

## System Council of Chief Academic Officers

Wednesday, September 18, 2013  
8:15 a.m. – 9:15 a.m.  
Kathy Rupp Conference Room  
Kansas Board of Regents  
Curtis State Office Building  
1000 SW Jackson  
Topeka, Kansas

### A G E N D A

	Page
1. Approve Minutes of June 19, 2013 [Attachment 1]	2
2. Discussion:	
a. Transfer and Articulation Council (TAC) Update	
b. Developmental Education Task Force	
c. Concurrent Enrollment Policy [Attachment 2]	4
d. Student Learning Assessment Update [Attachment 3]	11
e. System Perspective on Reverse Transfer	
f. Smarter Balanced Update	
3. Information:	
a. Washburn University –A Master of Studies in Law (22.0201) – Informational Item [Attachment 4]	15
4. Other Business	

### SCOCAO Schedule – September 2013 – June 2014

AGENDA MATERIALS DUE	MEETING DATES
August 23, 2013	September 18, 2013
September 20, 2013	October 16, 2013
October 25, 2013	November 20, 2013
November 22, 2013	December 18, 2013
December 20, 2013	January 15, 2014
January 22, 2014	February 12, 2014
February 19, 2014	March 12, 2014
March 21, 2014	April 16, 2014
April 18, 2014	May 14, 2014
May 23, 2014	June 18, 2014

**System Council of Chief Academic Officers  
Minutes**

**Wednesday, June 19, 2013  
8:15 a.m.  
Kathy Rupp Conference Room  
Topeka, KS**

The System Council of Chief Academic Officers met in the Kathy Rupp Conference Room, Kansas Board of Regents, 1000 SW Jackson, Suite 520, Topeka, Kansas, at 8:15 a.m. on Wednesday, June 19, 2013.

**Members Present:**

Alysia Johnston, Coffeyville Community College	Lynette Olson, Pittsburg State University
Karla Fisher, Butler County Community College	Larry Gould, Fort Hays State University
Jon Marshall, Allen County Community College	Nancy Tate, Washburn University
April Mason, Kansas State University	Rick Muma, Wichita State University
Gwen Alexander, Emporia State University	
Marilyn Mahan, Manhattan Area Technical College	

**Board Staff**

Gary Alexander, Karla Wiscombe, Jean Redeker, and Jacqueline Johnson

**Others Present:**

Sara Rosen, University of Kansas; Allen Rawitch, University of KS Medical Center; Steve Loewen, Flint Hills Technical College; John Dahlstrand, Washburn University; Andy Anderson, Johnson County Community College; Sara Harris, Independence Community College; Peggy Forsberg, Highland County Community College; Duane Dunn, Seward County Community College; Kim Krull, Cloud County Community College; Penny Quinn, Barton County Community College; Michael Ahern, Dodge City Community College

---

**Minutes**

April Mason moved to approve the May 15, 2013 minutes. Lynette Olson seconded, and the motion carried.

**Transfer and Articulation**

Karla Wiscombe stated the Transfer and Articulation Advisory Council is working on its annual meeting, which will be held on September 27, 2013. The Council also has four new members: Daniel Barwick, Independence Community College; Brian Inbody, Neosho Community College; Penny Quinn, Barton County Community College; and John Marshall, Allen County Community College.

**Assessment of Learner Outcomes**

Gary Alexander presented an update on the assessment of learner outcomes. Mathematics/Quantitative/Analytical Reasoning, Written and Oral Communication, and Critical Thinking/Problem Solving are the areas identified for assessment by all institutions. It is the Council's understanding that the state universities will present a status report in the areas from which they have collected data and the two year institutions will present information on a voluntary basis. Gary Alexander will present a report to the Board next spring.

**Smarter Balanced Update**

Gary Alexander presented an update on Smarter Balanced and explained Smarter Balanced is working on a sustainability model that would enable it to continue after 2014.

**24-hour and faculty Qualifications/Concurrent Enrollment Policy**

The Council reviewed the KCIA position statement on 24 semester credit hour limit and faculty qualifications for the concurrent enrollment program. The KCIA supports eliminating the 24 semester credit hour limit, but does not support any changes in the current policy on faculty qualifications. The Council asked Gary Alexander to present the proposal to eliminate the 24 semester credit hour limit to the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents for feedback, and also asked for more background information on the faculty qualifications for the concurrent enrollment program.

**Information**

Sara Rosen presented an update on the new programs the University of Kansas will include in its Midwest Student Exchange Program.

