPAs of entering students. Immediate attention will be given to prevent further erosion of this program.

Doctoral Program. The doctoral program is very good. The faculty has been productive in scholarship and in seeking external funding. However, the loss of key faculty in some critical areas has reduced the attractiveness of the program to prospective graduate students. Gender diversity among the faculty has improved markedly with new hires. The program has maintained a relatively constant number of students in the program (approximately 33) but the number of degrees produced is low, averaging three per year.

B. *Geology (400601)*

Baccalaureate Program. The bachelor's program is very good. The department has revamped the program with additional courses and new course content. The total SCH has nearly doubled (80% of the credit hours are taken by non-majors) and the graduation rate is outstanding, 98% of the declared majors complete the program. Two-thirds of the graduates go to graduate school, one-third take federal or state positions. The number of faculty has been decreasing rapidly due to retirement and resignation. Increased attention will be given to this area.

Master's Program. The master's program is very good and is the basic degree for many specialty positions as well as the preliminary degree for the doctoral program. The department's strongest programs, paleontology and sedimentology/stratigraphy, have been recognized nationally. The National Research Council (NRC) report places the entire program at 51/103.

Doctoral Program. The doctoral program is very good. The department is addressing student concerns in advising and mentoring and the unnecessarily long tenure to achieve the Ph.D. Improvement since the 1992 Program Review is noted but it is early to know all the results of program revisions.

C. History of Art (500703)

Baccalaureate Program. The bachelor's program is very good and unique in Kansas. A significant decline in majors (from 98 in 1993 to 50 in 1998) is offset by a larger service component for the department. Some 82.9% of their 1998 SCH were taken by non-majors (up from 77.9% in 1993). A lack of quantitative data on the post-bachelor's positions obtained by graduates is noted although anecdotal provided from the department indicates that most graduates find employment upon graduation.

Master's Program. The master's program is very good. Enrollment has been relatively stable since 1994 when there was a significant drop in enrollment (from 52 to 34). Students gave the program good marks for the educational experience and the department reported that the majority has found employment. Several have entered a graduate program in art history, many at KU.

Doctoral Program. The doctoral program is very good as measured by the faculty. Two hold distinguished professorships and all regularly publish refereed and invited research. Programs are supported by the exceptionally fine Murphy Arts and Architecture Library, by significant endowment funding, and by the outstanding teaching collections of the Spencer Museum of Art, the only comprehensive art museum in Kansas.

D. Human Development & Family Life (420701)

Baccalaureate Program. The bachelor's program is very good. Significant change in the program in response to 1992 Program Review is noted. The department is commended for the review and revision of curricula based on core competencies, specializations, practica, research training, and professional skills. Senior survey data indicate that the quality of instruction and advising is high.

Master's Program. The master's program is very good. Demand for this program is high with just 30% of applicants admitted. The high level of sponsored research provides students with diverse research and practicum opportunities. Recent resignations and retirements have resulted in a reduction in the breadth in course offerings and the department is developing a strategic plan for replacements.

Doctoral Program. The doctoral program is very good. The faculty is excellent with an outstanding record of teaching, research, and service. Major assets include external funding for research and the junior-colleague model for research development. There is high demand for this program with just 30-40% of applicants accepted. Graduates have little difficulty finding

1-31
1-29

positions. As noted above, breadth of faculty expertise is a concern as is length of time to degree.

E. Psychology (420101)

Baccalaureate Program. The bachelor's program is very good. The faculty are excellent teachers, research productivity is high, and extramural funding is increasing at a rapid pace. All faculty teach at the undergraduate level. Despite large class sizes (required courses have from 90 to 1000 and elective courses have over 70 students in many), student evaluations of teaching and advising are high. The spring 1999 total of 869 majors represents a calculated decrease of 8.2% since a selective admissions program was implemented in 1992.

Master's and Doctoral Program. The doctoral program is excellent. (Students are not admitted to the master's program.) The major strength is a strong, productive faculty, who have averaged four refereed journal articles, almost two books and about three presentations a year for the past three years. Extramural research funding has doubled in the past five years up to nearly \$1.6 million in 1998. Students complete the degree in a timely fashion and secure appropriate placements.

