

**KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS**  
**SYSTEM COUNCIL OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS**  
**MINUTES**  
**MAY 14, 2025**

The May 14, 2025, meeting of the System Council of Chief Academic Officers was called to order by Co-Chair Mickey McCloud at 8:34 a.m. The meeting was held virtually through Zoom, with an in-person option available in Suite 530, located in the Curtis State Office Building, 1000 S.W. Jackson, Topeka, KS 66612

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Brandon Galm, Cloud County CC	Barbara Bichelmeyer, KU	John Fritch, Washburn
Mickey McCloud, JCCC	Jason Sharp, Labette CC	Monica Lounsbery, WSU
Brent Thomas, ESU	Susan Bon, PSU	Jennifer Seymour, WSU Tech
Jill Arensdorf, FHSU	Luke Dowell, Seward CC	Rusty Monhollon, KBOR ( <i>ex officio</i> )

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Luke Dowell moved that the minutes of the March 12, 2025, meeting be approved. Barbara Bichelmeyer seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

**SYSTEMWIDE UPDATES**

**FIRST 15**

Vice President for Academic Affairs Rusty Monhollon shared a reminder that the work group was moving away from a no-cost model to a low-cost model. The work group met on May 2 to discuss this change. KBOR is working to collect data on current costs for concurrent enrollments. The work group will meet again in a few weeks.

**OTHER MATTERS**

**NEXT CYCLE PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT DISCUSSION**

Director for Academic Affairs Jenn Bonds-Raacke led a discussion focused on shaping the next cycle of Performance Agreements. The goal was to gather insights from Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) on what aspects of previous models were effective, what challenges they encountered, and how future agreements could better align with both statewide goals and institutional priorities. Director Bonds-Raacke began by outlining the statutory requirements tied to performance agreements and initiated the conversation by prompting reflections on past models.

Prior to Academic Year 2024, the Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) used a metric-based approach, where institutions reported on indicators such as graduation and retention rates. Brandon Galm noted that a major challenge was the delay in data, which made it challenging to address issues in real time. Jill Arensdorf appreciated the flexibility to select some institution-specific metrics alongside those mandated by KBOR, and valued the opportunity to provide both qualitative and quantitative feedback. Barbara Bichelmeyer highlighted the clarity metrics provided in defining success, especially when institutions had input in their selection. However, Luke Dowell pointed out that the binary nature of evaluating benchmarks—either met or not met—could misrepresent institutional progress, particularly when year-to-year fluctuations occurred. Mickey McCloud emphasized the benefit of aligning metrics with institutional strategic plans but noted a lack of guidance on setting stretch goals. He indicated some campuses set stretch goals (sometimes resulting in incremental losses), while others remained focused on goals they were trying to maintain based on their institutional strategic plans.

.

Starting in AY24, KBOR transitioned to a project-based model. Barbara Bichelmeyer appreciated this shift, noting that projects played a critical role in advancing Board metrics and fostering institutional alignment. However, she and Dr. Arensdorf expressed concern over the tight timelines and the level of detail required, which created strain within institutions and limited faculty input. Jill Arensdorf suggested that a middle ground between metrics and projects might offer a more balanced approach to accountability.

Several CAOs offered suggestions for considering a potential hybrid model that combines elements of both approaches. Mickey McCloud recommended forecasting projects in advance to allow institutions time to align goals and initiatives. Susan Bon emphasized the need for more precise boundaries and more manageable timelines. Barbara Bichelmeyer supported a balanced model that accounts for institutional size, program diversity, and faculty engagement. Brandon Galm added that while professional development sessions and Executive Implementation Team meetings helped unify direction, the implementation often felt improvised rather than well-planned.

The conversation also explored how performance agreements could foster both institutional improvement and innovation while maintaining accountability. Mickey McCloud proposed incorporating “innovation lab” elements that allow institutions to report on emerging initiatives and future-focused strategies. Barbara Bichelmeyer agreed, advocating for flexibility and the ability to adjust goals over time without penalizing failure. Jill Arensdorf echoed this sentiment, calling for more adaptability in the process. Susan Bon noted that recent innovations, such as those in associate degree programs, were not always captured by existing metrics. Luke Dowell stressed the importance of aligning funding decisions with innovation-focused metrics.

Vice President Monhollon and Co-chair McCloud agreed to continue the discussion at the June meeting, with plans to extend it into the fall. The aim is to implement changes within the next year. Director Bonds-Raacke will distribute questions to the group before the next meeting to support the ongoing dialogue.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Co-chair Mickey McCloud shared that the 2025 KCOG Preliminary course submissions were due on May 12, and the next SCOCOA meeting is scheduled for June 11, 2025.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Luke Dowell moved that the meeting be adjourned. Susan Bon seconded, and the motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:08 a.m.