SCOCAO discussed remedial courses as it relates to eligibility for Title IV funding. SCOCAO members who work at community and technical colleges will check with colleagues elsewhere to find out how this issue is handled.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.

**KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS  
CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT POLICY – WORKING DRAFT**

**CHAPTER III: COORDINATION – STATE UNIVERSITIES, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, TECHNICAL COLLEGES, WASHBURN UNIVERSITY AND/OR THE WASHBURN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**

**A. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

...

**11. CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN ELIGIBLE PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS THROUGH CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT PARTNERSHIPS**

It is the policy of the Kansas Board of Regents to encourage high school students to take advantage of postsecondary education opportunities by enrolling in postsecondary courses while still in high school or participating in home schooling. K.S.A. 72-11a01 through 72-11a05 provide for these opportunities through the Kansas Challenge to Secondary School Pupils Act. The act commonly is known as concurrent enrollment of high school students in eligible postsecondary institutions. Statutory language provides conditions under which secondary schools and eligible postsecondary institutions may establish cooperative agreements, defined as a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership (CEP).

~~Different types of concurrent enrollment can be included under the statute. In one type, a high school student may enroll at a postsecondary institution at any time without any formal agreement between the high school and the postsecondary institution. (This type of concurrent enrollment would include 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students enrolling pursuant to K.A.R. 88-26-3, as amended, and any non degree seeking student.) In another type, a high school teacher teaches a college level course to high school students at the high school during the regular high school day. The latter must conform to section b. of this policy.~~

While various forms of dual enrollment may be offered under the statute, this policy applies only to Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships formed between a high school and eligible postsecondary education institution in which a high school faculty member teaches a college-level course to high school students at the high school during the regular high school day. These partnerships must conform to paragraph b. of this policy.

Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships do NOT include the following: (1) programs in which the high school student travels to the college campus to take courses prior to graduation during the academic year or during the summer; (2) programs in which college faculty travel to the high school to teach separate courses to high school students; and (3) the College Board Advanced Placement Program and the International Baccalaureate Program, which use standardized tests to assess the student's knowledge of a curriculum developed by a committee consisting of both college and high school faculty.

**a. Purposes of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships**

As established by the Kansas Board of Regents, the system-wide purposes of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships are ~~fourfold~~ threefold:

~~i. To Develop Seamlessness in the Kansas Public Postsecondary Education System~~

~~“Seamlessness” is defined in the Transfer and Articulation provisions of this policy manual.~~

~~(ii) i. To Enhance Efficiency~~ Reduce Time-to-Degree and Lower Costs

~~Efficiency is enhanced by exposing as many qualified students as possible to a college level experience, allowing students to get a “jump”~~ Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships enable students to get an early start on their college education, by thus potentially reducing the time required to complete a degree and lowering the costs borne by parents, students and taxpayers.

~~(iii)~~ ii To Challenge High School Students and Promote College-Level Success

~~This goal is~~ Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships are aimed at providing a college-level learning experience for qualified students by enhancing the amount, level and diversity of learning in high school beyond the traditional secondary curriculum. First year experience courses, performing and visual arts courses and advanced science, mathematics and language offerings not available in high school are especially encouraged.

~~(iv)~~ iii To Foster Improved Relationships Between Kansas Public Postsecondary Education Institutions and Kansas Secondary Schools

~~The~~ Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (CEP) are intended to foster improved relationships among stakeholders by clarifying expectations, roles, and responsibilities.

~~Statutory language provides conditions under which secondary schools and eligible postsecondary institutions may establish cooperative agreements, or what has been defined as a CEP.~~

b. Procedures and Standards of Quality for Cooperative Agreements and Delivery of for Implementing Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships ~~Course Work~~

i Definitions of ~~Concurrent Enrollment~~

For purposes of this policy:

(1) ~~“Concurrent Enrollment Partnership pupil student” means a person who is in grades 10, 11, or 12, or who is gifted and is in grade 9 (see paragraph b.v.(2)); has been admitted to an eligible postsecondary education institution as a degree-seeking or non-degree seeking student; and is enrolled in classes-courses at a high school at which approved high school teachers faculty teach college credit classes-courses during the normal school day. who is in grades 10, 11, or 12, or who is gifted and is in grade 9 (see section b.(5) (c)(b)), and is acceptable or has been accepted for enrollment at an eligible postsecondary education institution.~~

(2) ~~“Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreement” means a written memorandum of understanding between an eligible postsecondary institution and a school district for the purpose of offering college-level learning to students who are eligible to enroll in college courses offered at a high school at which approved high school faculty teach said college courses during the normal school day.~~