Clinical Child Psychology Program (429999)

Master's and Doctoral Program. The doctoral program is excellent and considered one of the best in the U.S. (Students are not admitted to the master's program.) The clinical child psychology program is highly selective with only 12-14 students selected annually from 250 applicants. Students have excellent internship and research opportunities. The program is relatively new and there is insufficient data to determine if students are completing degrees in a reasonable amount of time.

F. Architecture and Urban Design

Baccalaureate Program, Architecture (040201). The bachelor's program is excellent. As the M.Arch. degree has become the professional entry degree, the bachelor's of architecture program has undergone substantial revision. Student demand remains high, averaging over 300 applications per year. Student feedback about the overall learning experience is positive. Some 25% of the students study abroad. While the quality of instruction remains high, teaching loads are higher than peers.

Master's Program, Architecture. The master's program is excellent. Recruitment for the academic program is being de-emphasized to focus resources on the accredited professional degree. The curriculum has undergone significant modification. The summer abroad and design/build studios offer notable learning experiences. The Edwards campus program provides electives which complement Lawrence campus offerings. One hundred percent of graduates receive jobs in the field within two months of graduation.

Master's Program, Urban Planning (040301). The master's program is good. Enrollment has remained stable over the past five years. Recruitment efforts are effective with a 50% admissions rate. Students progress toward their degrees in a timely manner although this is based on a graduation rate of only 55% of students. Ninety-five percent of the graduates find jobs within six months of graduation. The curriculum is driven by accreditation standards with limited evidence of innovation or development of unique emphases. The same four concentrations have been offered for over twenty years. There is limited evidence of seeking opportunities in the Kansas City area. While faculty research productivity is good, external funding remains low given faculty quality and the shift to applied research.

Baccalaureate Program, Architectural Studies (049999) The bachelor's program in architectural studies is very good and provides curricula to a wide range of disciplines. Strengths of the program are the quality of applicants (the 23-25 average ACT scores are among the highest at KU) and the faculty, who possess broad scholarly backgrounds. Continued growth is predicted as the B.Arch. program is phased out. An internal review to better define the program has been initiated by the School.

G. Journalism and Mass Communications

Baccalaureate Program. The bachelor's program is excellent. The undergraduate program is organized around a foundation of arts and sciences courses with a maximum of 25% of journalism course work. The School has engaged in extensive revision of the curriculum to prepare students for media convergence, emphasizing the ability to work across media and with developing technologies. Students have at least two professional work experiences prior to graduation.

Master's Program. The master's program is very good. Although designed for professional preparation, the master's program functions as an extension of the undergraduate program. There needs to be greater differentiation between the master's and bachelor's programs reflecting a rigor appropriate for graduate education. The master's program includes a significant number of undergraduate and combined graduate/undergraduate courses. There are few seminars and no thesis/final project is required. Further development of research in the School is appropriate.

H. Law (220101)

Professional Program. The law program is very good. Faculty teaching and research strengths identified in the 1992 program review continue to be evident. Enrollments are stable with attrition rates below 5% and placement rates above 90% six months after graduation. Bar pass rates have remained near or above 90% over the last five-year period. Expansion of student services and reorganization of the Schools administrative staff have increased effectiveness in these areas.

1-33
7-31

KUMC PROGRAM REVIEW 2000

1-34

1-32

**1999 Program Review Report to the Kansas Board of Regents
University of Kansas Medical Center
January 2000**

Overview

The vision statement for the University of Kansas Medical Center states: The University of Kansas Medical Center will be the premier customer-focused academic health science system in the region by becoming a regional and national leader in education, research and clinical services. To realize this vision, the Medical Center must have strong and viable programs. To this end, the Medical Center is committed to the periodic review of academic programs to ensure their quality and viability.

Goals

To ensure the quality and viability of academic programs, the periodic review assesses the strengths and concerns of the programs. To accomplish this, the following goals have been established for the periodic review of programs:

1. Assess existing program strengths and concerns to strengthen the quality and accessibility of academic and professional programs.
2. Identify and articulate academic program needs and campus priorities to augment institutional self-management.
3. Identify needs to reorganize academic programs, including modification, merger and discontinuance.

