MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Lisa Benlon at 3:40 p.m. on January 23, 2002 in Room 231-N of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Jo Ann Pottorff (E)

Committee staff present: Paul West, Legislative Research
Jim Wilson, Revisor of Statutes
Renae Jefferies, Revisor of Statutes
Dee Ann Woodson, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Dr. Kim Wilcox, Executive Director, Kansas Board of Regents

Others attending:

See attached sheet.

Chairperson Benlon asked Dr. Kim Wilcox, Executive Director of the Kansas State Board of Regents, to give a presentation in response to inquiries as to the duplication of schools of study at the various state supported institutions.

Dr. Wilcox stated that his testimony would cover two sets of comments which included some history in the process, and the second would cover the programs and program reviews in the State of Kansas. He said the Board of Regents has been serious about program review and the issue of duplication of programs. He stated that between 1982 and 1990 every academic program at the six state universities were reviewed, with the results being 180 programs were discontinued or modified out of approximately 600 which resulted in approximately $1M in savings reinvested.

In 1992, Dr. Wilcox testified that every academic program at the six state universities was reviewed in depth with the results being that another 182 programs were discontinued, modified or merged with other programs. He added that approximately $18M was reinvested during the period from 1994 to 1998. He told the Committee that in 1997 the Board of Regents implemented a new Program Review System for the six state universities wherein every academic program is reviewed intensively at least every eight years. Dr. Wilcox explained that the program focused on consistency with institutional missions, curriculum and instruction, and relies upon an integrated data base system which regretfully cannot be logged onto at the Capitol in order to demonstrate its capabilities in giving enrollments, graduation rates, size of facilities, student credentials (e.g. ACT scores, admission rates), and costs of the program. He said it was an essential tool for their office in monitoring costs of programs.

Dr. Wilcox talked about the six criteria involved with the Program Review System which included: (1) centrality of program to institutional mission, (2) quality of the program in terms of faculty talents and

CONTINUATION

productivity, (3) quality of the program in terms of student qualifications and curriculum, (4) demonstrated student and employer demand, (5) service to the discipline, university, and beyond, and (6) cost effectiveness. He told the Committee that they have completed the1999 review data, and that 2000 and 2001 were in their office, but do not have it summarized yet. He talked about the first two years, and said that the institutions were free to identify the order of program reviews within their institutions, along with the proviso that all programs be reviewed every eight years. He explained to the Committee what was involved with the reviews, and that of the 162 academic programs reviewed under the first two years using this process, 122 were recommended for continuation, 3 recommended for enhancement, 4 were scheduled for discontinuance, 11 monitored for possible re-review within the next four years, 3 were merged with other programs, 5 were possible future mergers, and 1 was moved from one department to another department.

In the second part of his presentation, Dr. Wilcox talked about context in which he said that duplication of programs does give the notion of wasted resources; however, some duplication is a necessary reality in a higher education system. He stated that access was the biggest factor, and gave examples of how complicated issue this was when consolidating programs across the entire state. He told the Committee that strength builds on strength, and within a campus environment it is very difficult to mount a first rate engineering program without a first rate business program given the inter-connectiveness of engineering and management in today's world. He explained that the aviation research program would be very difficult to do at Pittsburg State when it needs to be in Wichita where the aviation industry was located, and similarly the agriculture engineering would be more difficult to excel at Pittsburg rather than at Kansas State. He stated that in order for them to achieve their institutional as well as statewide goals, they have to cluster programs together even when they appear to be duplicative. He added that they need to be doubly cautious that they are not wasting resources, and that was where he felt their data base system worked.

Dr. Wilcox said that his comments were basically targeted towards the six state universities, and spoke briefly about the rest of the State Regents system. He said that the Board of Regents had worked with the six state universities for 77 years, and the other 30 institutions for the last two and half years or since 1999 and the implementation of **SB 345**. He explained that the data base system he had been talking about was built essentially by the state universities, but they are working toward a data system for the state. He told the Committee that they have continued the intensive program and course approval process for the technical schools, technical colleges, and community colleges. He said they had implemented them fully, and any new program at any of the community colleges or technical schools is thoroughly reviewed in their office using the same parameters, i.e. institutional resources, student demand, faculty credentials, duplication within the state as well as competing demand. He concluded his testimony by pointing out that in addition to program reviews at community colleges they do course approvals which involves the community colleges only being reimbursed by the State for those courses approved by the Board of Regents. (Attachment 1)

General questions and discussion followed regarding: service areas of the various community colleges which were identified by the Board of Education, number of the Regents colleges that offer doctorate degrees in the field of education, if size of programs have anything to do with whether they are eliminated or not, inquiry if there was anything in place for sharing programs when colleges are in close proximity of each other, availability of an advising guide configured by schools which is used by both students and advisors, collaboration between the schools, different funding formulas used, and the challenge that different institutions are accredited by different agencies with various accreditation standards and issues in terms of enrollment.