~~(2)~~ (3) ~~“Eligible postsecondary education institution” means any state educational institution-university, community college, technical college, municipal university or affiliated institute of technology.~~

(3) ~~“State educational institution” means any state university as defined in K.S.A. 76-711, and amendments thereto.~~

(4) ~~“Community college” means any community college organized and operating under the laws of this state.~~

~~(f)(e)~~ ~~“Municipal university” means a municipal university established under the provisions of article 13a of chapter 13 of Kansas Statutes Annotated.~~

~~(g)(f)~~ ~~“Technical college” means any technical college established under the laws of this state as described in K.S.A. 74-3201b.~~

(7) ~~“Concurrent Enrollment Partnership (CEP)” agreement means a written memorandum of understanding between an eligible postsecondary institution and a school district for the purpose of offering college-level learning to students who have been accepted for concurrent enrollment partnership in off-campus classes at a high school at which approved high school teachers teach college credit classes during the normal school day.~~

The CEP agreement must contain, at a minimum, the names and contact information of the liaisons for both parties, term and termination of the agreement, an overview of the partnership's purpose and benefits, the individual and

~~joint responsibilities of both parties, information, guidelines and necessary directions for curriculum, faculty, students, assessment, professional development activities and a listing of principles for assuring quality in programming. CEPs must include attachments that address issues of compensation, awarding of credit and course listings for each party.~~

~~CEP arrangements shall include collaborative faculty development programming such as pedagogy, instructional design, course management, instructional delivery skill improvement, curricular reform initiatives, qualified admissions considerations (if applicable), and student success assessment strategies.~~

~~Although courses in some CEPs may have some elements or characteristics of the programs stated below, CEPs do not include the following programs:~~

~~(i) Programs in which the high school student travels to the college campus to take courses prior to graduation during the academic year or during the summer.~~

~~(ii) Programs in which college faculty travel to the high school to teach separate courses to the high school students.~~

~~(iii) The College Board Advanced Placement Program and the International Baccalaureate Program where standardized tests are used to assess students' knowledge of a curriculum developed by a committee consisting of both college and high school faculty.~~

ii Agreement between Eligible Postsecondary Institutions and School Districts

A CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreement ~~must~~ shall be established between the eligible postsecondary institution and the school district. Such agreement ~~must minimally~~ shall satisfy the requirements of statute K.S.A. 72-11a04 and contain the essential elements provided in this policy. The agreement shall contain, at a minimum:

General provisions of the statute relative to ~~CEP~~ agreements are as follows:

(1) the names and contact information of the liaisons for both parties, term of the agreement and any provisions for early termination, the individual and joint responsibilities of both parties, information, guidelines and necessary directions for curriculum, faculty, students, assessment, and a listing of principles for assuring quality in programming;

(2) an implementation plan for ensuring high school faculty teaching concurrently enrolled partnership students are integrated into the postsecondary partner institution through orientation, professional development, seminars, site visits, annual evaluations and ongoing communication with the postsecondary partner institution's faculty;

(3) a clause addressing issues of compensation, awarding of credit and course listings for each party;

~~(4)~~(4) acknowledgement that the academic credit is to shall be granted for course work successfully completed by the ~~pupil~~ student at the ~~eligible~~ postsecondary partner institution, which shall qualify as college credit and may qualify as both high school and college credit;

~~(2)~~(5) acknowledgement that such course work ~~must~~ shall qualify as credit applicable toward the award of a degree or certificate at the ~~eligible~~ postsecondary partner institution;

~~(3)~~(6) acknowledgement that the ~~pupil~~ student shall pay to the postsecondary partner institution the negotiated amount of tuition, fees and related costs charged by the institution for enrollment of the ~~pupil~~ student except in the case of tiered technical courses. Secondary students admitted to postsecondary tiered technical courses conducted by a community college, technical college or institute of technology may be charged fees, but shall not be charged tuition;

(7) a plan for ensuring that courses offered through a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership are annually reviewed by college faculty in the discipline at the postsecondary partner institution according to the criteria described in iii.(5); and

(8) a statement indicating the Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreement shall be reviewed at least every five years by the postsecondary partner institution to assure compliance and quality considerations as outlined in this policy.

iii Curriculum Standards and Content of Courses in which Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Students are Enrolled, Course Content/Materials, and Assessment of Students

(1) Courses administered through a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership shall be university/college catalogued courses with the same departmental id, course descriptions, numbers, titles and credits. Courses must have been approved through the curriculum approval process of the postsecondary partner institution.