Process and Criteria for Program Review

One avenue for administering periodic reviews has been the program review conducted for the accreditation process. Due to their professional nature, all programs offered at the Medical Center are reviewed and evaluated by appropriate accrediting agencies at specified intervals. These reviews are rigorous and identify progress toward the stated mission, program strengths, weaknesses, and if appropriate, improvements necessary to meet national standards.

To take advantage of the activities associated with the accreditation reviews, the University of Kansas Medical Center has coordinated the Kansas Board of Regents program review with the accreditation review schedules. In addition to the criteria required as part of the accreditation review, all program reviews incorporate the six criteria required by the Regents:

- Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution

1-35
7-33

- The quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty
- The quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students
- Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program
- The service the program provides to the discipline, the university, and beyond
- The program's cost-effectiveness

For most programs, the accreditation agencies provide an external evaluation, and the team/committee conducting the review prepares a comprehensive report of their findings. Some of these findings are used to address the six BOR criteria. All graduate programs do an internal departmental self-review using the form designed for the BOR Review.

In addition to the six Regents criteria and the accreditation review criteria, the program review incorporates an assessment of the progress toward the goals stated in the Vision 2020 plan, wherever appropriate, for the departments.

Elements of the Program Review

Part 1. Data Profile

The data profile of the program being reviewed contains all of the data elements required by the Board of Regents in the annual statistical data submission. The data sources are institutional data sets, in most cases. In the area of enrollment, there are special circumstances relating to the University of Kansas - Lawrence campus and the Medical Center campus that require some variance in the methodology used to count students. Due to the unique situation in which there is one enrollment system, which serves two separate reporting entities, students are counted at the campus at which the majority of credit hours are taken. As a result, the official reporting database does not always reflect the number of students and enrollments in the programs. This is especially apparent in intercampus programs, such as the graduate programs in Hearing & Speech and in Nursing, where students in degree programs at one campus are required to take some courses at another campus (Lawrence and/or Edwards). Also, to meet the needs of working students who prefer classes in the evenings, many courses are offered at the Edwards Campus in Overland Park. Thus, depending upon the current status of the students in the progression toward their degree, the students might be counted at the campuses other than the Medical Center campus when they are actually KUMC students. The reverse might occur also for some Lawrence-based students.

For the accreditation reviews to accurately reflect the number of students participating in a program, departments use data on students who are enrolled in the program regardless of where they are taking the courses. Therefore, these data do not always match the officially reported data. To conduct a program review in conjunction with the particular accreditation review, it is necessary to use the data that most accurately reflects real enrollment in the

program, regardless of the local formulas developed for reporting purposes.

Part 2. Departmental Self-Review:

All graduate programs, including the Basic Science programs, are required to be reviewed on a periodic basis by the North Central Association. In order to meet the requirements of the North Central Association and the Board of Regents, data sheets were developed to assist graduate departments in evaluating their programs. These sheets serve as the departmental self-review for all graduate programs. The accreditation report serves as the departmental self-review for the undergraduate and M.D. programs.

Program Review Schedule:

To take advantage of the insight provided by the accreditation reviews, the Medical Center has opted to schedule the Regents program reviews in conjunction with the accreditation review schedule. However, any programs that demonstrate a greater need for review will be given priority in the review process. It should also be noted that some administrative review of all programs occurs every year. The Basic Sciences in the School of Medicine were scheduled as the second series in the new BOR Review schedule to offset by a year the accreditation review of the MD Program by the Liaison Committee for Medical Education (LCME) and subsequent BOR Review of that program. The LCME accreditation included the Basic Sciences.

The following is a schedule of the reviews of programs at the University of Kansas Medical Center:

Prog Rev Report to Regents	Program	Level	Accrediting Agency	Accred. Status	Last Accred. Review	Accred. Period	Next Accred. Review
Jan. 2000	Basic Sciences: Anatomy Biochemistry Microbiology Pathology Pharmacology Toxicology Physiology	Grad	North Central Association	Full	1994	10	2004
Jan. 2001	Dietetics and Nutrition	Grad	American Dietetic Assoc.	Full	1989	10	1999
Jan. 2001	Nurse Anesthesia	Grad	Council On Accred. Of Nurse Anesth. Educ Prg/Sch	Full	1993	6	1999
Jan. 2001	Physical Therapy	Grad	Amer. Physical Therapy Assoc. - MS Prog	Full	1993	6	1999
Jan. 2002	Health Services	Grad	Accrediting Comm. for	Full	1996	4	2000