Additional discussion related to the Board of Regents providing real direction to the vocational technical programs, the status of the Stower's project at the KU Medical Center which the Board of Regents has not received a formal request on to date, and clarification on the definition of an academic program.

Dr. Wilcox had some closing comments to the Committee which consisted of explaining what **SB 345** required of the Board of Regents in regard to creating a unified budget process and coordinating a plan for all the higher education institutions in Kansas. He said they had been working hard on that in two primary

Unless specifically noted, the individual remarks recorded herein have not been transcribed verbatim. Individual remarks as reported herein have not been submitted to the individuals appearing before the committee for editing or corrections

Page 2

modes: (1) created seven advisory task forces with representation from across the state of which reports have been completed and are in process of moving ahead with some of the recommendations therein, and hired a team of consultants and they have offered a set of recommendations on structuring governments for higher education in Kansas which are receiving a lot of attention; (2) and lastly the Legislature during last session asked the Board of Regents to create a plan for the Kansas Educational Network, which has been completed, a report has been written which was endorsed by both the Board of Regents and the Board of Education. He suggested that these topics might be of interest to the Committee for further discussion.

Representative Tanner stated that he was keenly interested in the Kan Ed Program, and wanted to know the price tag if possible. Dr. Wilcox responded that it would be in the Executive Summary, and stated that it was a political success that many people thought would never happen which calls for a private/public partnership. He said that the price tag was approximately $10M for the state, and have submitted applications to the Federal government for discounts of $2.5M. He clarified that the Board of Regents did not want to run a phone company, and if they were unable to provide resources to develop content for the network, then they were not going to be able to achieve their goals.

Representative Kuether suggested that if the Committee chose to hear a presentation on the Kan Ed Program, then the New Economy Committee should be invited to come in and hear the presentation at the same time because it involves utilities, higher education, Work Force Development, and economic development.

There being no further questions, the Chair expressed the Committee's appreciation to Dr. Wilcox for his presentation. The Chair called for Bill Introductions, and seeing none adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

The next meeting of the House Higher Education is On Call of the Chair.

HOUSE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMITTEE GUEST LIST

DATE __1-23-02__

NAME	REPRESENTING
DICK CARTER, JR	KBOR
KIM WILCOX	KBOR
Jon Vasserand	KU
David G Moncial	Washburn
Jffrson Santn	ESU
John Pinegar	Washburn Univ
Julia Sheerin	Intern
Vichilynn Helsel	DOB
Judy Shaw	KATSC

House Higher Education Committee
January 23, 2002

Report on Academic Program Duplication in the Board of Regents System
Kim A. Wilcox

HISTORY

1982-1990

Every academic program at the six state universities was reviewed
Results:

- 180 programs (out of approximately 600) were discontinued or modified
- approx. $1M in savings reinvested

1992

Every academic program at the six state universities was reviewed
Results:

- 182 programs discontinued, modified or merged
- approx. $18M reinvested during the period from 1994 to 1998

1997

The Board of Regents implemented a new Program Review System for the six state universities

- Consistent with campus planning and missions
- Focused on curriculum, instruction, and use of faculty time and talent
- Requires that every academic program be reviewed at least once every 8 years, based on the following criteria
    a. Centrality of program to institutional mission
    b. Quality of the program in terms of faculty talents and productivity
    c. Quality of the program in terms of student qualifications and curriculum
    d. Demonstrated student and employer demand
    e. Service to the discipline, university, and beyond
    f. Cost effectiveness
- Supported by a Common Program Review Database including data on:
    a. Enrollment
    b. Graduation rates
    c. Size of faculty
    d. Student credentials (e.g. ACT scores, admission rates)
    e. Cost

- Of 162 academic programs reviewed under in the first two years (1999 and 2000) of this process:
  - 122 Recommended for continuation
  - 3 Recommended for enhancement
  - 4 Scheduled for discontinuance
  - 11 Monitored for possible re-review
  - 3 Merged
  - 5 Possible mergers
  - 1 Move to another department

Total does not sum to 162, due to double-listing of some programs (e.g. monitored for possible merger)

1999

Implementation of S.B. 345 and expansion of responsibilities to include all of higher education.

The Board of Regents has continued the intensive program and course approval process implemented by the State Board of Education for the community colleges, technical colleges and technical schools. This includes an assessment of institutional resources, faculty credentials, student demand, and duplication within the state.

2002

Planning continues on several fronts to develop a more unified system of program review and approval for all of post-secondary education.

ISSUES RELATED TO PROGRAM DUPLICATION

I.   Inevitable tension between need for geographic access and the desire to minimize unnecessary duplication.

II.   Need to align programs with institutional strengths

      E.G.   Aeronautical engineering in Wichita
                Agricultural engineering in Manhattan
                Biomedical engineering in Kansas City

III.   Need to align programs with regional needs

IV.   Regardless of similarity of title, no two programs are identical, in terms of faculty, curriculum, emphases, etc.

V.   Board of Regents is committed to balancing these competing forces to best utilize available resources and to serve the needs of Kansas. Much of that effort has centered on defining and re-enforcing differentiation among institutions.