(2) The high school and college-level prerequisites, the content of courses, course goals and objectives, must be the same as those for the same courses offered to students at any location or by any delivery method.

(3) Materials such as textbooks used must be comparable to those used in the same course throughout the postsecondary partner institution. Procedures for selection of textbooks and related material by high school faculty who teach concurrently enrolled students must follow adopted the postsecondary partner's institutional policies.

(4) If a course has been approved by Board staff as competency-based, the competencies for the courses must be the same as those for courses not taught to concurrently enrolled students.

(5) College faculty at the postsecondary partner institution shall annually review Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses in their discipline to ensure that:

(a) Concurrent Enrollment Partnership students are held to the same grading standards and standards of achievement as those expected of students in on-campus sections;

(b) Concurrent Enrollment Partnership students are being assessed using the same methods (i.e., papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs) as students in on-campus sections;

(c) high school faculty are utilizing the same final examination for each Concurrent Enrollment Partnership course as is given in a representative section of the same course taught at the public postsecondary institution awarding the course credit; and

(d) high school faculty are applying the same scoring rubric for the assigned course as is used in the on-campus course; and that course management, instructional delivery and content meet or exceed those in regular on-campus sections.

(6) Remedial/developmental course work or course work that does not apply to a Board of Regents' approved degree program at the postsecondary partner institution in a CEP agreement is not considered appropriate for college level credit. shall not be offered as a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership course.

iv High School Faculty/Instructors

(1) Qualifications

(a) High school faculty teaching college-level, non-tiered Concurrent Enrollment Partnership (CEP) courses must shall attain instructional eligibility by meeting one of the following minimum standards: (1) demonstrate possession of a masters degree in the discipline or (2) demonstrate possession of a masters degree with a minimum of 18 credit hours in the assigned course content or (2) demonstrate possession of a bachelors degree, with at least 24 credit hours in the assigned course content and utilize the same final examination as given in a representative section of the course taught at the institution awarding the course credit and apply

~~the same scoring rubric for the assigned course as that used in the on-campus class. Institutions may set higher standards. Teaching evaluations must be conducted. The postsecondary institution shall provide instructors with orientation and ongoing professional development.~~

Postsecondary partner institutions unable to employ qualified faculty due to geographic isolation or other insurmountable factors, may employ faculty possessing a bachelor's degree and at least 24 hours in the assigned course content. This shall not, however, be the norm for Concurrent Enrollment Partnership faculty.

~~(b) Faculty teaching college-level tiered technical courses through a Concurrent Enrollment Partnership (CEP) must shall attain instructional eligibility by meeting the academic standards addressed above or possess a valid/current industry- recognized credential and a minimum of 4,000 hours of work experience in the specific technical field and utilize the same final examination as given in a representative section of the course taught at the institution awarding the course credit and apply the same scoring rubric for the assigned course as that used in the on-campus class. Institutions may set higher standards. Teaching evaluations must be conducted. The postsecondary institution shall provide instructors with orientation and ongoing professional development.~~

(c) Postsecondary partner institutions may set higher standards.

(2) Orientation, Professional Development and Evaluation

(a) Before approving high school faculty the instructors to teach college-level CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses, the postsecondary partner institution must shall provide the high school instructors faculty with orientation and training in course curriculum, assessment criteria, course philosophy, and CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership administrative requirements.

(b) The postsecondary partner institution shall provide the high school faculty with ongoing professional development opportunities.

(c) Orientation and/or professional development activities shall include collaborative faculty development programming such as pedagogy, instructional design, course management, instructional delivery skill improvement, curricular reform initiatives, and student success assessment strategies.

(d) The postsecondary partner institution shall annually conduct evaluations of high school faculty teaching Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses to ensure compliance with the state expectations for Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses.

~~(e) Each CEP must include an implementation plan for ensuring that instructors teaching concurrently enrolled partnership students are part of a continuing collegial interaction through professional development, seminars, site visits, and ongoing communication with the postsecondary institution's faculty and administration of the partnership.~~

v Student Eligibility for Enrollment, Advising and Student Guides

~~(1) Concurrently enrolled students must meet institutional enrollment requirements; follow institutional procedures regarding assessment/placement; and satisfy course prerequisites. High school students enrolled in courses administered through a CEP may Concurrent Enrollment Partnership shall be enrolled as degree or non-degree/-or non-matriculated students of at the sponsoring postsecondary partner institution. Each Concurrent Enrollment Partnership student must meet the postsecondary partner institution's requirements for admission as a degree-seeking or non-degree/non-matriculated student. Concurrently enrolled students shall have met institutional enrollment requirements; satisfied course prerequisites; and followed institutional procedures regarding assessment/placement. In order to enroll in a CEP course, students shall achieve the same score or subscore on a standardized placement test as is required for students enrolled in the same on-campus course. To meet the "academic challenge" purpose of this policy, CEP students must have an acceptable achieve the score or subscore on a standardized placement test in order to enroll in a CEP course. Postsecondary partner institutions may establish higher standards.~~



(2) Students who are enrolled in grade 9 and are classified by a school district as “gifted” according to the State Department of Education’s definition, K.A.R. 91-40-1(bb), as amended, may be admitted as concurrently enrolled students provided all other applicable requirements as outlined above are satisfied.