1-37
T-35

Prog Rev Report to Regents	Program	Level	Accrediting Agency	Accred. Status	Last Accred. Review	Accred. Period	Next Accred. Review
	Administration *		Educ. in Hlth. Svcs. Admin.				
Jan. 2002	Hearing & Speech	Grad	Amer. Speech, Language and Hearing Assoc.	Full	1992	8	2000
Jan. 2003	Medical Technology	UG	Natl Accred. Agency for Clinical Lab. Sciences	Full	1994	7	2001
Jan. 2004	Health Information Management	UG	Comm. On Accred. Of All. Hlth Educ. Prog	Full	1994	8	2002
Jan. 2005	Cytotechnology	UG	Amer. Society of Cytopathology; Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Educ. Programs.	Full	1996	7	2003
Jan. 2005	Nursing	UG & Grad	Natl League of Nursing	Full	1995	8	2003
Jan. 2005	Occupational Therapy	UG & Grad	Amer. Occupational Therapy Assoc.	Full	1996	7	2003
Jan. 2005	Respiratory Therapy	UG	Comm. On Accred. Of All. Hlth Educ. Prog	Full	1997	5	2003
Jan. 2005	Preventive Medicine	Grad	Council on Education for Public Health	Full	1998	5	2003
Jan. 2006	M.D. Program	1st Prof	LCME	Full	1997	7	2004

* Site visit schedule subject to change as a result of plans to move the program to the Medical Center.

Program Review Reporting

Upon completion of the comprehensive program review, the following reports, as required by the Board, are submitted:

- A five-page institutional overview describing the review process, how data sources were used to shape program recommendations, and the most significant program changes or recommendations resulting from the program review
- A two-page summary assessment and institutional recommendations for each program reviewed
- A one-page institutional estimate of the fiscal implications of the recommended program changes

1999 Basic Sciences Program Review

The School of Medicine Basic Science programs were reviewed during 1999 using the Medical

Center program review process outlined above. The program review data profile was prepared using internal databases. Other data sources used for the review included departmental records and published departmental activity data.

Ten significant program initiatives resulted from the review process. New initiatives for the next five years are the following:

- Refine the core Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Biomedical Sciences (IGPBS)
- Establish a Neuroscience Doctoral Graduate Program (joint with KU-Lawrence)
- Develop a predoctoral training program in reproduction (Physiology)
- Obtain additional research laboratory space and maintain state-of-the-art facilities
- Increase stipend support for students
- Recruit new faculty (Biochemistry, Microbiology, Pathology, Pharmacology)
- Hire new Pathology Department chairperson – *this action was accomplished with the hire of Dr. Barbara Atkinson who assumed the duties of chair on Jan. 5, 2000*
- Increase scholarly productivity (Microbiology)
- Increase enrollment of doctoral students (Pathology)
- Seek additional funding from public and private sectors to enhance research activities

On the next five pages, the Board of Regents six criteria are addressed for the Basic Sciences programs. There are seven Basic Science programs offered within six departments. The seven academic programs are Anatomy, Biochemistry, Microbiology, Pathology, Pharmacology, Physiology, and Toxicology.

Given the similar nature of the program missions, program review data, and the core interdisciplinary connections through the Interdisciplinary Graduate Program in Biomedical Sciences (IGPBS) among the departments, responses to the Regents' criteria for the seven Basic Science programs have been summarized together. The decision to alter the Regents proscribed format for the program review report was made to assist Regents staff with compiling a large amount of similar data and was made with their agreement. Additional detailed review data for each program is available on request.

PSU PROGRAM REVIEW 2000

1-40
~~1-38~~

REGENTS PROGRAM REVIEW - 1999
Pittsburg State University

All programs in the College of Technology were reviewed in 1999. Written reports with emphasis on quality of programs were submitted to the Review Committee followed by public hearings on all degree programs. Each program was required to provide information concerning Program Foundation (goals, objectives, theoretical and conceptual framework, and strategic planning initiatives). Furthermore, each program was required to provide:

1. Course by course listing,
2. support course information,
3. sequence of courses in the major,
4. admission requirements, and
5. faculty advisement within the program.