(3) The student must be authorized by the high school principal to apply for enrollment.

(4) Students must be provided with a student guide created as part of the CEP that outlines their rights and responsibilities in the learning experience as well as a description of how courses may be transferred in the Kansas public postsecondary education system. Advising of students who desire to enroll in CEP classes Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses must be carried out by both the high school and postsecondary institution.

(5) Students shall be provided with a student guide created as part of the Concurrent Enrollment Partnership that outlines their rights and responsibilities as university/college students. The student guide shall also provide a description of how courses may be transferred in the Kansas public postsecondary education system.

~~(3) Students who are enrolled in grade 9 and are classified by a school district as “gifted” according to the State Department of Education’s definition, K.A.R. 91-40-1(cc), as amended, may be admitted as concurrently enrolled students provided all other applicable requirements as outlined above are satisfied.~~

~~(4) The student must be authorized by the school principal to apply for enrollment.~~

vi CEP Courses which that Include Students Enrolled for Secondary and/or Postsecondary Credit

A course may include students enrolled for postsecondary and/or secondary credit. The postsecondary partner institution is responsible for ensuring that academic standards (course requirements and grading criteria) are not compromised.

~~(7) Accountability/Assessment Standards~~

~~(a) Courses offered through a concurrent enrollment partnership must be reviewed annually by faculty in the discipline at the postsecondary partner to assure that grading standards (i.e., papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs), course management, instructional delivery and content meet or exceed those in regular on-campus sections.~~

~~(b) Each CEP must be reviewed at least every five years by the eligible postsecondary institution to assure compliance and quality considerations as outlined in this policy.~~

~~(c) The Board office will track students who have participated in concurrent enrollment partnerships and other forms of concurrent enrollment.~~

~~(8) Collegiate Learning~~

~~CEP classes are not intended to replace a substantial portion of the academic experience on a college/university campus. Up to 24 semester credit hours may be earned in concurrent enrollment partnership classes, excluding credit hours earned in tiered technical courses.~~

c. Reporting of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships Courses

i Institutions will report the following as a part of the regular Kansas Postsecondary Database collection:

- (1) Directory information for each high school student enrolled;
- (2) Credit hours generated by each high school student;
- (3) Credentials of faculty teaching CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses; and
- (4) CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership credit hours generated by each high school student.

ii By January 31 of odd-numbered years, each public postsecondary institution ~~will~~ shall provide to Board staff a list of high schools ~~involved in formal CEP with which it has Concurrent Enrollment Partnership~~ agreements. For each institution, Board staff will select no more than two high schools for reporting. For each high school selected, each institution will submit the following to the Board office:

(1) Copy of the ~~CEP~~ Concurrent Enrollment Partnership agreement ~~including (but not limited to) that includes the criteria described in b.ii.;~~

(2) ~~Implementation plan for professional development of instructors of CEP students (as described in b. i.(7) and b. iv..(3))~~

~~(b) Student Guide for CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership students (as described in b.v.(2) b.v.(5); and~~

~~(2) (3) Report resulting from the annual review of CEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership courses by postsecondary partner institution faculty and dates of most recent review of all CEP courses, aggregated by discipline (as described in section b.vii.(4) b.iii.(5)).~~

iii By January 31 of odd-numbered years, each institution ~~shall~~ will forward to the Board office a copy of ~~the~~ all reports resulting from the five-year institutional review of ~~CEPs~~ Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (as described in ~~b.vii.(2) b.ii.(8)).~~

iv All reports shall be reviewed for compliance and the results will be reported to the Board President and Chief Executive Officer.

d. ~~Implementation~~

~~This policy shall become effective at the beginning of the fall semester one calendar year after approval. (5-18-05)~~

**Undergraduate Student Learning Assessment Update**  
**System Council of Chief Academic Officers**  
**September 18, 2013**

At its June 2012 meeting, the Board approved a report developed by the System Council of Chief Academic Officers (SCOCAO) identifying the following three areas for assessment and reporting of student learning outcomes:

- Mathematics/Quantitative/Analytical Reasoning
- Written and Oral Communication
- Critical Thinking/Problem Solving

The first report to the Board is due in June 2014. Institutions are using multiple mechanisms to assess student learning in one or more of the core areas. The report will focus on the areas accepted by KBOR and will provide the mechanisms and results for each institution.

With one revision based on more recent information (PSU), the following charts were provided the Board as part of the June 12 report.

Emporia State University

Area to be Assessed	Assessment Mechanism
Writing	ACT/CAAP Writing Score
Oral Communication	Embed in Advanced Public Speaking course
Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning	ACT/CAAP Quantitative Reasoning Score
Critical Thinking	Embed in academic courses: World Cultures to 1550; US History to 1877; Operations Management
Reading	ACT/CAAP Reading Score

Fort Hays State University

Area to be Assessed	Assessment Mechanism
Analytical and communication skills	Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) [test freshmen through composition program; seniors as part of capstone experience]; Program level assessment; Writing Across the Curriculum Program; iSkills, National Survey of Student Engagement
Personal well-being skills	Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) [test freshmen through composition program; seniors as part of capstone experience]; Program level assessment; Writing Across the Curriculum Program; iSkills, National Survey of Student Engagement
Awareness of cultural heritage; critical access to past achievements	Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) [test freshmen through composition program; seniors as part of capstone experience]; Program level assessment; Writing Across the Curriculum Program; iSkills, National Survey of Student Engagement
Develop potential for life-long learning and personal growth	Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) [test freshmen through composition program; seniors as part of capstone experience]; Program level assessment; Writing Across the Curriculum Program; iSkills, National Survey of Student Engagement

Kansas State University

Area to be Assessed	Assessment Mechanism
Critical Thinking	Annually, randomly select an undergraduate program to assess critical thinking; university programs use over 371 different assessments linked to critical thinking;

Pittsburg State University

Area to be Assessed	Assessment Mechanism
Writing and Oral Communication	Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA); Departmental level courses (English composition; Speech Communication)
Mathematics	Grading rubric developed by campus; Departmental level courses (College Algebra, Quantitative Reasoning, Elementary Statistics)
Critical Thinking/Problem Solving	Collegiate Learning Assessment

The University of Kansas

Area to be Assessed	Assessment Mechanism
Written Communication	Junior/senior level courses in the major with rubrics developed and submitted for analysis by all departments with undergraduate programs.
Other learning goals	Will expand to other critical learning goals in 2012-13

Wichita State University

Area to be Assessed	Assessment Mechanism
Oral/Written Communication	Speech and writing rubric (annual); National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE, every two years)
Analytical Reasoning	Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA; annual)
Critical Thinking and Problem Solving	Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA; annual); Watson Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal (annual); National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE, every two years)
Diversity and Globalization	NSSE (every two years); annual exit survey
Library Research Skills/Lifelong Learning	Annual exit survey; Clearing House Data (annual)
Collaborative/Service Oriented	Annual exit survey; NSSE (every two years)

### Washburn University

Area to be Assessed	Assessment Mechanism
Critical Thinking	Administer ETS Proficiency Profile standardized instrument to a representative subset of first time freshmen and seniors
Reading	Administer ETS Proficiency Profile standardized instrument to a representative subset of first time freshmen and seniors
Writing	Administer ETS Proficiency Profile standardized instrument to a representative subset of first time freshmen and seniors
Mathematics	Administer ETS Proficiency Profile standardized instrument to a representative subset of first time freshmen and seniors
	Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) – test first-year students in fall; seniors in spring

All universities are assessing writing and six assessing oral communication and mathematics/quantitative/analytical reasoning (ESU, FHSU, KSU, PSU, WSU, Washburn). Five are assessing critical thinking (ESU, FHSU, KSU, WSU, Washburn). Two are assessing reading (ESU, FHSU). In addition, individual institutions report assessment in the areas of creativity and technology (Washburn); global citizenship and diversity (WSU, Washburn); and library/lifelong learning (WSU).

### Community and Technical Colleges

The following chart shows the assessment emphases for those Kansas' community and technical colleges responding to a request for information. All but one of the responding colleges reports assessing oral and written communication; all but two report mathematics assessments; and all report assessing either critical thinking or problem solving, or both.

Examples of assessment tools used at different institutions include: placement exams (COMPASS, ACT, ASSET); the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA); Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP); WorkKeys, departmentally developed instruments; and satisfaction surveys; customized pre- and post-tests.