The most important component of the program review document was the "Evidence of Program Quality" section. The Review Committee composed of four departmental chairpersons, three members of the Faculty Senate, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Director of Institutional Research, and the Director of Institutional Assessment provided individual feedback to the departments, as well as approving the enclosed Executive Summary. The Executive Summary includes background materials, strengths, and weaknesses of the programs and Committee recommendations.

Committee Membership

Stephen Meats, Chairperson, Department of English
Elwyn Davis, Chairperson, Department of Mathematics
Felix Dreher, Chairperson, Department of Computer Science/Information Systems
Rob Hefley, Chairperson, Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
Khamis Siam, Chairperson, Faculty Affairs Committee
Robert Kehle, President, Faculty Senate
Mark Peterson, Chairperson, Academic Affairs Committee
Robert Wilkinson, Director of Institutional Research
Shirley Drew, Director of Institutional Assessment
Robert Ratzlaff, Vice President for Academic Affairs

1-41
7-39

WSU PROGRAM REVIEW 2000

1-42
+40

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY
PROGRAM REVIEW
DECEMBER 1, 1999

INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW

1. **The Review Process: general**

The Vice President for Academic Affairs established a Vision 2020 committee during AY 1997-98. The committee is composed of administrators, faculty, unclassified professionals, and a student. In addition, the director of Institutional Research serves on the committee. The role of the committee is to assist in the university's efforts in preparation of the Legislative Budget Request document, the Vision 2020 Update Report, Program Review, Performance Indicators and other comparable activities. During AY 1998-99 this committee developed the timetable and process for review. This same process was continued for this year's reviews.

The Review Process: detail

Initially, departmental data was forwarded to the college deans and to all academic departments from the Office of Institutional Research. Data was checked and refined in an effort to insure internal accuracy and compliance with KBOR definitions. After the data was refined, the department undergoing program review was asked to follow the procedures developed by the Vision 2020 committee. The procedure included a departmental review, review by the college dean, review by the graduate dean and graduate council (in cases where departments had a graduate program), review by the Vision 2020 committee, and review by the interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President.

The programs that were "triggered" by the limiters established by the KBOR were handled in a slightly different manner. The dean of each college in which a triggered program was housed was asked to get departmental review and response to four questions developed by the Vision 2020 committee. These questions included (a) why was the program triggered; (b) what is the department's/chair's explanation for the triggering; (c) does the triggering data reveal a problem with the program; and (d) what can or will be done to remedy the problem. The dean of each college was then asked to review the department's response and prepare a report indicating the cause of the trigger and whether this presented a cause for concern. Each program and each dean complied with this request. Again, in the case where triggered programs were at the graduate level, the graduate dean and

the graduate council also prepared their own review. The three reviews (the department, the college and the graduate school) were forwarded to the Vision 2020 committee for their final review before the materials were forwarded to the interim Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Vision 2020 Committee reviewed the materials for both the programs undergoing review (the Elliott School of Communication) as well as those programs triggered by the data.

One of the problems identified with the process last year remained this year. In particular, the timing of the triggered program review process coming, as it does, so closely on the heels of the Vision 2020 update report allowed relatively little time for in-depth review and debate. Insofar as these issues may impact on curriculum, budgets, personnel and other related matters it would be in the best interest of the process to allow time for a more thorough investigation and review.

2. Use of Data to Shape Program Recommendations:

The Elliott School of Communication found the data and information collected for the review useful as they seek ways to strengthen both the undergraduate and graduate programs. At the same time, it was evident from the self-study and the review of the external consultant that the School was sufficiently strong and cost effective that changes were more programmatic than data driven. The department, college and the Vision 2020 committee considered ways to improve an already strong and healthy department.

Triggered programs were analyzed on the basis of the data. In a number of cases, plans have been made to change departmental requirements or to consolidate or suspend several programs. The review of the data for all programs led to many discussions about the mission of the university, and the interface between the work of the Vision 2020 Committee and the WSU Accountability Planning Matrix.