**Responding Community and Technical Colleges: Institutional Foci for Assessment of Student Learning**

	Math	Oral Com	Written Com	Tech Skill	Critical Thinking	Problem Solving	Ethics	Cooperation	Reading	Diversity	Work-place Skills	Listening
<b>Community Colleges</b>												
Allen	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	
Barton					X	X						
Butler		X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X
Cloud	X	X	X			X						
Coffeyville	X	X	X	X	X	X		X				
Colby	X	X	X	X	X					X		
Cowley	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X
Dodge	X	X	X		X	X			X			
Fort Scott	X	X	X	X	X		X		X			
Garden	X	X	X	X					X			X
Highland	X		X		X				X			
Hutchinson		X	X	X	X	X					X	
Johnson	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X		
Kansas City	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		
Labette	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X
Seward	X	X		X	X					X	X	
<b>Technical Colleges</b>												
Manhattan Area Tech		X	X	X	X	X					X	
North Central		X	X	X	X	X					X	
Northwest K.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X
Salina		X	X	X	X						X	
Wichita	X	X	X	X		X	X			X		
Washburn Tech		X	X	X	X		X	X				

## A Master of Studies in Law (22.0201) – Washburn University

### Summary and Recommendation

*Universities apply for approval of new academic programs following the guidelines in the Kansas Board of Regents Policies and Procedures Manual. Washburn University has submitted an application for approval of a Master of Studies in Law (CIP 22.0201). This program is presented to the System Council of Chief Academic Officers and the System Council of Presidents for information before submission to the Board Academic Affairs Committee for placement on the Board agenda.*

*The proposing academic unit has responded to all of the requirements of the program approval process. No other institution has a program using this Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) code. The program will be funded through internal reallocation.*

*A PDF of the full proposal is available at [http://www.kansasregents.org/forms\\_documents](http://www.kansasregents.org/forms_documents).*

### Background

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Program Summary</u>
1. Program Identification	<u>Master of Studies in Law</u> <u>Detail for CIP Code 22.0201</u>
2. Academic Unit	School of Law
3. Program Description	Washburn's M.S.L. degree provides a focused course of study for students who will benefit from a background in legal education and who do not require the broad training of a Juris Doctor degree. The program begins with an introductory course and at least one foundational course related to the individual's chosen career path. Subsequent course selections provide in depth study of a particular field of law tailored to meet the interests of each individual student. The goal of the program is to provide a legal background that will complement the professional interests of the participants, strengthen their ability to interact effectively with the legal community, and provide professional certification of those accomplishments.
4. Demand/Need for the Program	<p>The market for students who may be interested in a master's level law-related degree has changed dramatically in recent years. Larger numbers of prospective students have decided that they lack the interest and resources needed for a full three year study of law, and their professional interests do not require admission to the bar. Employers in fields ranging from human resources departments to oil and gas field representatives recognize the value of legal study, but do not required services of a licensed attorney.</p> <p>By offering the program for either full or part-time students, it will be possible to reach individuals making career changes as well as those wanting to advance their existing professional positions. The proposed M.S.L. degree would meet this demand while also allowing the law school to make relative adjustments to the size of its existing J.D.</p>

	<p>program.</p> <p>The M.L.S. program will offer new opportunities for prospective students and will enhance the educational opportunities of existing students. Admission of a limited number of M.S.L. students will offset comparable reductions in the size of the J.D. program. This strategy will allow the school to maintain or increase the standards for admission of J.D. students while also allowing the school to maintain a wide range of viable courses and adding diverse perspectives to the students enrolled in those courses. J.D. students would gain insight into the interests and concerns of people in parallel professions with whom they will be likely to interact as lawyers. The total size of the M.S.L. program would be limited so that combined enrollment of J.D. and masters' level students will not exceed historical levels of J.D. enrollment, and the low student/faculty ratio at Washburn will be maintained.</p>
5. Comparative /Locational Advanta	<p>Washburn Law currently provides a professional curriculum in all of the subject areas addressed in this proposal. A growing number of law schools, including Nebraska, Illinois, Arizona State, Ohio State, Georgetown, and Yale, have recently recognized this degree, but it is not currently offered by law schools in this immediate vicinity. Topeka is an ideal location for such a program because of the high level of state government related professional activity in this community.</p>
6. Curriculum	<p>All students in the program will participate in an introduction to law course, and will be guided to upper level courses consistent with their individual career pathway. The curriculum pathway selected for each student will build upon the particular strengths of Washburn Law, with the Centers and certificate programs of the school providing a framework for selection of courses. The Law School currently maintains five centers: Business and Transactional Law Center; Children and Family Law Center; Center for Excellence in Advocacy; Center for Law and Government; Oil and Gas Law Center. In addition to the center program areas, certificates indicating in depth study are also offered for the following: Advocacy; Business and Transactional Law; Estate Planning; Family Law; International and Comparative Law; Law and Government; Natural Resources Law; and Tax Law.</p> <p>Students must satisfactorily complete a minimum of 30 credit hours of approved work within the individualized professional pathway determined on the basis of the student's professional background and career goals; and complete all such credit hours within four calendar years beginning with the first semester after enrollment.</p>
7. Faculty Profile	<p>There are more than 30 Law School faculty. All faculty have Juris Doctor degrees (or the equivalent). Approximately 1/3 have a post J.D. Masters in Law degree, and 4 have earned or are working toward Doctorates in Juridical Sciences (or the equivalent). No new faculty need be hired to put on this program.</p>



8. Student Profile	Preference will be given to students who have a strong undergraduate record and substantial prior experience in fields that parallel the legal profession. Students who lack that experience will be expected to demonstrate their potential to meet academic expectations by performance on the LSAT or GRE. Enrollment is expected to total 5 to 10 full time students and 5 to 10 part time students.
9. Academic Support	We will use the existing academic support network at the Law School, which includes small group study experience and assigned faculty guidance for students who perform poorly after their first semester of law study. In addition, a member of the law faculty will be designated as Director of Graduate Legal Programs, and will provide individual guidance to these students to assure appropriate upper level course selections.
10. Facilities and Equipment	We will use existing facilities and equipment. No new facilities and/or equipment will be needed.
11. Program Review, Assessment, Accreditation	The ABA does not accredit or assess MSL programs. However, we will apply for ABA acquiescence to ensure our proposed program does not detract from the program we have for our J.D. students and request approval from the Higher Learning Commission. The Dean and faculty of the Law school annually review and evaluate each of the school's programs.
12. Costs, Financing	Because the total size of the student body would not change from historical levels, there would not be a significant fiscal impact. Costs per credit hour would be the same for J.D. and M.S.L. students. Expenses will include addition of one course, marketing, and scholarship support, but no new faculty would be hired for this program.

**CURRICULUM OUTLINE  
NEW DEGREE PROPOSALS  
Kansas Board of Regents**

**I. Identify the new degree:**

Master of Studies in Law

**II. Provide courses required for each student in the major:**

	<b>Course Name &amp; Number</b>	<b>Credit Hours</b>
<b>Core Courses</b>	<u>Introduction to Law, Legal Analysis, Legal Research, and Legal Writing</u>	<u>3</u>
	<u>Plus one of the following courses depending upon student career path.</u>	
	<u>Contracts I and II</u>	<u>5</u>
	<u>Criminal Law</u>	<u>3</u>
	<u>Property</u>	<u>3</u>
	<u>Constitutional Law I</u>	<u>3</u>
	<u>Family Law</u>	<u>3</u>
<b>Electives</b>	<u>Students enroll in a variety of courses from one of the following career pathways: Business and Transactional Law; Children and Family Law; Tax or Estate Planning; Government Law; Natural Resources; or Criminal Justice,</u>	<u>24</u>
<b>Research</b>	<u>An introduction to Law, Legal Analysis, Research and Writing is required and students have the option of enrolling in an advanced research course.</u>	
<b>Practica</b>	<u>Optional externship will be offered for most career paths.</u>	
<b>Total</b>		<u>30</u>

IMPLEMENTATION YEAR FY 2014

Fiscal Summary for Proposed Academic Programs

Institution: Washburn University Proposed Program: Master of Studies in Law

<b>Part I. Anticipated Enrollment</b>	Implementation Year		Year 2		Year 3	
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time
A. Full-time, Part-time Headcount:	2-5	3-5	5-10	5-10	5-10	5-10
B. Total SCH taken by all students in program	84-190		190-380		190-380	
<b>Part II. Program Cost Projection</b>						
A. In <u>implementation</u> year one, list all identifiable General Use costs to the academic unit(s) and how they will be funded. In subsequent years, please include only the additional amount budgeted.						
	Implementation Year		Year 2		Year 3	
	July 2014					
<u>Base Budget</u>						
Salaries	-		-		-	
OOE	- \$15,000		-- \$1,000		-	
Total	- \$15,000		-- \$1,000		-	

Indicate source and amount of funds if other than internal reallocation:

tuition

---

---

(Revised: September, 2003)

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_