3. Changes resulting from Program Review:

The interim Vice President for Academic Affairs has used the experience of the previous year to involve more faculty in the academic planning process. Additionally, an effort was initiated this year to involve faculty in the financial planning process as well.

SUMMARY OF S.B. 657

The 1999 Legislature restructured postsecondary education in S.B. 345, the Kansas Higher Education Coordination Act. It was expected when the legislation was enacted that more legislation would be needed to address issues that were unforeseen at the time or that the new Board of Regents would identify for further action. The major proposed change, which is contained in other legislation (H.B. 2996 in the House Appropriations Committee), would make changes in how community college operating grants are determined. Other proposed changes, which are contained in S.B. 657, generally concern community colleges and area vocational schools, because statutes applicable to these institutions were among the most affected by 1999 S.B. 345. The changes contained in S.B. 657 are generally technical and consist of the following:

- On page 1, beginning in line 19, vocational education funds of community colleges, which currently are set to expire June 30, 2000, would be continued. S.B. 345 abolished community college vocational education funds because the funds were considered unnecessary, once community colleges begin to receive funding in FY 2001 through an operating grant and separate levies for vocational education are abolished. However, retaining vocational education funds would make it possible to have an audit trail in order to account for federal and other vocational education funds that community colleges receive.
- On page 2, line 20, an obsolete reference to Johnson County Area Vocational-Technical School would be deleted. Johnson County Area Vocational-Technical School merged with Johnson County Community College in the mid-1990s.
- On page 2, beginning on line 30, a sentence would be deleted that requires area vocational-technical schools to have approval of the State Board of Regents before they can construct or acquire buildings or land. "Area vocational-technical school" refers to schools that are governed by a multi-board of control made up of representatives of participating school districts. All other area vocational schools are governed by a single school district board of education or by a community college board of trustees. Presently, the only area vocational-technical schools are Northwest Kansas Technical School in Goodland and Southeast Kansas Area Technical School in Coffeyville. None of the other area vocational schools or technical colleges has to have approval of the State Board of Regents to construct buildings or to acquire buildings and land. The amendment contained in S.B. 657 is proposed by the State Board of Regents in order to treat similar institutions in a uniform manner.
- On page 4, beginning on line 24, the definition of "adult supplementary education program" would no longer be a course "taught for personal enrichment" but would be defined as a course other than courses in adult basic education or courses approved for state funding purposes. The change being proposed is intended to recognize that not all adult supplementary education programs are hobby and recreational, as the term "personal enrichment" might infer, but in fact include such things as professional licensure courses. Adult supplementary education programs do not receive state aid and are supported by user

*Senate Education
3-16-2000
Attachment 2*

fees.

- On page 5, line 6, the term “out-district” would be inserted in an item that pertains to the duties and functions of the State Board of Regents. The use of the term “out-district” targets the community colleges and provides that course locations outside the community college district would have to be approved by the State Board of Regents, which would continue a function that was performed by the State Board of Education. The change would make it clear that, within the community college district, the location of courses would be determined by the community college board of trustees.
- On page 5, beginning on line 42, and continuing on page 6, are changes relating to Kansas’ membership on the Midwestern Higher Education Commission. Currently, a member of the State Board of Education and a member of the State Board of Regents or a designee are on the Commission. However, since the State Board of Education no longer has postsecondary education programs under its jurisdiction, the proposed change would delete the State Board of Education’s representative and give the State Board of Regents two member positions. One of the members would represent two-year institutions and one would represent four-year institutions. Other amendments on page 6 would delete obsolete language that was needed when membership on the Commission originally was established. Other Kansas commissioners would continue to be the Governor or a designee and two legislators—one from the House of Representatives and one from the Senate.
- On page 6, beginning on line 27, several provisions of existing law would be repealed because the State Board of Regents considers that they no longer are necessary. They are:
 - K.S.A. 71-1001 through 71-1003. These provisions require the State Board of Regents to develop a State Plan for Community Colleges. The State Board considers the requirement obsolete because the Kansas Higher Education Coordination Act requires the State Board to develop a comprehensive plan for the coordination of all of higher education in Kansas, a plan that would encompass the community colleges.
 - K.S.A. 1999 Supp. 71-901 and 71-902. These provisions establish the Advisory Council of Community Colleges. The State Board of Regents considers it unnecessary to continue the Advisory Council because there now is a commission of the State Board that is responsible for matters relating to community colleges and vocational-technical education. Further, one of the traditional functions of the Advisory Council was to review the State Plan for Community Colleges, which the State Board of Regents recommends be discontinued.



KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

700 SW HARRISON • SUITE 1410 • TOPEKA, KS 66603-3760

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION - 785-296-3421
STUDENT FINANCIAL AID - 785-296-3517
GED TESTING SERVICES - 785-296-3191
FAX - 785-296-0983
www.kansasregents.org

KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

TESTIMONY to SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE on SENATE BILL 657

By

**Dr. Kim A. Wilcox, Executive Director
Kansas Board of Regents
March 16, 2000**

Madam Chair, Mr. Chair, members of the Senate and House Education Committees, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to speak in favor of Senate Bill 657.

As you are aware, anytime legislation the magnitude of Senate Bill 345 is enacted, there are bound to be a few clarifications or technical cleanup issues as the new law is implemented.

Working closely with our colleagues at the Kansas Association of Community College Trustees and the Kansas Association of Technical Schools & Colleges, we have identified five such areas, which the Board of Regents deems worthy of statutory fine-tuning:

As you know, the purpose of Senate Bill 345 was to coordinate public postsecondary education in Kansas. As we worked through these proposals all the parties at the table kept firmly in our minds the role and responsibilities of the new Kansas Board of Regents: Continued governance of the universities and coordination and supervision of the community colleges, technical schools and Washburn University.

We believe these proposed changes are consistent with the foundation of Senate Bill 345, and dovetail nicely with the spirit and intent of that historic legislation.

This exercise proved enormously worthwhile in one very important respect: While all stakeholders – universities, community colleges, technical schools and Board staff -- agreed these cleanup proposals were strictly technical in nature, the process of working through them provided us a “real-life” example of the challenges the Board will face in differentiating between strict ‘governance’ and the more nebulous ‘coordination and supervision.’

I would like to stress that none of these five are policy changes. We view them as cleanup, clarification and, in many cases, confirming a shift of responsibilities from the State Board of Education to the Board of Regents.

*Senate Education
3-16-2000
Attachment 3*

The first is the Community College Vocational Fund. Senate Bill 345 would have appropriately eliminated the community college levy authority for vocational courses or programs effective June 30, 2000. This action, however, inadvertently eliminated the vocational education fund, which serves as a depository for vocational funds, such as the federal Carl Perkins grants.

The proposal spelled out in Senate Bill 657 will provide community colleges the flexibility they currently enjoy in administering vocational education funded through grants.

The second proposed change deals with inconsistent language in the statute dealing with building projects. As written, the law would require two institutions -- the Northwest Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School campus in Goodland, and the Southeast Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School campus in Coffeyville, to seek Board of Regents approval before embarking upon construction, reconstruction or land acquisition.

The language presented in Senate Bill 657 simply brings consistency throughout as it relates to the 11 technical schools.

The third clarification has to do with the definition of Adult Supplementary Education. This change is recommended to conform with what was pre-existing language to the actual practice of the community colleges. The Adult Supplemental Education Fund is used not only for "personal enrichment" as detailed in statute, but is used as the funding mechanism for training and retraining when not reported for state funding.

The fourth proposal contained within Senate Bill 657 clarifies the role of the Board of Regents in the approval of locations of course offerings by the various institutions of public postsecondary education in Kansas. In this case, the Board of Regents simply assumes a duty previously carried out by the Board of Education.

This specific language, drafted by the Revisor of Statutes Office, meets with approval by the various parties involved in our efforts to reach consensus.

And finally, the fifth recommended change deals with appointments to the Midwestern Higher Education Commission by clarifying that responsibility lies with the Board of Regents. The language in Senate Bill 345 left one of those appointments to the state Board of Education. One of the appointees is to represent four-year schools and the other is to represent two-year schools.

The Board offers special thanks to Avis Swartzman of the Revisor of Statutes Office and Carolyn Rampey of your Legislative Research Department for their assistance in helping us bring this proposal together.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear. I would be happy to respond to any questions you may have.